

SUBMISSION TO ATTORNEY-GENERAL

The Hon Senator George Brandis

CANBERRA – S18Cconsultation@ag.gov.au

On the proposed Amendment of RDA Section 18C –

The TOBEN LAW

THE ACCUSED HAS TO PROVE HIS INNOCENCE

By Dr Fredrick Töben – toben@toben.biz 14 April 2014

CONTENTS

A. SUBMISSION

- 1.** Preliminary Comment
- 2.** Recent controversy over proposed changes to Section 18C
- 3.** The Jewish-Israeli Lobby
- 4.** Legal Deception led to Bankruptcies – Jewish Supremacism wins
- 5.** “Antisemitism” catch-cry designates Freedom Fighters against Judaism
- 6.** Conclusion

B. SENATE SUBMISSION – 16 December 2012 & 27 January 2013

C. THINK ON THESE THINGS – 14 February 2014

D. JEWISH SUBMISSION – and claiming support from other ethnic groups

E. ON RICHARD WAGNER – Jewish Supremacism = “Antisemitism” = old trick

1. Preliminary Comment

My two detailed written Submissions to the 2013 Senate Enquiry, No 560 on the Senate Enquiry website list, were recorded as *Confidential*. I attended both public hearings held at Melbourne on 23 January, and at Sydney on 24 January. My request to the Enquiry-head and Deputy-head, and to Senator Brandis, that my Submissions be released to the general public was refused. I attach a copy, below, and I subsequently released the submissions to Adelaide Institute, which published them in full at URL:

http://www.adelaideinstitute.org/HomePage28April2009/toben_submission_13.htm

2. Recent controversy over proposed changes to Section 18C

The recent flurry of media attention on the proposed changes to the RDA indicates that my concerns are deliberately blocked and substituted with the pseudo-problem generated by the Andrew Bolt case. Federal Court of Australia Justice Mordecai Bromberg used my 2002 and 2003 precedent-setting case as a basis on which he found Bolt guilty.

The fact that Bolt's employer funded the case, and that the matter was not appealed to the High Court, speaks for itself. It cannot be said that the Murdoch media enterprise does not have the financial means with which to launch an appeal. The reason why I didn't take my case to the High Court is obvious – I could not find a lawyer willing to take it up on a pro-bono basis, and I certainly would not be foolish enough to become, again, an unrepresented Applicant.

The whole RDA modification occurred during the 1990s and was initiated by representatives of Australia's Jewish community in whose interest it is to retain a divisive multicultural policy that is re-enforced by legal sanction.

3. The Jewish-Israel Lobby

The recent Bob Carr dispute, as aired in the *Sydney Morning Herald* in an article by Mark Leibler – **Bob Carr's 'Israel lobby' claims inaccurate, bizarre. Mark Leibler, April 11, 2014** – enabled me to write a letter-to-the-editor, published on 11 April 2014, wherein I express my concerns about the role played by the Jewish Lobby in drafting the RDA, especially Section 18C:

□ *In his response to Bob Carr's claim Mark Leibler misses the point made, and I formulated this maxim to explain what is going on: 'Don't only blame the Jews, also blame those that bend to Jewish pressure!' Bob Carr didn't bend - and that will now have him in the sights of those who love to use the concept "antisemite", perhaps even "racist", in order to deflect from what Bob Carr's expressed concerns are all about.*

Think of how the Section 18C debate is progressing, to which I just added the following comment: Section 18C was drafted during the 1990s by, among others, Mark Leibler's Jewish lobby specifically to introduce into Australia a legal constraint on open discussion of matters Holocaust-Shoah. It is shameful that HREOC commissioners and Federal Court judges went along with this and applied Section 18C because this section aligns us with what had already been enacted in European countries and in Canada where "hurt feelings" are protected on "racial" grounds!

What the Abbott government is trying to do is to get back to some basic British Common Law principles where a right-of-reply/Natural Justice become active again. Anyone who has hurt feelings to complain about may then take legal action under defamation law. Also, Australia is trying to get closer to the US First Amendment where expression is free - unless the act threatens physical harm to property or person, which is referred to as committing "moral turpitude".

Of course, specific Jewish groups in the USA are trying to get rid of the First Amendment by introducing the concept of "Hate Speech". This splitting of free expression into free speech and hate speech is a typical Talmudic-Marxist dialectic trick that we must all oppose because free expression is the hallmark of our still functioning democracy.

Fredrick Töben

Date and time April 11, 2014, 5:30PM

<http://www.smh.com.au/comment/bob-carrs-israel-lobby-claims-inaccurate-bizarre-20140410-zqt5m.html>

4. Legal Deception led to Bankruptcies – Jewish Supremacism wins

The Bolt Case is now celebrated as a free expression case that justifies a change in Section 18C. But this is the hypocrisy and an illusion sustained in the media so that the real reasons for this change remain hidden. Only a few media commentators mentioned my precedent-setting case, and that of Mrs Olga Scully, but none mentioned the fact that we were both legally unrepresented – and that the end result for us was bankruptcy because Legal Aid would not cover our costs, and we certainly could not cover the legal bill that the Jewish Applicants had ensued. Thus our cases are useless as precedent-setting and must, of necessity, have created bad law.

Also, it is difficult to sheet home any blame to Justice Bromberg, who, when framing his judgment, with diligent sophistry adheres to Labor Party politics and simply navigates through the flawed judgments made by his FCA colleagues. This is politics writ large where human frailty cries out for comfort.

It is thus understandable that the current government's attempt to rectify the legal mess generated by a flawed law, which only benefits Jewish-Zionist-Israeli interests, needs to be amended. The Jewish cow-towing to other minority ethnic groups is a ruse because Jewish motivation to change Australia's social mix enables them to pursue almost uncontested their quest for Jewish supremacism.

5. "Antisemitism" catch-cry designates Freedom Fighters against Judaism

Of course, any kind of criticism directed at Jewish behaviour is immediately labelled ANTISEMITISM. This concept, formulated by German Wilhelm Marr in 1897, justified why

Germans, if they wish to be free, must differentiate and disconnect themselves from Jewish influences. The term was then adopted by Jewish groups and used as a weapon to silence any kind of criticism of their behaviour. A prime example of an individual who quite consciously disconnected from Jewish cultural influences was German composer Richard Wagner. Adopting such stance did not mean that Wagner rejected individual Jews but he did consciously liberate himself from Jewish impulses that, for example, were embodied in composer and musical entrepreneur Giacomo Meyerbeer.

It must be remembered that when the Soviet Union constituted itself in Russia one of the first laws enacted criminalised the concept ANTISEMITISM.

The recent criticism made by former Australian Foreign Minister, Bob Carr, about the unhealthy influence exerted by Australia's Israel lobby on then Prime Minister Julia Gillard, and her government's policies towards the Palestinian's quest to join the UN will be noted and quickly discarded. But under the RDA, Section 18C, anyone who feels hurt by what Bob Carr expressed in his book could legally complain about "hurt feelings".

