

THE NEW TIMES

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

VOL. 59, No. 2.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

FEBRUARY 1995.

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

THE REAL TRAGEDY OF THE JEWS

by Eric D. Butler

The 50th anniversary of the Soviet Union's takeover of German concentration camps in Poland, especially the most publicised of these camps, Auschwitz, has resulted in an international flood of propaganda designed to try to convince the whole world that the Jews were the main victims of the Second World War. What remains of the Christian West is told that it is basically responsible for an "anti-Semitism" which resulted in millions of Jews being gassed to death in centres like Auschwitz.

As the Poles are attempting to point out, the Jews do not have a monopoly on suffering, and that large numbers of Polish people also perished as a result of the German invasion of Poland. Generally overlooked in the growing controversy concerning the truth about Auschwitz and other events concerning the Second World War, is that the real tragedy of the Jews is their treatment as a collectivity by their own leaders. Commenting on the problem in *Social Credit*, C.H. Douglas said that it could only be solved by freeing the individual Jew from domination of the group.

Zionist leaders correctly perceived that the biggest threat to their collectivist philosophy and futuristic programme, was the integration of a growing number of Jews into a Western culture which, rooted in the Christian stress on the uniqueness and value of every individual, undermined a collectivism undergirded by the "Chosen race" myth, one which Douglas described as the key myth of history. Anyone who takes the trouble to read the Zionist Jewish press is struck by Jewish leaders constantly stressing the threat of assimilation. "Marrying out" is a major concern.

Much of what is termed "anti-Semitism" is deliberately promoted, primarily to create fear among the rank and file of the unfortunate Jewish people. C.H. Douglas pointed out that Zionism and its policies mislead large numbers of people into believing that Zionism was some type of romantic movement with the objective of returning the world's Jews to a nation skilfully termed "Israel", thus confusing large numbers of Christians. It was in fact a movement designed to ensure that events could be moulded to advance a Messianic type of world programme. A number of distinguished Jews have attempted to warn about the true role of Zionism, but have received comparatively little publicity. There is evidence that their numbers are growing.

The brilliant Douglas Reed, foreign correspondent for the prestigious London *Times*, was one of the first to draw attention to how Hitler was welcomed by Zionist leaders as a means of advancing their long-term programme. A number of Jewish scholars have subsequently drawn attention to the Zionist-Nazi nexus. Dr. Oscar Levy drew attention to how the Nazi race theories paralleled the Jewish "Chosen race" myth. A

highly centralised Germany under Hitler, who had been financed by Zionist bankers, was a threat to the stability of Western Europe. But the threat first had to be created. Even before Hitler had come to power, Zionist leaders had proclaimed Germany a major threat. *The Daily Telegraph* of March 14, 1935, reported, "the Israel people around the world declare economic and financial war against Germany..." Zionist Jewish leaders wanted war, as did, of course, Soviet leaders.

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.

British Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain put British interests first and sought to prevent the outbreak of war as long as he could. History defames Chamberlain and eulogises those who wanted a war, which they felt could advance their long-term objectives.

The rank and file of the Jewish people have been seen by their leaders as a type of army, centrally directed and kept in a state of constant fear. Thus the "Holocaust" mythology. Or constant programmes about "our rising tide of anti-Semitism". While not eulogised by the Zionist Jewish media, British

historian David Irving was tolerated until that fateful day that he proclaimed that he could no longer believe in the authenticity of "the holocaust". He was seen as a major threat to a myth, which must be sustained at all costs. Thus the incredible international campaign against Irving, brilliantly documented by Australian writer Nigel Jackson in his scholarly work, *The Case for David Irving*.

The role of the genuine Christian in all this is to keep on insisting that only Truth can free both Jews and Gentiles from an enemy which threatens both of them.

ORWELL'S OGRE REARS ITS HEAD

In the following article, which appeared in *The Ipswich Advertiser* of January 11, Paul Myers, a former editor of *The Land* and senior executive with Rural Press Limited, comments on Australian society's tendency to mirror circumstances in George Orwell's classic '1984':

If George Orwell thought for one second that the future world he created in his classic novel, *1984*, would -or even could - eventuate, he may have been the most accurate soothsayer of this century.

More than 50 years after Orwell manufactured his unreal, mindless, soulless, and totally regimented society - which seemingly would forever remain fiction - unsuspecting Australians are adopting this ogre as their own.

Never mind that Orwell's prediction is a decade overdue, his world of New Speak, the desecration of democracy, the abandonment of all principle and common-sense, the unbridled rule of the bureaucracy, and salacious pandering to pressure groups and minorities is a frightening real feature of the modern Australian social and political landscape.

Until now we have believed that a 1984-type society could arise and survive only under the most authoritarian socialist clique, where all forms of individuality, creativity and scrutiny are squashed; where the most extreme penalties are meted out to non-conformists; and where mass indoctrination feeds the cancer's growth. How foolish we were.

In a nation that purports to champion the rights of the individual, Australians are passively and wimpishly being overrun by piffle, which passes for any number of forms of "correctness".