Further, anyone versed in Jewish Supremacism thinking knows full well that the *Babylonian* and *Jerusalem Talmud* form the foundation of Jewish ethical behaviour – and this tradition espouses hatred towards the non-Jewish world. I attach an item, *Think on these things*, dated 14 February 2014, wherein briefly matters Holocaust are reflected upon.

6. Conclusion

The above point is the main reason why the RDA Section 18C must be abolished and replaced with firm British Common Law Principles. History should not and must not be censored because such theoretical disputes should, in a functioning democracy,

be done openly without fear of censorship. For example, the basic concept of Natural Justice, giving someone a right-of-reply, is fundamental for a society retaining its democratic vibrancy. It is thus imperative that together with the ideal of truth free expression be re-activated because this is the foundations of our civilisation. Under the RDA any proceedings cannot be defended because especially Section 18C does not enable TRUTH to be a defence. In this brief conclusion I shall not detail what horrible things are written in *Talmud* and what it has to say how a non-Jew ought to be treated if in dispute with a Jew.

Let me spell it out again: The essence of what the RDA Section 18C is all about and why it needs to be repealed is that the so-called "Bolt Law" is in effect a "Holocaust" protection law – hence the claim that if Section 18C is not scrapped, we then have a TOBEN LAW specifically designed to shut me up! If it is scrapped, then the changes will be known as the TOBEN AMENDMENTS.

The "Bolt Law" case was used in an attempt to hide this Holocaust matter and to still make it a free expression issue. The trap set for the multiculturalists in Australia by Jewish interests, who designed Section 18C, is that the sole aim of this section has always been legally to protect and as long as possible the Holocaust-Shoah narrative.

Section 18C also enables Palestinians, through Holocaust Studies, to empathise not with their own plight but rather with the "eternally suffering and persecuted Jew", thereby forgetting their dream of ever having a country of their own – Palestine. Now there are even moves to teach matters Holocaust in Palestine -

Interestingly as an aside, the Institute of Public Affairs' Chris Berg wrote a book: *From Galileo to Bolt*, wherein he does not mention my case of about 18 years duration that was determined during 2002

and 2003 with my ultimately being bankrupted because I could not pay the court costs of over \$230,000. The IPA offered the book for free if you joined up. I joined up but then had my application rejected and money refunded.

This elimination of Section 18C is the Anglo-Australian establishment trying to extract itself from the direct Jewish grip and align itself with the US First Amendment that permits anyone to hurt another's feelings so long as it is not a direct threat to violence against person or property, i.e. not committing an act of moral turpitude; but the "hate" concept will perhaps eliminate the First Amendment. The Liberals are trying to get back to basic British Common Law principles of Natural Justice where an individual is given a right-of-reply, and then if needed defamation law takes over when an insult is not true, and hurt feelings are just that and not actionable.

This elimination of Section 18C is global politics writ large but a flowing against the stream. At the moment the term "denier", which at one time was exclusively used by those who defamed Holocaust Questioners, is used to shut up anyone who questions the climate change orthodoxy - as if science is ever settled, or what is worse, as if scientific results are obtained through consensus!

As "Holocaust" studies is now compulsory in NSW schools, it is interesting but certainly not surprising to find that the specific "Holocaust" angel was revealed in Sean Nicholls' 7 April 2014 *Sydney Morning Herald* exclusive article:

"Barrister warns Barry O'Farrell of Holocaust denial risk under George Brandis' changes"

Changes to the Racial Discrimination Act proposed by federal Attorney-General George Brandis would "open the door to Holocaust deniers", allowing them to publish their claims with impunity, legal advice to NSW Premier Barry O'Farrell says.

The opinion by leading barrister Arthur Moses, SC, says the changes would "radically narrow the protection that Australian citizens will receive from racial vilification" and "undermine the very purpose" of the act.

"A new legislative right to engage in racial vilification in the course of public discussion would, for instance, open the door to Holocaust deniers to publish their opinions on websites and on social media in the course of 'public discussion'," he writes in the opinion handed to Mr O'Farrell on Friday.

Senator Brandis plans to abolish section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act, which makes it unlawful to publicly "offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate" a person. Section 18D, which provides protections for freedom of speech, will be removed. The act was used to prosecute News Corp columnist Andrew Bolt over an article he wrote attacking "fair-skinned" Aborigines.

But, in his opinion, Mr Moses cites the 2003 prosecution of Fredrick Töben over publication of his view that there were "serious doubts" the Holocaust took place and some Jewish people exaggerated the number of Jews massacred during World War II for improper reasons, including financial gain.

The full bench of the Federal Court found Dr Töben's comments were not made in "good faith" - an exception to prosecution in the existing act.

The proposed new law protects comments made "in the course of participating in the public discussion of any political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter". "This exception is wide

enough to allow people to publish anti-Semitic material if they demonstrate that they were participating in public discussion," Mr Moses says.

He says Dr Töben's comments "would be allowed under the new law, which has no 'good faith' exception".

Mr O'Farrell sought the advice from Mr Moses after comments by Senator Brandis that people "do have a right to be bigots". During debate in the Senate he declared that "in a free country, people do have rights to say things that other people find insulting or offensive or bigoted". The comments prompted protests.

Mr O'Farrell responded last week by publicly declaring that bigotry "should never be sanctioned, whether intentionally or unintentionally" and that "vilification on the grounds of race or religion is always wrong".

The proposed changes have also been criticised by Australian Human Rights Commission president Gillian Triggs.

Senator Brandis has not denied that he was forced to water down the original proposal for the bill by his cabinet colleagues. One minister previously said, "George has really drunk the right-wing Kool-Aid" while a second minister said the original proposal had been "much worse". Senator Brandis is out of the country. A spokesman did not respond to a request for comment.

<http://www.smh.com.au/federalpolitics/political-news/barrister-warns-barry-ofarrell-ofholocaust-denialriskundergeorgebrandischanges20140406-366r8.html>

**Dr Fredrick Töben, DPhil, MACE.
14 April 2014**

SENATE SUBMISSIONS

Memo from Dr Fredrick Töben – Adelaide – toben@toben.biz

**Re: A MATTER OF VALUES
Truth-telling is a moral virtue, not an Antisemitic Act!**

Remember – on 5 February 2013 at 15.10 hours at its first Commonwealth Parliamentary Question Time The Hon Julie Bishop, reinforced by The Hon Christopher Pyne, directed a question at the new Attorney-General, The Hon Mark Dreyfus, about the illegality of West Bank settlements but the Speaker dis-allowed the question! No wonder Israel has just arrested Palestinian West Bank Parliamentarians

6 February 2013

Dear

On 4 February 2013 ABC TV's **4 Corners** program featured an in-depth investigative story about US bike-riding champion Lance Armstrong's decade-long lying about his drug-taking and race-fixing activities. Then, a day later, Europol announces that a corruption investigation is under way about extensive European football match fixing.

From personal experience I am quite familiar with a similar pattern of conspiratorial deception, lying and legal bullying; in my case, it is for the sake of suppressing the truth about an historical event. For twenty years now I have investigated the alleged truth content of statements made about the historical event known as 'Holocaust-Shoah'.

Since 1996 I have been legally persecuted under the Racial Discrimination Act, especially under that notorious section 18.c where a Complainant's 'hurt feeling' is enough to prove and action and find a Respondent guilty of an offence.

My submissions to the Parliamentary Enquiry into the Exposure Draft of the Human Rights and Anti-Discrimination Bill 2012 details this legal persecution. My submission is numbered 560 and it has been declared **Confidential**.

I now release my two submissions for your consideration.

Yours sincerely

Fredrick Töben, DPhil, MACE.

Adelaide

M: 0417088217

**From: Dr Fredrick Töben - Adelaide toben@toben.biz
SUBMISSION to the Parliamentary Enquiry into the EXPOSURE DRAFT
of the HUMAN RIGHTS and ANTI- DISCRIMINATION BILL 2012
16 December 2012**

1. Introduction

The philosophical underpinnings of any discrimination ideology need to be illuminated and clarified, which is lacking in the DRAFT.

For example, any thinking person discriminates because the act of thinking is itself a discriminatory act, which indirectly is acknowledged by the much-used concept of

'choice', i.e. giving individuals choices when acting upon a matter.

Thinking is thus a critical activity that clarifies basic human values wherein the universal 'battle-of-the-wills' is resolved, hopefully, in a civilised way.

The criteria that are legally protected from criticism – race, religion, sex, disability, et al, encompass fundamental human values. Any legal sanction that prevents an open discussion on any fundamental human matter on grounds that such a discussion is discriminatory has the potential to turn the discrimination ideology into a blunt political instrument. For example, if the DRAFT advocates criminal sanctions, then a public debate on some political issue such as objections to Israeli fruit imports to Australia can lead to a criminal conviction. An aggrieved person who develops 'hurt feelings' because another person objects to such imports and expresses such objection in strong language, will receive legal protection under the DRAFT. The protester, however, has no defence against the accusation that his protest is 'offensive and insulting'.

The very political nature of such public protest acts will inevitably reveal behind-the-scene machinations that flow into any subsequent legal action contained in the DRAFT. This is because a Complainant need not prove the quantum of hurt by any objective means, for example by submitting a medical certificate. The fact that anything can be deemed to be offensive – from the verbal to the non-verbal glance, to the outright physical attack – is an accepted fact, and which a victim mentality mindset is able to exploit. It is interesting that a successful discrimination act will in most instances be resolved through monetary compensation. This means that a psychological state is assessed and comforted materialistically, which is problematic.

2. A 17-year legal battle – a practical example of injustice emerging from an application of the RDA - DRAFT

The fact that since 1996 I have been legally persecuted under the RDA, especially its notorious Section 18c – "reasonably likely to offend, insult..." is reason enough for me to submit a brief informative narrative of my

long battle for your consideration. It is important for lawmakers, such as our political representatives, to know about and be aware of the practical effects such unjust laws have on individuals whose behaviour is based on sound principles and lofty ideals. I say this as a teacher who has lived by his cherished belief that the most precious gift with which we can imbue our next generation is the ability to discern truth from lies and deception.

For 17 years Mr Jeremy Sean Jones, Executive Council Australian Jewry, pursued me first before HREOC, then in the Federal Court of Australia.

HREOC's attempt to be a mediator in our differences of opinion on matters 'Holocaust-Shoah' failed because the complainant Jones could not be forced to attend a conciliation meeting, and he refused to even indicate he had an interest in doing so.

When the matter proceeded to the FCA it was clear that Jones' intention was not to settle the dispute amicably but to have a court ruling that placed a gag on open discussion about matters 'Holocaust-Shoah'.

He claimed that the material we published on Adelaide Institute's website was causing not only him great hurt and anxiety but also all the 'Holocaust' survivors and their descendants living in Australia, yet neither Commissioner McEvoy nor Justice Branson ever asked Jones to submit a medical certificate that proved his mental state was being affected by what we had published. In effect it was his word against mine.

Also, my contention before the Commissioner and in the FCA was that the RDA legislation under which we were appearing was fundamentally flawed because TRUTH was not a defence, and 'hurt feelings' of only particular complainants, such as those claiming to represent Jewish interests, were protected. The recent Andrew Bolt case that cost the *Herald and Weekly Times* over a million dollars to defend publicly clarified this legal injustice.

To counter the Jones attack I submitted a complaint to HREOC wherein I stated that anyone who canvassed matters 'Holocaust-Shoah', in particular stating that during World War Two Germans systematically

exterminated in homicidal gas chambers, especially at Auschwitz detention centre, European Jewry, then as a German-born Australian I take it as my right to ask the question: 'Was my father a mass murderer, were the German people responsible for the death of six million Jews?'

I also stated that I am deeply hurt and offended when I hear this kind of war-time propaganda, and so I ask questions and I conduct research into the allegation. My research trips in 1997 and 1999 resulted in my claiming that I consider the 'Holocaust-Shoah' to be a massive historical lie because technically/physically Germans could not have done what is claimed they did.

Instead of discussing the contentious matters objectively all I received from Jones and the media was defaming abuse. The words that are designed to stifle debate on this contentious historical issue are: HATER, HOLOCAUST DENIER, ANTISEMITE, RACIST, NAZI.

3. Dangers within the RDA – modelled on Germany's Section 130

In this context it must be remembered that when the Soviet Union was established in 1917 two words were criminalised: ANTISEMITE and REVISIONIST, and anyone labelled by the former word was shot while the latter attracted banishment to the Gulags.

Through this current legislation we are again, by stealth and high-minded rhetoric that claims to protect a person's well-being, moving into the Soviet-era style of legislation where uppermost Jewish interests are protected. This focus on a minority's self-interest disregards the mental well-being of the majority in whose interest it is not to be living on a state-enforced ideological lie.

There are legal practitioners who consider my views 'abhorrent' and when they conduct a case in the FCA, they make it clear to the judges they are towing the official line on matters 'Holocaust-Shoah', i.e. so they cannot be labelled 'Holocaust denier', 'antisemite', or horrors-above-horrors a 'racist'.

This stifling public/social effect means that the RDA is modelled on the notorious German

Penal Code's Section 130 that criminalises 'defaming the memory of the dead'. This has the effect that any matter concerning the factual details of World War Two are off-limits in any public discussion. In other words, a section of history has been mythologised and is set in legal concrete.

If something is offensive, then we have defamation laws that can be used to seek redress but this RDA legislation is a watered-down version of defamation law. There is also the political agenda marked by the Talmudic-Marxist class dialectic of win-lose. This perverse dialectic is driving a social agenda that will, as in the Soviet Union's case, ultimately self-destruct. But in the meantime millions of individuals suffered injustices as vested interests, such as the Jewish-Zionist lobby, push their personal agenda along at the expense of mainstream Australian society.

4. No Legal Aid – leading to bankruptcy

At the basic matters-of-fact stages the issues before the court are fleshed out, but in my case I could not afford legal representation and both Commonwealth and State Legal Aid Services refused to assist. This meant I had to do all the legal matter myself – but my academic training has been in literature and philosophy where sound moral principles and ideals are my guide. I developed the maxim: 'Do I tell the truth or do I obey the law? The Talmudists-Marxists will state: 'Obey the law' while I use the Hegelian dialectic and state: 'Do both'.