Who determines the new agenda is often obscure, and every year the latest commands emerge, almost from thin air. What is obvious is that, for fear of offending special interest groups, politicians of all persuasions meekly succumb to this politically correct drivel, bureaucrats have a field day institutionalising it, and the public plods along willing to accept whatever is dished up next.

Oh yes, there are opponents. They just happen to be the great majority of Australians. But their views and values have been rendered irrelevant. Anything with a semblance of tradition or posterity is dismissed as anachronistic or reactionary, and is thus easily over-ridden.

"Multiculturalism" has become the centrepiece of this Brave New World. Australia has made an art form of fostering, funding and guaranteeing the retention of far-flung, eternal

ethnic division. Assimilation is somehow dangerous and separation so condoned that, as far as influence is concerned, the Aussie genre itself is already a minority.

Multiculturalism's principles and funding are entrenched to the extent that to even question or criticise can be construed to represent some form of racial slur. New racial vilification laws further entrench the divisiveness Australia purports to abhor. Sadly, under the guise of correctness, complete integration of other peoples and cultures into the Australian way of life has been eliminated.

It was, of course, different in the past. Early post-war migrants from Italy, Greece and other non-English speaking countries did not "benefit" from today's multiculturalism, relying instead on raw, unsophisticated but thoroughly effective integration into a new society. A far cry from the bureaucratic, expensive, controlled and divisive system that is now promoted so widely and championed so ignorantly.

Patronising our own aborigines has taken a similar route. The politically correct are able to sleep soundly at night knowing that hundreds of millions of dollars are spent each year on aboriginal programs - again regardless of the benefits. Their concern is not that our native people continue to have life expectancies, birth rates, nutrition and infant health standards among the world's worst; nor apparently that aborigines' level of education and employment prospects are appallingly low, and their self esteem even worse.

Likewise, native land claims have become the sacrificial lamb for all of society's past "errors". The public is cowed into accepting that the only solution is to hand over land - almost without condition. Immaturely we have accepted the notion that, on receipt of title, trust and honor between black and white will be restored, and the future welfare of the recipients magically assured. Now the indoctrination process has begun in convincing us that "reconciliation" with the aborigines is the most important issue facing Australia leading up to the Year 2000. This ignores the reality that forced "reconciliation" will lead to even greater excommunication, division and misunderstanding.

And then, of course, there is the republic and the flag.

Absurdly the politically and historically correct want us to believe that a different political system and flag will somehow make Australia a better, more mature, considerate and prosperous nation -with a new, contemporary identity. It is yet another case of superficial twaddle taking precedence over reasoned logic.

Employment is a recent takeover victim. No longer is it permissible to employ the best candidate for a position. Appointing, selection and hiring is now all about balance, and equal representation - not getting the best job done. Have the right mix of people, no matter how incompetent, and everyone is happy!

Women are supposedly the main "beneficiaries" of this

new order. Changing social and domestic patterns are not enough to allow them to naturally and rightfully find equality - the system now dictates it, enshrines and ensures it. So long as correctness has been served, tokenism does not count.

There are already hundreds of examples of how political correctness has steam rolled the political process and society. Doubtless, yet more will find their mark before this next year is out.

Clearly, Australians have become victims of their own stupidity and, despite a machismo image, are too impotent to do much about it. The damage will not be undone until people fully understand the implications of the gullible and gleeful adoption of the world George Orwell created.

THE JEWS WHO RUN CLINTON'S COURT

Under the above heading, the following article appeared in the Tel Aviv Hebrew language daily MA'ARIV on September 2, 1994, by Avinoam Bar-Yosef, was translated by Dr. Israel Shahak, and published in the November-December 1994 issue of *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*.

Several weeks ago the rabbi of the "Adath Yisrael" synagogue in Cleveland Park, Washington, DC, dedicated his Sabbath sermon to the Jewish cultural and political center now being formed in America. "For the first time in American history," the rabbi said, "we no longer feel that we live in the Diaspora. The U.S. has no longer a government of Goyim (Gentiles), but an administration in which the Jews are full partners in the decision making at all levels. Perhaps the aspects of the Jewish religious law connected with the term 'government of goyim' should be re-examined, since it is an outdated term in the U.S."

Indeed, as far as the Jews are concerned, President Bill Clinton has contributed toward a real change in administration outlook, having concluded a series of changes, which enhance Jewish power, a process that began under President Reagan and his secretary of state, George Shultz. True, the Jewish political influence was also evident in America in previous decades. We have already seen a Jewish secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, enjoying the full confidence of President Richard Nixon. There were Jewish Cabinet members also under Carter. However, they were exceptions proving the rule. Especially, pious Jews were seldom appointed to participate in political work concerning the Middle East.