However, if a law is wrong and unjust, then it is my duty to navigate gently through this injustice so that I can still obey the law and tell the truth. That is what most concerned citizens do, and only in extreme cases would anyone directly challenge unjust laws. Unfortunately the Canberra lawmakers are aware of this and so the legislation is subtly formulated to reflect the sincere concerns of those who do need social protection for whatever reason. Fortunately British Common Law still has basic safeguards that rest on tried legal principles such as Natural Justice, which I certainly did not receive.

It was only at the matters-of-law stage that I gained pro-bono representation, but then it

was already too late. In this respect Australia is also following the Canadian model in persecuting 'Holocaust-Shoah' matters under the false 'racist' concept. In fact, the RDA is primarily designed to catch and to protect the official 'Holocaust-Shoah' narrative, which is Israel's primary propaganda weapon that justifies its ethnic cleansing of Palestine.

In my case the judges involved in my matter were not Jewish but they bent to Jewish pressure, which enables me to state they became morally and intellectually bankrupt.

The consequences of my long legal battle led to its final conclusion when on 24 September 2012 I was declared a bankrupt. In November 2010 Jones had asked for \$56 000 court costs and I offered him about \$30 000, which he rejected. The law firm negotiating the settlement stated that Jones doesn't want the money but seeks my bankruptcy, which lawyer Steven Lewis confirmed in July 2010 when he, as hopeful Labor Party candidate for Wentworth, addressed a political meeting of the NSW Jewish Board of Deputies and claimed for the past four years he had done good service to the Jewish community by sending Töben to prison for contempt and 'we're about to bankrupt him'.

I sold my home of 17 years to raise the necessary money. Then this year another court cost claim was made for \$175 000, and that I could not pay and so I was declared bankrupt for three years.

The list of orders against me is a long one:

Federal Court of Australia Judgments against Töben

- [1. Jones v Toben \[2000\] HREOCA 39 \(5 October 2000\) Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission](#)**; 5 October 2000;
- [2. Toben v Jones \[2002\] FCAFC 158 \(21 May 2002\) Federal Court of Australia - Full Court](#)**; 21 May 2002;
- [3. Jones v Toben \(includes explanatory memorandum\) \[2002\] FCA 1150 \(17 September 2002\) Federal Court of Australia](#)**; 17 September 2002;
- [4. Toben v Jones \[2003\] FCAFC 137 \(27 June 2003\) Federal Court of Australia - Full Court](#)**; 27 June 2003;
- [5. Jones v Toben \(Corrigendum dated 20 April 2009\) \[2009\] FCA 354 \(16 April 2009\) Federal Court of Australia](#)**; 16 April 2009;

[6. Toben v Jones \[2009\] FCA 585 \(2 June 2009\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 2 June 2009;

[7. Toben v Jones \(No 2\) \[2009\] FCA 807 \(30 July 2009\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 30 July 2009;

[8. Jones v Toben \(No 2\) \[2009\] FCA 477 \(13 May 2009\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 13 May 2009;

[9. Toben v Jones \[2009\] FCAFC 104 \(13 August 2009\) Federal Court of Australia - Full Court](#); 13 August 2009;

[10. Toben v Jones \(No 3\) \[2011\] FCA 767 \(8 July 2011\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 8 July 2011;

[11. Toben v Jones \[2012\] FCA 444 \(3 May 2012\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 3 May 2012;

[12. Toben v Jones \[2012\] FCA 1193 \(31 October 2012\) Federal Court of Australia](#); 31 October 2012;

5. Free Expression in danger

The most precious value we have within our democratic framework is free expression because without it our thinking processes are stifled and suppressed – often through fear of legal consequences. If dissenting voices are silenced, then a society loses the value/quality of trust and personal relationships fall apart.

This phenomenon I witnessed at first hand while travelling through the Soviet Union during the early 1970s. The country, as its Eastern European dependencies, lacked 'soul'. There was security control everywhere – much of what we now see happening in Australia as government agencies barricade themselves from public intercourse under the pretext of security concerns.

Likewise at universities the situation is of some paranoia flowing into expressed administrative concerns. One of the prime reasons is that educational courses on matters 'Holocaust-Shoah' at school and university level do not permit dissenting voices to express unorthodox or speculative view-points. Lecturers threaten students who ask probing questions with: 'Your question borders on the offensive.'

Such anti-intellectual stance is not conducive to our students' moral and intellectual development and the HR&ADB 2012 does nothing to safeguard an individual's free

expression, which is the hallmark of our Australian democracy.

In fact, even in the USA where the First Amendment has been securing free expression for all Americans, it has come under attack by notorious Zionist, Professor Alan Dershowitz, who has split free expression into: 'free speech' and 'hate speech'. Anything offensive to Jewish interests is considered to be a 'hate crime', as is matters 'Holocaust-Shoah'.

This trend is now manifesting itself in Australia, and the **HUMAN RIGHTS and ANTI-DISCRIMINATION BILL** will give legal force to the word 'hater', and also to the word 'denier' as we have witnessed in the Climate Change debates. When individuals run out of arguments and their overarching narrative does not accord with the physical facts – thereby creating an ideology such as we witnessed in the Soviet Union and its Marxism-Socialism – then the word 'denier', for example will be used to silence any opposition, which for example claims strict objective scientific criteria can never produce an 'absolute' result. Science is not absolute and there is always a margin of error involved in any research results.

When some public figure claims, for example, 'the science is in, it's beyond debate', then that is someone trying to sell a product. It may be politically expedient to talk like that but a scientist knows all results are subject to a margin of error and to revision as soon as new information comes to hand – which is inevitable. The quip is still current: 'There are liars, bloody liars, and statisticians', and one may add to that – 'and politicians'.

6. Publishing and Internet Censorship

As regards DRAFT Division 5 Clause 53 'Publishing etc. material indicating intention to engage in unlawful conduct' is a subtle but vicious way of stifling debate. In 2002 Mrs Olga Scully was found guilty in the FCA for publishing and distributing material that clarified matters about her Russian background and how significant Jewish influence was in setting up the Soviet Union government. Justice Heley rejected her defence that she was acting and doing things

'reasonably and in good faith, to publish or display material'.

The proposed legislation will continue to be used by those who oppose and suppress a public airing of historical matters involving Jewish interests. I always wonder what these suppressors of public debate have to fear! Truth is a powerful weapon but in the case where the RDA operates and the proposed modifications come into effect, truth will not be a protective shield from legal persecution because the sword formed by the words **hater, Holocaust denier, antisemite, racist, Nazi**, will continue to slay free expression, and that mercilessly.

The current public discussion about Israel's treatment of the Palestinians, and the 29 November 2012 UNGA vote granting the Palestinian Authority observer status, is a prime example where these usual words are used to stifle an open debate on this contentious public interest topic.

I have endured such verbal abuse for almost two decades now and I have had no recourse publicly to counter those who engage in such abuse because the print and electronic media outlets ride on the same platform. The Internet has given me the opportunity to freely express my views – though this did not protect me from being incarcerated three times in three different countries – Germany, England, and Australia.