The picture now has totally changed, and not only about the Middle East. For example, every morning at about 6 o'clock, several staff cars travel from the CIA center to the White House with senior officers of the American intelligence community, who are about to present to the president and to the four top staffers a PDB - President's Daily Briefing - the term for the most exclusive report in Washington. The document, consisting of 5-7 pages, is often accompanied by top-secret satellite photographs transferred by the Pentagon. It is composed in the course of the night by the best American intelligence experts, who analyze the telegrams and reports arriving from the CIA's worldwide network of agents. It contains the most sensitive information regarding developments around the world. Its uniqueness, compared to all other American intelligence documents, lies in the fact that it almost always indicates the source of the information, whether it is a document stolen by a spy, or an agent or "mole" infiltrating a foreign government, or whether the source is tapped by means of satellite. If Clinton is in Washington, he holds a short

discussion on the contents of the document with the five other addressees: Vice President Al Gore, National Security Adviser Anthony Lake, White House Chief of Staff Leon Panetta, Deputy National Security Adviser Samuel ("Sandy") Berger, and National Security Adviser to the Vice President Leon Perth. Two of the addressees, Berger and Perth, are warm Jews. They have reached posts that are extremely sensitive for U.S. policy. They are by no means exceptions.

In the National Security Council, 7 out of 11 top staffers are Jews. Clinton has especially placed them in the most sensitive junctions in the U.S. security and foreign policy administrations. Sandy Berger is the deputy chairman of the council; Martin Indyk, the intended ambassador to Israel, is a senior director in charge of the Middle East and South Asia; Dan Schifter, the senior director and adviser to the president, is in charge of Western Europe; Don Steinberg, the senior director and adviser to the president, is in charge of Africa; Richard Feinberg, the senior director and adviser to the president, in charge of Latin America. Stanley Ross, the senior director and adviser to the president, is in charge of Asia.

The situation is not much different in the president's office, which is full of warm Jews; the new White House counsel, Abner Mikva; the president's schedule and programs manager, Ricki Weidman; deputy chief of staff, Phil Leida; economic adviser, Robert Rubin; media director, David Heiser; staff director, Alice Rubin; Ely Segal, in charge of volunteers; Ira Magaziner, in charge of the health program. Two Cabinet members, Labor Secretary Robert Reich and Mickey Kantor, in charge of international trade agreements, are Jewish. They are joined by a long list of senior Jewish officials in the State Department, headed by the chief of the Middle East peace team, Dennis Ross, and followed by many deputy secretaries and even more senior secretaries' chiefs of staff.

One of the most interesting Jews from the Israeli point of view, who has rarely been exposed to view until now, is Rahm Emmanuel, Clinton's senior adviser in charge of coordinating special projects in the White House. His office is located next to the famous Oval Office. Rahm won extra points from his boss last week, when he succeeded in passing a law for combating crime. He has become an expert at communicating with Congress and has already had many successes, the most prominent of which was the ratification of NAFTA. Now he is

immersed in the passing of the health bill. Last Thursday his office was in shambles and he strode around it like a typical Sabra, simultaneously conducting a lively conversation with me, studying the protocols of the debate being held at the time by the Senate, and watching the report of Wolf Blitzer (also a Jew) on CNN and being updated by his secretary and three aides on the positions of the senators regarding the votes. "Do you prefer to meet over the weekend or early next week, after this whole nightmare is over?" I asked him. "That would be a relief," he replied.

The following day, after the law passed by one vote, I called to congratulate him. "If you want to come -you have to come now. The president decided to take a vacation and told us that whoever wanted to enjoy the summer should also take a vacation. So I'm packing and leaving on Sunday morning." Even then he was not calm but nervously fidgeting in his chair. He has a face that is more suitable for an Israeli tourist than for a senior official in the U.S. administration. "You know, Rahm Emmanuel is a name that would not be out of place in the Tel Aviv phone directory," I told him. A large warm smile spread across his face. "Our original name was Auerbach. We opened the first pharmacies in Tel Aviv and in Jerusalem. My father changed his name after my uncle, Emmanuel, was killed in Israel's War of Independence (1948-49). My father was then a member of Etzel (IRGUN) commanded by Begin and it was customary to change names in the underground. Yes, he is still a warm Likud supporter, but he also admires Yitzhak Rabin since he admires whoever becomes prime minister as a result of the last Israeli elections. After the war he came to America, studied medicine and met my mother, who was then a social work student. I was born in Chicago." Rahm and his two brothers received a warm Jewish education. "You know, we studied at a Jewish school and had private Hebrew teachers. My first visit to Israel was three days after the Six-Day War. My father said then that we had to go to Israel. I was eight years old, but I remember it as if it were this morning. The Arabs were completely defeated. There was such a joy and it was so very exciting. There were high hopes that as a result the Jews would enjoy freedom and peace. Since then I have continued to visit Israel every summer until 1972. Then I began my studies. When I matured I went into politics, the pastime of an American youngster."

"What meaning does the connection to Israel and to Judaism have for you today?"

"Since 1972 I did not visit Israel until 1991. Then the Gulf war broke out and missiles landed in Tel Aviv. I immediately volunteered for one-month service in the Israeli army, through the 'Overseas Volunteer Unit'. What I did then to help the Jews was not much. Naturally, it was not combat service. But we helped as much as possible and the main thing was that we were there. Does that answer your question?"

Perhaps the most intriguing thing that happened to me personally in the course of the past year, since I have been posted in Washington, was meeting with organized American Jewry. The best place to see them as they are, the place where I always came each year to admire them, is the annual convention of the pro-Israeli lobby, AIPAC. This is the place not only to feel the pulse of American involvement in the Middle East, but also where I feel that somehow it helps me to ignore the deep distress inherent in the feeling of loneliness of living in a state located in the heart of so many hostile Arabs. I always asked myself what was the value of the Jewish experience in America as far as Israel is concerned. Did the

identification with Israel derive from a deep sensation of a common Jewish fate or was it one of the tools of the local community to garner power for achieving truly equal rights in a mixed society comprised also of many immigrants and members of various faiths? Was the Jewish power in the U.S. a phenomenon, which will decrease or increase? Were the intermarriages of Jews with Gentiles threatening to weaken the Jewish power in the U.S.? Or, as I was sometimes afraid, were the American Jews building a new Jewish cultural center that would compete with Israel?"

"Adath Yisrael" synagogue in Washington is not only a place of worship. It is a Jewish community center, with a prestigious Jewish kindergarten, a Jewish school with Judaism, literature, culture and, of course, Hebrew classes. On Saturdays there are always two separate prayer sessions. The first is the large one, encompassing hundreds of worshippers, which ends in a food blessing at tables tastefully laid with Jewish delicacies. Its members belong to the *crème de la crème* of Washington society: senior administration officials, successful lawyers, rich businessmen. All are wealthy people. Next week, on the Jewish New Year, the prayers will be joined by many other Jews who usually spend their weekends at the most exclusive clubs, or on the most expensive golf courses, or riding the best horses, or at their expensive houses near the West Virginia lakes, or sailing in their private yachts. Next week, as during all Jewish holiday seasons, the most expensive limousines that can be imagined will stop at the entrance to the synagogue, to let out elegant women, the men mummified in their expensive suits at their side, followed by the well-dressed children. The entrance fee to synagogue is \$1,000 for a single holiday.

In addition to this prayer session, another, with younger members and less expensive entrance fees, regularly gathers in one of the other halls, where prayers are held according to the customary Israeli style, except for the fact that men and women sit together. This famous session has several other characteristics. Most of the members visit Israel at least once every year. Most of them speak fluent Hebrew. All of them are familiar with the prayer procedures. Only a few of them come out of deep faith. Others do so out of the wish to meet the best Jewish society or to meet a Jewish girl whom they would like to marry. But the most important reason for their praying is that they feel a close connection with Israel. Those of them whose love for Israel is most ardent watch the Israeli TV news every night. It might sound strange, but the Washington cable station broadcasts the Israeli TV news program every night at half past midnight.

The other synagogue competing for the young generation of wealthy Jews is located in Georgetown. It is a fully Orthodox synagogue, but its prayers are conducted in the Israeli style favoured by "Gush Emunim." The Israeli flag is proudly displayed above the Sacred Ark alongside the American flag. On each Sabbath the prayers include the benediction for the Israeli Jewish soldiers and the prayer for the welfare of the Israeli government and its officials. Many Jewish administration officials pray there. They not only don't try to conceal their religious affiliation, but go to a great length to demonstrate their Judaism since it may help their careers greatly. The enormous Jewish influence in Washington is not limited to the government. In the Washington media a very significant part of the most important personages and of the presenters of the most popular programs on the TV are warm Jews. A significant portion of senior media correspondents,

newspaper editors and analysts are Jewish and many of them are warm Jews too. Many of them are influenced in Israel's favor by attending suitable synagogues. AP's political reporter, Barry Schwied, and *The Washington Post's* education reporter, Amy Schwartz, regularly participate in a prayer session, which is considered to be close to Israel at the Cleveland Park synagogue. Also there the Israeli flag is posted proudly above the Sacred Ark. Let us not forget in this context the Jewish

predominance in the Washingtonian academic institutions. At the National Institute of Health the percentage of Jewish researchers is very much higher than their relative percentage in the population. In the fields of security and science, in the film industry, in art and in literature, the Jewish influence can only be described as immense, with a corresponding enhancement of Jewish power.

RACE "THE KEY TO WORLD HISTORY"

The famous Jewish Prime Minister of Great Britain, Benjamin Disraeli, wrote, *"No one must lightly dismiss the question of race. It is the key to world history and it is precisely for this reason that written history so often lacks clarity - it is written by people who do not understand race and what belongs to it. A language and religion do not make a race, only blood does that."*

If Disraeli were alive today and made this type of comment, he would probably be charged with "racism" and "anti-Semitism" and dragged before a star chamber anti-discrimination commission, as has been the fate of British-born Canadian journalist Doug Collins.