Although the FCA found me in contempt of court the Australian regulatory authority gave our websites an 'M' rating, which again upset Jeremy Sean Jones. We do not deal with pornography nor do we incite hatred.

However, as stated above, under the DRAFT any point-of-view expressed that challenges an official narrative can be regarded to be in breach of the Act. For example, before the hypothesis HIV=AIDS had been legally anchored in legal concrete and thus globally protected, the dissenting voices who dared state that the hypothesis needs to be 're-evaluated' were drowned out and sidelined by powerful interest groups. Dr Peter Duesberg and Elenie Papadopolous-Eliopolous have been waiting since 1984 for upholders of the HIV=AIDS hypothesis to show HIV in isolation. Their claim that other factors are causing AIDS, especially life-style issues, and

this is unacceptable and offensive to those who have embraced the orthodoxy HIV=AIDS. Dissenting voices were vilified as 'AIDS deniers' – end of discussion.

7. Innocent until Proven Guilty

The fact that Clause 124 throws overboard a basic British Common Law principle is enough reason to designate this attempt at legislating alleged social protection for the vulnerable as a devious attempt to change Australia's basic legal tradition and enforce an unacceptable societal mix.

If Complainants do not have to prove their case anymore, then the ugly trend already seeping through the legal back door will become a flood – individuals spending time in prison without being charged.

This is making retroactive law enforcing child's play – but the health of our society will suffer, as it already is by having laws that are filling our gaols to the brim on account of social support mechanisms breaking down because we are celebrating hedonistic materialism to the full.

As indicated above, overseas precedents of discrimination have been followed in matters 'Holocaust-Shoah' to successfully muzzle open enquiry and thereby protect one view of this historical narrative. We don't need this kind of historical censorship because our

society is mature and tolerant enough to embrace the overarching moral principles embodied in truth-telling. Without this quality/value our society loses the element of trust, which then rots relationships and draconian controls need to be applied. The DRAFT suggests that the value of 'trust' is already eroded and hence the need to implement the DRAFT!

8. Conclusion

This is in the form of three questions to the lawmakers:

1. Will the dictatorial implications contained and activated in the DRAFT be limited in legal proceedings by an application of basic concepts such as Truth and Justice?

2. Will the proposed new Human Rights Act accord me the human right to question certain aspects of history without being labelled and defamed as a 'hater', 'Holocaust denier', 'antisemite', 'racist', 'Nazi'?

3. Will Legal Aid be available to those brought before the courts so that a competent legal defence can be mounted at the matters-of-fact stage of proceedings?

From: Dr Fredrick Töben
Adelaide toben@toben.biz M: 0417088217

SUBMISSION to the Parliamentary Enquiry into the EXPOSURE DRAFT of the HUMAN RIGHTS and ANTI- DISCRIMINATION BILL 2012

Senators Trish Crossin, Susan Boyce, George Brandis, Mark Furner, Garry Humphries, Louise Pratt, Scott Ryan, Penny Wright.

To: Enquiry Secretary
Ms Jackie Morris - Jackie.Morris@aph.gov.au
FURTHER SUBMISSION: 27 January 2013
Dear Committee Members

I had the benefit of attending both your sessions - in Melbourne on 23 January and in Sydney on 24 January 2013.

I noted that not a single submission insisted on including the concept TRUTH as a fundamental guiding principle when enacting human rights legislation. On the second day of the hearing I approached Committee Deputy Chair Senator Garry Humphries requesting permission to address the Committee. Both he and the Chair, Senator Trish Crossin, discussed the matter and the Enquiry secretary Jackie Morris advised me of their decision, i.e. it was not appropriate for me to be given such an opportunity.

Later Senator Humphries advised me that I should send in another submission on this matter of Truth that I was worrying about, which I now do in the following:

1. During the various submissions I noticed that whenever he could Senator George Brandis made much of Andrew Bolt's legal case having activated Section 18c of the RDA. However, Senator Brandis failed to stress that Justice Mordecai Bromberg's judgment against Bolt rested on a precedent set by my case before Justice Catherine Branson in the FCA on 17 September 2002, confirmed on appeal on 27 June 2003. Only Senator Scott Ryan mentioned in passing that not only did Andrew Bolt get caught by the RDA but also 'Holocaust deniers'.

2. It must be noted that in 2009 Senator Brandis 'finished-off' the President of the Human Rights Commission, Catherine Branson, when he grilled her about the Australian Human Rights Commission having attended the UN Durban II conference as observers, which Brandis saw as a contravention of Australia's political stance adopted against the political agenda embodied in the UN's Durban Conference. Branson did not see out her five-year contract and departed in the middle of 2012 at the end of her fourth year to spend more time with 'family'.

3. At our 2010 annual national conference of Australian College of Educators in Sydney the President of the Human Rights Commission, Catherine Branson, delivered a keynote address about bullying in schools wherein she stressed

the importance of teaching human rights in schools. During question time - and only two questions were allowed - I asked her where the Truth concept is to be found within the human rights legislation. I stressed that TRUTH is one of the most important concepts on which the foundation of our civilisation rests. She could not answer my question and made some personal remarks about my case, which was quite irrelevant.

4. I recall that it was Justice Branson who gave me the FCA gag orders forbidding me to question the pillars of the 'Holocaust' narrative: Six million, systematic extermination and existence of homicidal gas chambers, which was however welcomed by Senator Brandis who appears to be enamoured by the prospects of sniffing out 'antisemites' and 'Holocaust deniers' through any legislation enacted by Parliament.

5. On numerous occasions it was necessary for Senator Crossin, who chairs the hearing with Senator Humphries, to admonish Senator Brandis' interjections, especially when the news of the day detailed how Senator Crossin has been sidelined by her Prime Minister as a senate candidate for the Northern Territory at the next election. As a former teacher I could empathise with Senator Crossin who must have thought she was back in the classroom where a naughty boisterous and active mind interjects and impedes a free flow of ideas by monopolising the discussion.

6. During my teaching years I always delighted in firmly confronting such 'naughty boys' by giving them the opportunity to extend their mental prowess but then also setting moral limits and requiring that manners be observed. Today this lack of manners is in part taken up indirectly through 'political correct' thinking processes, i.e. we should not in these verbal exchanges of the battle-of-the-wills become rude or insulting, i.e. we need to remain civilised. That is what I essentially discerned during the submissions, especially by individuals who because of their sexuality do not need additional problems of social victimisation-bastardisation.

7. Such demand for manners transcends any of the categories that are now deemed in need of protection, something the legislators fail to understand because they have rejected the concept of morality and truth as a guiding light in settling human disputes. These dialectic materialist-rationalists claim that TRUTH is a social construct, i.e. there is no such thing as TRUTH. Yet, if a person does not tell the truth under oath, in effect tells lies, then they still consider such an act an indictable offence.