The following is a major section of an article by well-known Melbourne scholar and English teacher Nigel Jackson, in a detailed analysis of the House of Representatives debate on the Racial Hatred Bill (15-16 November 1994). The cross-headings are ours:

With rare exceptions, the speakers on both sides of this debate (in which the bill was finally passed by 71 to 59 "on party lines", with Independent MHR Phil Cleary (Wills) supporting the Government) showed an astonishing ignorance of the nature and importance of race. Indeed, the topic of race, as opposed to 'racism' was hardly examined at all.

The truth is that the Parliament's lower chamber has shown an ostrich-like attitude to the issue and collectively encouraged a Lysenkoist attitude to the science of races.

One of the most important contemporary studies of race and its significance can be found in William Gayley Simpson's *Which Way Western Man?* (National Alliance, USA, 1978). Section 3 ("Definitions") of Chapter XVIII ("The Everlasting Truth About Race") begins as follows:

"A race is a major division of the human species. Its members, though differing from one another in many minor respects, are nevertheless, as a whole, distinguished by a particular combination of features, principally non-adaptive, which they have inherited from ancestors as alike as they are themselves. These distinguishing features are most apparent in body, where they are both structural and measurable, but manifest themselves also in 'innate capacity for intellectual and emotional development', temperament and character. With this we may compare Professor Bertil Lundman's definition: 'Race. . . is a term that can be applied only to a reasonably homogeneous human group that has preserved its hereditary characteristics almost unchanged through a long succession of generations.'"

"What then is a 'racist'? For all of forty years there has been acute need of honest and fearless inquiry about what race is, and an atmosphere of free discussion out of which might have come something like a scientific consensus as to whether or not racial differences are real, and if so, how much attention they require. But 'racist' is a term of opprobrium that was invented by the

equalitarians to prevent such investigation and discussion. (491)

ANTI-EQUALITARIAN SCIENTISTS

Later Simpson gives a "Who's Who of Distinguished Scientists who reject the Equalitarian Dogma", providing details of each expert and his or her career (567-570). A list of these scientists now follows:

Baker, John	Guenther, Hans F.K.
Baur, Erwin	Holmes, Samuel J.
Burt, Cyril	Hooton, E.A.
Coon, Carleton	Jensen, Arthur R.
Crew, A.A.E.	Keith, Sir Arthur
Darlington, C.D.	Kuttner, Robert E.
East, Edward M.	Leakey, L.S.B.
Fischer, Eugen	Lenz, Fritz
Fairchild, Henry Pratt	Lundberg, George A
Garrett, Henry E.	Lundman, Bertil J.
Gates, R.R.	McGurk, Frank C.J.
Gayre, Robert	Porteus, S.D.
Gedda, Luigi	Putnam, Carleton
George, Wesley Critz	Rife, David C.
Gini, Corrado	Shockley, William
Grant, Madison	Shuey, Audrey
Gregor, A. James	

Thus, when Mr. Tanner (Melbourne) claimed:

We are seeing the consequence of a long overdue change in community attitudes in our society, which recognises that people are equal irrespective of their race or gender, they should be treated as equal and our language and the way we conduct ourselves should not show otherwise. (3356) he was flying in the face of the scientific evidence and in fact mouthing a political superstition. And when Mr. Williams (Tangney) quoted approvingly from Article 4(a) of the United Nations Organisation's Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination the stipulation that governments parties to that convention:

. . . shall declare an offence punishable by law all dissemination of ideas based on racial superiority of hatred, incitement to racial discrimination. . . and also the provision of any assistance to racist activities, including the financing thereof. . . (3362) he was not only kow-towing to a corrupt and tyrannous organisation which lacks sacred and moral authority over nations or individuals, but he was also assisting in a deliberate campaign to suppress the scientific facts about race and racial differences.

The spurious doctrine of racial equality has been thoroughly exposed by men of the greatest intellectual eminence. Frithjof Schuon, pre-eminent writer among the "Perennialist" school of metaphysical philosophers originated

by Rene Guenon and Ananda Coomaraswamy and discussed by Aldous Huxley in his 1946 book *The Perennial Philosophy*, wrote as follows in *Castes and Races* (Perennial Books, UK, 1982):

... race is a form... It is not possible, however, to hold that race is something devoid of meaning apart from physical characteristics, for, if it be true that formal constraints have nothing absolute about them, forms must none the less have their own sufficient reason;... races.. . must. ... correspond to human differences of another order (37)

and

In order to understand the meaning of races one must first of all realise that they are derived from fundamental aspects of humanity and not from something fortuitous in nature. If racialism is something to be rejected, so is anti-racialism which errs in the opposite direction by attributing racial difference to merely accidental causes and seeks to whittle away these differences by talking about inter-racial blood-groups, or in other words by mixing up things situated on different levels . . .Racial mixtures may be good or detrimental according to the case (39)

Schunon's essay *The Meaning of Race*, with its loving analysis of the particular and distinguishing characteristics of each of the three major races, should be read by anyone concerned to discover the truth about race.

The best short political study of the race question is probably still *Race and Reason* by Carleton Putnam (Public Affairs Press, USA, 1961). Putnam was a very distinguished Yankee American with profound experience of the American South. He graduated with a science degree and with honours in history and politics from Princeton University and later took a law degree at Columbia University. For fifteen years he was president of Chicago and Southern Air Lines and then later became chairman of the board of Delta Air Lines. After retirement he wrote a four-volume biography of Theodore Roosevelt.

SCIENTIFIC INTEGRITY ENDORSED

The scientific integrity of *Race and Reason* is vouched for in an introduction by four of the scientists listed above from Simpson's book -R. Ruggles Gates, Henry E. Garrett, R. Gayre of Gayre and Wesley C. George. These authorities make an important comment about the corruption of science by political ideology, which runs as follows:

We can also confirm Putnam's estimate of the extent to which non-scientific, ideological pressures have harassed scientists in the last thirty years, often resulting in the suppression or distortion of truth.

The intrusion of political thought into the social and anthropological sciences which has occurred on a massive scale during this period, has been a very great disservice to scientific investigation and to the guidance, which scientific work and its conclusions ought to be able to render to human society. Man must be guided by science, but scientific thought must not be moulded to preconceived political ideas.

We, as signatories to this introduction, although we may differ over some aspects of genetic, biological, anthropological and sociological theory, believe that statesmen and judges today frequently take positions based upon an inadequate knowledge of the facts so far as they relate to the nature of man. Therefore, we have no hesitation in placing on record our disapproval of what has been all too commonly a trend since 1930. We do not believe that there is anything to be drawn from the sciences in which we work which supports the view that all races of men, all types of men, or all ethnic groups are equal and alike, or likely to become equal or alike, in anything approaching the foreseeable future. We believe on the contrary that there are vast areas of difference

within mankind not only in physical appearance, but in such matters as adaptability to varying environments, and in deep psychological and emotional qualities, as well as in mental ability and capacity for development. We are of the opinion that in ignoring these depths of difference modern man and his political representatives are likely to find themselves in serious difficulties sooner or later, (vii-viii)

Putnam's book is a thoroughgoing attack on misapplication, in political and racial contexts, of the concept of equality. He early rejects two common modern fallacies: "the fallacy that men by weight of number can defy the moral law and lean increasingly upon other men under the guise of the State, and the fallacy that this dependence is justified by the supposed right of all men to share equally in everything."(4)

He supports the ideals of equality of opportunity and equality before the law, but resists doctrines of "social and cultural equality". Putnam's study was particularly prompted by the enforced desegregation of southern schools in America in the mid-fifties. He stresses that "rights to equal education are inseparably bound up with rights to freedom of association" and that "social status has to be earned".(6)

Putnam asserts that the spurious doctrine of "the equality of man" is everywhere contradicted by the facts. In a 1958 letter to President Eisenhower, he tackled the religious aspect of the question:

As I recall, you, yourself, in a recent statement used some phrase to the effect that men were 'equal in the sight of God'. I would be interested to know where in the Bible you get your authority for this conception. There is doubtless authority in Scripture for the concept of potential equality in the sight of God - after earning that status, and with various further qualifications - but where is the authority for the sort of *ipso facto* equality suggested by your context? The whole idea contradicts the basic tenet of the Christian and Jewish religions that status is earned through righteousness and is not an automatic matter.

What is true of religion and righteousness is just as true of achievement in other fields. And what is true among individuals is just as true of averages among races.

The confusion here is not unlike the confusion created by some left-wing writers between the doctrine of equality and the doctrine of Christian love. The command to love your neighbour is not a command either to consider your neighbour your equal, or yourself his equal; perhaps the purest example of great love without equality is the love between parent and child.(8) Putnam researched the racial controversy carefully and came to an emphatic conclusion:

There is no basis in sound science for the assumption promoted by various minority groups in recent decades, that all races are biologically equal in their capacity to advance, or even to sustain, what is commonly called Western civilisation. They most emphatically are not. (36)

He found that there had been a "subversion of sciences" (16) and held the development of "social anthropology" from the teachings of the Jewish "authority" Franz Boas to be just such a subversion. Two generations of Americans had been victimized by 'a pseudo-scientific hoax¹ which could 'not stand an informed judicial test'.(22)

DEBASING A SUPERIOR RACE

The character-intelligence index - the combination of intelligence with all of the qualities that go under the name of character, including especially the willingness to resist rather than to appease evil - forms the only possible index of the capacity for civilisation as Western Europeans know it, and there is no test for this index save in observing the native culture in which it results. Such observation does not sustain the doctrine of equality. (23-24)

Putnam insists that "One does not build a healthy society on error" (28) and offers a major thesis that racial integration will debase a superior race and that it is in the interests of all humanity that the successful white race not be debased, since its creativity holds the best hope of solving the most crucial world problems. Putnam's thesis offers powerful advocacy of the case for *racial conservation*, as opposed to the deliberate destruction of individual races by race mixing based on massive immigration almost invariably resented by the masses of any host people. The speakers in the House of Representatives debate appeared to be almost totally oblivious of this racial philosophy, which does not appear to affront the dignity of human beings (individually or in racial and/or ethnic groups) and which thus cannot justly be sneered away as an evil under the ambiguous term 'racism'. It is indeed astonishing that the conservation of animal and vegetable species should be widely approved as a social good at the present time, while the effort of racial nationalists to conserve their racial or ethnic groups should be stigmatized as the greatest of sins, as punishable inhumanity or as lunacy!