8. This twisted ideological stance rests in large measure on the success of the language philosophers having displaced the moral philosophers that then gave the Marxist ideologues open-ended space to introduce their absolutist ideology of dialectic materialism – which in the Soviet Union until the late 1950s filled the Gulags with political prisoners who refused to embrace the Marxist ideology. That Australia can easily slip into such absolutist mindset is not too farfetched and fanciful a notion especially if it is borne in mind that these hearings are testing the water so see if the social climate is ready to establish a new Australian Human Rights Act.

9. I am reminded of the clash that occurred during the 1950s between Ludwig Wittgenstein and Karl Popper when the latter invites the former to give a talk at Cambridge University. Wittgenstein, a language philosopher, introduces Popper to the seminarians by stating that 'all our problems will disappear, if only we correctly analyse our language'.

Popper asks: 'What about moral problems?', to which Wittgenstein, standing next to the fire place, agitatedly responds by picking up the fire poker and waving it about exclaiming: 'There are no moral problems.' Popper responds: 'What about the moral problem of a host threatening a visitor with a fire poker?'

Although the ending remains controversial, Popper himself informed me that Wittgenstein threw down the fire poker and stormed out the room.

10. This exchange is an example of two grown men having a public dispute, which one settles by developing a huff-and-puff attitude, then running away. In regard to today's legal

mindset, and bearing Jeremy Sean Jones' behaviour in mind, and the RDA activated, Wittgenstein would have redress by claiming what Popper said was a provocation and 'reasonably and likely offended him'.

11. This is the situation I faced in 1996 when Jeremy Sean Jones claimed my 'Holocaust-Shoah' research offended him. Interestingly, although each time when I was ordered to remove so-called offensive material from our Adelaide Institute website, which I did, it was not the material cited in the HREOC findings nor in the FCAS judgment that are now on public record. The material objected to by Zionist Jeremy Sean Jones was specific 'Holocaust-Shoah' material that contradicted his 'official' narrative, i.e. that during World War Two Germans never killed anyone in homicidal gas chambers – which is an outrageous war-time propaganda lie that he wanted protected on that nonsense claim his feelings had been hurt. All the non-Jewish judges involved in my case bent to Jewish pressure, thereby throwing TRUTH out the proverbial legal window.

12. At no time was Jones prepared to discuss our differences, i.e. my personal research at Auschwitz and Treblinka where I could not find any evidence of mass gassings. He did not wish to conciliate because his aim was to implement the Zionist agenda of criminalising and legally protecting the official conspiracy 'Holocaust-Shoah' narrative that served the racist Zionist State of Israel so well against its battle with the original first people, the Palestinians.

13. Sadly, my 'Holocaust-Shoah' research conclusion remains unaltered since my first visit to Auschwitz in April 1997, i.e. that technically the official 'Holocaust-Shoah' narrative has become a legal fiction – and I refuse to remain silent on this matter because as an Australian of German ethnic origin it is hurtful to be confronted by such continuous barrage of lies.

14. Now that the New South Wales public school system has been forced – its bureaucrats and politicians let themselves be forced – by Jewish-Zionist interests to make 'Holocaust Studies' a compulsory subject, I find it outrageous that young Year Nine and Ten

students' minds are forced to be exposed to a horrendous and gruesome Jewish propaganda story that is not true: Germans did not systematically exterminate European Jewry in homicidal gas chambers.

15. Why should this myth be legally protected and why, in most so-called 'free and democratic western nations' is an open enquiry into the actual physical details of the murder weapon not permitted?

16. Of course, this 'Hoax of the Twentieth Century' is now fading slowly into oblivion, but the new Jewish-Zionist racist supremacist narrative has already had ten years of legal construction, namely, the 9/11 narrative, i.e. that a bunch of Arabic-speaking individuals perpetrated a 'terrorist attack' on the USA.

17. As with matters 'Holocaust-Shoah' this *9/11 Hoax of the Twenty-first Century* cannot stand having its official conspiracy narrative subjected to forensic analysis. In both instances the natural laws of nature need to be suspended in order for the 'official conspiracy narrative' to stand up to logical and empirical analysis.

18. The latest intellectual fraud is the Global Warming - carbon tax scam. Any scientist knows that scientific investigation never produces absolute results, something philosopher and quantum physicist Werner Heisenberg taught us when in 1927 he formulated his indeterminacy/*uncertainty principle*.

19. I conclude with a thought from Iran where it is generally held that humans are fallible-imperfect, only God is absolute-perfect, which makes the idea itself an absolute. In western democracies it is permissible to deny the existence of God but not to deny the existence of, for example, matters Holocaust - homicidal gas chambers at Auschwitz.

20. Also, today, on Holocaust Memorial Day, it became a world news item that Italian politician Berlusconi stated that besides the bad laws enacted against Jews during World War Two Mussolini was not a bad man! Is it not time to also welcome rational and balanced debate on

matters Adolf Hitler and focus on why his memory is still with us? Perhaps it is instructive to revise our views thus: *German racialism meant re-discovering the creative values of their own race, re-discovering their culture. It was a search for excellence, a noble ideal. National Socialist racialism was not against the other races, it was for its own race. It aimed at defending and improving its race, and wished that all other races did the same for themselves.* - *Waffen SS General Leon Degrelle.*

21. As I am almost reaching my three-score-and-ten years I find it shameful to see Australia join other so-called western nations in introducing the Jewish-Zionist 'Holocaust-Shoah' narrative, together with the '9/11' narrative as a tool into political debate that is not in Australia's self-interest but serves only the racist, Zionist state of Israel. Globally this furthers the political aim of 'Eretz Israel' much to the detriment of the Palestinians who have lived in the Middle East as the Felestin people since before our A.D. calculations.

22. Permit me to close my deliberations with the following thought:

In the first half of the 19th Century, Honoré de Balzac, 1799-1850, pointed out that there are two kinds of world history. One is official, falsified and designed to be taught in the schools, while the other is the real and secret history that accurately depicts world events.

Balzac's appraisal illuminates the fact there have always been powerful groups that direct politics from behind the scenes and make certain that the great majority are kept ignorant of their machinations.

When truth-seekers present evidence of deception and bring the true story to light, they are dismissed as 'conspiracy theorists' who are not to be taken seriously - and they are always persecuted in one way or another.

Submitted for your consideration.

Dr Fredrick Töben

Adelaide toben@toben.biz

THINK ON THESE THINGS

*

'Don't Criticise, seek clarification' – Nigerian academic to Fredrick Töben, 1981

*

TALMUD: – the fountain of Jewish racism and anti-Gentilism/Goyimism; remember, before anti-Semitism there was anti-Gentilism – David Brockschmidt

>Rather than launching Stukas and Panzers, the new invasion employed the obscurely portentous language of German phenomenology to pound the French, or at least a good number of intellectuals, into submission. ... In a word, the Jew is persona non grata not just in Hitler's world, but in Heidegger's world as well.< - Robert Zaretski

Interestingly, in the above quotation Professor Robert Zaretsky, not reflecting on his own "battle-of-the-wills" technique used in his following article on Heidegger, employs the well-worn but still effective concept of "anti-Semitism" to separate himself from a philosophical thought structure that has moved beyond Judaic-Christian language-use.