Putnam argued that wide-scale dishonesty characterized American discussion of racial controversies. Commenting on the Supreme Court desegregation decision of 17 May 1954, he had this to write about "the patent partiality of the authorities cited in favour of integration":

The majority of these appear either to belong to Negro or other minority groups or to have prepared their studies under the auspices of such groups. To expect these groups to present impartial reports on the subject of racial discrimination is like expecting a saloon-keeper to prepare an impartial study on prohibition . . . Their point of view is important and deserves consideration. Many of them are brilliant and consecrated men. But to permit them to provide the overwhelming preponderance of the evidence is manifestly not justice. (28)

This criticism bears upon an important weakness of the House of Representatives debate. Mr. Lavarch (Dickson) argued:

Three major inquiries have found gaps in the protection provided by the Racial Discrimination Act. The National Inquiry into Racist Violence, the Australian Law Reform Commission Report into Multiculturalism and the Law and the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody all argued in favour of an extension of Australia's human rights regime to explicitly protect the victims of extreme racism. (3336-3337)

Mr. Williams (Tangney) commented in response:

While these reports may have prompted a racial hatred bill, it is difficult to see how their recommendations are reflected in this bill. All three reports recommended against the creation of a criminal offence of incitement to racial hatred or hostility. This bill creates such an offence. The reports favoured the creation of a civil offence of incitement to racial hatred where a high degree of serious conduct is involved. This bill establishes a civil offence with the significantly lower threshold of behaviour which 'offends, insults, humiliates or intimidates' These words clearly include the hurt feelings which the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission rejected as the basis for a civil offence, concerned that such a low standard could lead to a large number of trivial complaints. (3359)

This disagreement simmered through the whole debate, but it was left to Mr. Campbell (Kalgoorlie) to make an important criticism:

It is dear in the texts that there was networking between the authors of these reports . . . Only the report of Irene Moss supported criminal sanctions which were contained in the 1992 draft bill and are also contained in the 1994 bill. I would urge

interested academics who still care about free speech to analyse this Moss report closely, because this document, which I believe to be intellectually corrupt, is the main justification for federal racial vilification legislation. (3385)

INTELLECTUAL CORRUPTION

Mr. Campbell was referring to *Racist Violence*, the report of the National Inquiry into Racist Violence. He was correct on at least two scores in his charge of intellectual corruption. That inquiry, which was set up by an earlier ALP government, was placed in the hands of two representatives of minority ethnic groups who were thus interested parties and should never have been charged with such a task - nor should they have presumed to undertake it. Such an inquiry should have been in the hands of clearly impartial as well as qualified persons, and there should have been a majority of persons drawn from the majority British ethnic group - so that justice could be seen to be done as well as be done.

Secondly, it is plain from the text of the report that submissions made by individuals and groups holding views contrary to those of Ms Irene Moss (the Chinese wife of a Jew) and her assistant, Mr. Ron Castan QC (a Jew) were not fairly taken into account. This can be seen in the report's refusal to adequately define the key terms "race", "racism" and also in its scandalous mistreatment of the Australian League of Rights - and, no doubt, in other areas.

It is both astonishing and disgraceful that so many members of the House should have been ready to accept such a report as the basis for debate, let alone legislation; and it is reasonable, since the Attorney General bracketed them together, to hold doubts about the reliability of the other two reports as well.

Mr. Campbell had further pertinent observations to make:

In any consideration of the new Racial Hatred Bill, the public consultations and the written public submissions on the 1992 draft bill should have been taken into account and the results, at the least, made public. I placed a question on notice about the bill and, among other things, asked about the results of the 1993 public consultations and submissions. The Attorney General took three months to answer and made it dear that he would not be making the results public. This was a typical display of arrogance.

A public submissions process was conducted, yet the public was not to be informed of the result I strongly suspected that the reason for this was that the results were not what the Attorney General wanted to hear. And so it proved. Freedom of information documents revealed what I had expected. Written submissions ran almost seven to one against the bill and the attempt to stack the public consultations process had dearly failed. The attempt of the Attorney General to cover up the results is merely a measure of the misrepresentation, intellectual corruption and deceit, which has marked the entire sorry history of the push for such legislation....

. . . the bulk of the media is quite happy to countenance a partisan like Irene Moss acting at one and the same time as advocate for supposed victims of racial intolerance and inquirer into such supposed intolerance. Not only that, but she was to have also administered the civil section of the legislation she called for, as her successor will do if the law before us is passed.