As with Richard Wagner's works, the fact that he successfully transcends this Judaeo-Christian conceptual world in his operas has Wagner's critics pull out the "racist" and "anti-Semitic" cards in order for Jews to retain control of the Wagnerian Weltanschauung-world view. Unfortunately, because Wagner was a skull-splitting genius, and because he dared, among others, criticise Jewish behaviour, to retain control of the Wagnerian world view can only be achieved through brute force and state legal sanction.

In this way Jewish intellectuals also retain control of their own world view, which ultimately rests on the *Babylonian* and *Jerusalem Talmud* wherein the win-lose death dialectic of Jew versus Goyim operates.

Christian thinkers, who cannot tolerate the fact that their belief system is derived from Judaism – is a sect of Judaism – use an inordinate amount of energy to separate themselves from this Talmudic thought structure. But some critical thinkers are now succumbing to it by using the conceptual framework adopted by the Catholic Church and are now openly referring to a Judaeo-Christian world view, as the current Roman Catholic Pope has done. The outsider in this worldview is, of course, the Muslim, the

Islamic religion, which is the third pillar of the three monotheistic religions that has emerged out of Jerusalem-Al Quds. Current world politics reflect the stirrings for absolutism-supremacism of these religious forces within the context of the "free democratic world", the emerging New World Order where international capitalism rules supreme!

Now a re-evaluation of Heidegger's thinking seems again to open up the flood gates of "anti-Semitism" and "Nazism", which will be used against anyone who disagrees with the Talmudic-inspired separation-supremacism movement.

That Heidegger made a positive comment about Adolf Hitler is, in the usual deceitful fashion, exploited to the full by Talmudists distorting and then projecting their own absolutist thought structure on the discourse. For example, Heidegger's remark to Jasper about Hitler's delicate hands should be augmented by the fact that Hitler had also written an opera and that the only person he admired amongst the immediate historical Germans was Richard Wagner and his music. That Karl Jasper condemned Heidegger's thinking as "unfree, dictatorial and incapable of communication", is, of course a nonsense.

No wonder Carl Jung described the emerging National Socialist movement as the rise of a new religion. That such a new political movement needs to compromise in order to grow is a truism that some theoreticians tend conveniently to forget. By using the Hegelian life-giving dialectic of win-win the National Socialists worked together with the Zionists in order to fulfil the Jewish dream of becoming a secular

movement and thus to establish a Jewish homeland. The 25 August 1933 Transfer Agreement - *Ha'avara* - עבררה - still remains a problem for current "anti-German-Nazi-bashers" who wish to suppress this knowledge from the general public because it shows there existed collusion between "Jews and Nazis". Of course, the "Holocaust" concept also serves well such a purpose, and with its narrative of distortions, fabrications and outright lies the current crop of Zionists deflect from this collusion fact. The Eichmann trial served to sacrifice a man's life in order to eliminate the right-wing political forces and consolidate the left-wing in Israeli politics.

Likewise, because of this political alliance between Germans and Jews, there are the purists pushing the Germanism line that has little time for Adolf Hitler and his National Socialists, of which [Georg Kausch](#) writes in his book, *Die unbequeme Nation. 2000 Jahre Wirtschafts- und Religionskrieg gegen die Deutschen - The irritable Nation. 2000 Years of Economic and Religious War against the Germans.*

It seems that what we saw emerging on the political battle field before and during World War Two had for another force, the mercantilists—financial globalists, begun to shape itself a hundred years before, by the beginning of World War One. And so we can speak of the 100-Year-War which, however, began even earlier when the Zionist theorist Theodor Herzl issued his program in the 1896 published book *Der Judenstaat*.

The above overview indicates that, among other things, matters "Holocaust" serve the purpose of Jewish supremacism over the non-Jewish world. Multiculturalism policies and anti-racism legislation serve the purpose of fracturing nation states into

easily controlled entities where Jewish Supremacism has a free reign, while in Israel itself, racist-politics are practised that surpass in brutality even what the Germans attempted to do during World War Two.

But to deflect from such Jewish barbarism it is convenient to continue to wheel out the tired and overloaded bandwagon of "Holocaust-Shoah" where non-Jewish guilt towards Jewish interests continues to grease its wheels. However, anyone who sees the evil residing only in Jewish thought structures falls for the trick of being manipulated into the still effective conceptual prison where "anti-Semitism" and "racism" - and "Holocaust denial" - rule supreme. In the majority of democratic nations these concepts are legally sanctioned, and from which there is no immediate escape because a rational discourse of their proper meaning is not permitted. Thus anyone charged with such is usually without a defence because TRUTH, the conceptual bedrock of our civilisation, is not permitted to operate as an arbiter of irrationality. Luckily, the Hegelian dialectic comes to the rescue here, and I formulated the following: 'Don't only blame the Jews, also blame those that bend to their pressure'.

Those interested in an in-depth analysis of the "Jewish Problem" are advised to read [Professor Kevin MacDonald's](#) excellent trilogy: *The Culture of Critique, Separation and its discontents, A People That Shall Dwell Alone*.

Now, enjoy and continue to think -

Fredrick Töben

Adelaide - 14 February 2014

D. SUBMISSION by Australian Jews – and claiming support from other ethnic groups; the focus is on Hate Speech – also Holocaust. Note that their expressed concerns are covered by Defamation Law.

There is no need for a Section 18C TOBEN-HOLOCAUST-LAW

What we think

April 14, 2014 by J-Wire Staff

Thirty one multicultural and religious communities in Victoria have responded to the opportunity offered by Attorney-General Senator George Brandis and the Federal Government to comment on the proposed changes to the Racial Discrimination Act (RDA).

The comments include

“Racial and religious intolerance, vilification, incitement of hatred and intimidation are lines that should not be crossed.” – **Nina Bassat AM, President of the Jewish Community Council of Victoria**

“For more than 30 years, the B’nai B’rith Anti-Defamation Commission has been on the frontlines, fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of racism whenever and wherever they occur. Racism is still a pervasive problem in our community and legal protections against racial vilification are essential in combatting bigotry and protecting individuals. We know through our work that strong and effective racial vilification laws such as section 18C of the RDA are a vital and necessary tool in addressing and countering the unique harm caused by bias-motivated hate speech.” – **Dr Dvir Abramovich, Chair of the B’nai B’rith Anti-Defamation Commission**

“Mental and emotional harm can cause physical harm through substance abuse, self-harm and potentially suicide: these outcomes also need to be avoided. This has serious implications for the individual and the community.” – **Dr Andre Oboler, CEO of the Online Hate Prevention Institute**

“The CCJ Vic is the oldest inter faith organisation in Australia and has fought for 30 years to create understanding and respect between faiths and communities. We

see at the cutting edge what harm and division, racism and bigotry can create.

Anything that dilutes the present legislation can only harm community relations in this country and opens a Pandora’s box in which no one can predict the outcome.” – **Philip Bliss, Vice Chair and Chair of Programming, Council of Christians and Jews Vic**

We are deeply concerned about the Exposure Draft of proposed changes to the RDA.

Any watering down or perceived dilution of the RDA would send the wrong message to potential offenders that hate speech was becoming more acceptable in our society, opening the door to more abuse, and to potential victims that their right to live free from racial or religious vilification, abuse and intolerance was diminished.