There is absolutely no understanding or appreciation of just how improper it is for the same person to be advocate, judge and jury in one. Those who rightly uphold the general principle of division of powers in our wider political context should be deeply concerned about the blurring of such responsibilities in quasi-judicial bodies like the Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission.. . This is the sort of new class law we are evolving -

a de facto judicial system in which an accusation is taken as proof and the publicists are also the prosecutors and the judges. Not only that, but determinations of the commission can be registered in the Federal Court and become legally binding - a star chamber usurping the authority of a proper court. (3387-3388)

Eleven government speakers, including the Attorney General himself, spoke in the debate after Mr. Campbell; but not one of them endeavoured to answer his very serious charges. Comments by the opposition speaker on the issue were almost non-existent.

Putnam dealt further with the question of dishonesty in high places when he responded to the question: "Is it true that there is virtual unanimity among scientists on the biological equality of the Negro?" He wrote:

It is not. There is a strong northern clique of equalitarian social anthropologists under the hypnosis of the Boas school which . . . has captured important chairs in many leading northern and western universities. This clique, aided by equalitarians in government, the press, entertainment, and other fields, has dominated public opinion in these areas and has made it almost impossible for those who disagree with it to hold jobs . . . The non-equalitarian scientists have been forced largely into the universities of the South where they are biding their time.

It is folly to talk of freedom, either of the press or of any other kind, when such a situation exists. . (there is) a trilogy of conspiracy, fraud and intimidation: conspiracy to gain control of important citadels of learning and news dissemination, fraud in the teaching of false racial doctrines, and intimidation in suppressing those who would preach the truth. (49)

Putnam also dealt with the manifestation of political opportunism as a corrupting factor in party politics in the context of the race controversy. He explained why leaders of both major political parties (it is as true in Australia of 1995 as it was of Putnam's America in the 1950s and 1960s) close their eyes to the truths of race:

Partly (it is) through ignorance of its scientific validity. But this ignorance they are inclined to cherish, and to avoid correcting, because of the balance of power held by Negro voters in certain key states . . . The tragedy is that the great majority of Americans are dividing their votes on other issues in such a way as to give this issue into the hands of the minority . . . Could the race question be isolated so that it could first be thoroughly debated and then voted on by itself alone, the minority would be swamped. (84)

By contrast, Putnam defended the 'racism' of ordinary peoples and quoted Esme Wynne-Tyson in *The Contemporary Review* in the context of Britain's race problems. She wrote:

. . . the instinctive feeling of many inarticulate but intuitive British people that a mingling of races, which is, more basically, a mingling of two incompatible evolutionary streams, is not 'right', is a sure one. Specifically they complain of the coloured races being dirty, noisy, or immoral; but these objections are only the outward and visible signs of a different stage of spiritual development, a lower culture, and it is that which is sensed and resented by numbers of British people who have no personal ill-will towards their coloured neighbours as such. (68)

A FAILURE OF LEADERSHIP

Putnam commented further on the political conditions in

which the truths of physical anthropology and genetics could be suppressed:

There has been a failure of leadership. In his *Revolt of the Masses* Jose Ortega y Gasset speaks of the current 'sovereignty of the unqualified' and I would ask, how far has this been due to the abdication of the qualified, how much of our soft surrender to equalitarianism has derived from a lack of confidence in the old ideals on the part of those who ought to assert and exemplify them? (102)

And he quoted Lord Tweedsmuir (John Buchan) in his support:

"Something has happened. A civilization bemused by an opulent materialism has been met by a rude challenge. The free peoples have been challenged by the serfs. The gutters have exuded a poison, which bids fair to infect the world. The beggar on horseback rides more roughshod over the helpless than the cavalier. A combination of multitudes who have lost their nerve and a junta of arrogant demagogues has shattered the comity of nations. The European tradition has been confronted with an Asiatic revolt, with its historic accompaniment of janissaries and assassins." (102)

Buchan had in mind particularly the spectre of Bolshevism in Russia; but his words are relevant in many ways to the current Australian situation. For is not the fanatical ideologue from a minority ethnic group who creates 'star chamber' law to achieve his ends (as described by Mr. Campbell) not exactly symbolised by the image of the beggar on horseback -since the horse is a traditional symbol of enthusiasm and fanaticism?

BASIC FUND PASSES \$40,000

Sacrificial donations from a minority of our readers have taken the League of Rights' 1994-95 Basic Fund to just over \$40,000. This leaves approximately \$10,000 to reach "the target" of \$50,000. Will the majority of our readers who have not yet contributed, please back up the minority who have? The League's planned programme continues to unfold. Investment in the type of "ammunition" required to carry the battle on, continues, sustained by the faith that adequate financial support will be provided. What we would like to see is a flood of smaller contributions. 1000 supporters contributing only \$10 each will sweep the Basic Fund past its minimum objective. We look forward to being able to announce in our next issue that the total fund has been contributed. All donations to Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne. Unless requested, receipts are not forwarded, thus saving on postal costs.