Perceptions are important, and there is a danger in even proposing to change the RDA and the proposition that “people should be free to be bigots”, that this increases the risks to the community of increased racial intolerance, vilification and abuse.

Freedom of speech is a very important right but not an absolute right. It is limited for good reason in several areas, such as defamation, libel and sexual discrimination, as well as racial discrimination.

Hate speech based on race, ethnicity or religion should be deplored and all members of society should be protected from it. Just as freedom of speech should be valued, so should the right of people to be part of a free and fair society without suffering the emotional and mental damage caused by hate speech.

Political philosophers such as Thomas Paine and John Stuart Mill have been quoted in

support for the importance of freedom of speech over protection from hate speech, however they did not live in a modern multicultural society. In the days of Paine and Mill many forms of sexual discrimination, which are no longer acceptable today, would have been the norm. Just as sexual discrimination is unacceptable today, so too is racial discrimination unacceptable in modern Australia with our society blessed with people from a multitude of countries, ethnicities and faiths.

We believe that Australia's multicultural society and our diversity are valuable and important elements of modern day Australia. Harmony in a diverse society can be a fragile thing, and hate speech puts this harmony at risk.

We believe that the Racial Discrimination Act (RDA) as it stands has been working well and is effective in creating an environment that supports multiculturalism and a harmonious Victorian community. We also believe that the protections it provides and the avenues it opens to conciliation are critical to a society that can see things from the perspective of the vulnerable and less powerful.

The current legislation is to protect all Australians regardless of their backgrounds, not just minority ethnic groups. It is here for the protection of all people, whether from a minority or mainstream group from any racially abusive language by anyone. It forms a good foundation to create a civilised civic society for all.

The burden of proof bar for the existing legislation is already very difficult to reach, so any proposed watering down would be a serious problem.

Particular communities may be perceived as strong or weak, united or fragmented, but any individual within any of those communities may feel threatened, harassed, fearful or disempowered when confronted with racially vilifying graffiti, incitement of racial or religious hatred in the media, religious or racial abuse hurled from a passing car, people calling for the death or elimination of a race on a sports field or when confronted by hate speech on public transport.

The current legislation has also been very useful in helping to remove hate speech in

the online world. We would not like to see this removed.

We would not like to see the existing legislation changed, except to strengthen it by explicitly adding religion into the protections. By adding 'religion' into the list in s.18B(b) and s.18C(1)(b) of the existing Racial Discrimination Act - "race, religion, colour or national or ethnic origin", we believe that many people of various religious affiliations and faiths would feel better protected, accepted and respected as members of society.

For many people, wearing a hijab, turban, yarmulke, cross or other symbol of religious observance can make them feel like they are wearing a target for abuse. In a free and just society, this should not be the case. For effective freedom of religion, people should be able to practice their faith without fear, intolerance or vilification.

Racial and religious intolerance, vilification, incitement of hatred and intimidation are lines that should not be crossed.

This is not an issue specific to any one race or religion, but an issue for all members of society. Over the past few months, 35 Victorian ethnic, community and faith organisations have been discussing the issues involved and issuing statements expressing our concerns about the potential watering down of the RDA.

Response to Proposed Changes

18B is entirely removed. This section is designed to ensure that if a person commits an act prohibited under s. 18C but does so for several reasons only one of which is in order to insult, offend, humiliate or intimidate a person on the basis of race etc, then even if that reason is not the dominant one, it will be treated as THE reason for the commission of the prohibited act for the purpose of s.18C.

We are opposed to the removal of s.18B. Its removal would elevate the burden of proof required from someone who has been the target of hate speech. For example, if in a game of soccer, a Jewish player is abused as an opposition player and is told to "**go back to the gas chambers**", then we believe the victim should still be protected from the hate speech component of the abuse. This may not be the case if 18B is removed.

18C and 18D are also repealed but replaced by a new 18AA. The major changes here are that the words "insult, offend, humiliate" are deleted and replaced subsection 1 with the word "vilify" and so the core prohibition is to commit an act reasonably likely to vilify another person or group of persons or intimidate another person or group of persons.

To insult, offend and humiliate are not trivial, and trivial cases under the existing legislation do not get very far. The existing wording is virtually the same as in the Sex Discrimination Act s.28A (offended, humiliated or intimidated) and we believe that the existing wording supported by the 'reasonably and in good faith' exemptions under s.18D ensure a rational and responsible view of situations.

We would be amenable to amending the wording to "seriously offend, insult or humiliate" to ensure that there is no perception that trivial situations are included. Nevertheless, we recognise that use of the word 'serious' could be too subjective and we would prefer to maintain the current s.18C balanced by s.18D as a better solution.

"Vilify" and "intimidate" are both defined in subsection 2.

Vilification as defined (inciting hatred) would concern itself with how the hate speech affected a third party or audience, rather than the damage inflicted directly by the hate speech on the target.

We welcome the introduction of the idea of 'vilification' into the RDA, but believe that by narrowly defining it as inciting hatred it is far too narrowly defined, unless it is used *in addition* to existing protections rather than as a replacement of existing protections: offend, insults or humiliate. People should be protected from direct racial and religious vilification as well as incitement of hatred if we are to feel free to safely practice our faiths and cultures in Australia.

Intimidation in the Exposure Draft is defined as "to cause fear of physical harm". We believe that this is too narrowly defined and that mental or emotional harm should be included, which we believe is at least as serious as physical harm. Victims of intimidation may not be seen as under threat of physical harm but the seriousness of emotional harm from Aboriginal citizens being refused a taxi ride because of their

race, or people being afraid to leave their homes or actively participate in society because of emotional harm cannot be underestimated.

Mental and emotional harm can cause physical harm through substance abuse, self-harm and potentially suicide: these outcomes also need to be avoided. This has serious implications for the individual and the community.

Emotional intimidation may actually deter people from participating fully in society, including participating freely in public debate and discussion. People may avoid participation out of fear of verbal racial harassment and the proposed new wording would not provide any sense of protection.

By what standards should acts alleged to vilify or intimidate be judged? Subsection 3 states that it is to be judged by the standards of an ordinary reasonable member of the Australian community, not those of a particular group. This would mean that if words were uttered about a person who is a member of Group A and by the standards of that Group the words would be regarded as reasonably likely to vilify that person, that would not be enough to constitute a breach of the new section UNLESS the words concerned would be so regarded by an ordinary member of the wider Australian community as well.

The implication of the proposed subsection 3 is that there is such a thing as an ordinary reasonable member of the Australian community. The Australian community is diverse and there is no such thing as 'normal' or 'ordinary'. **Does the 'ordinary' Australian understand what it is to be an Indigenous Australian, a Holocaust survivor, an African refugee, a Muslim woman wearing a hijab, a Chinese family walking down the street or an Indian student on the way to classes?**

All can feel intimidation, intolerance and alienation. All should feel welcome, safe and valued members of Australian society.

We would prefer to keep to the community standards test as applied in *Eatock v. Bolt* where the court considered the likely impact on a reasonable member of that part of the community vilified. We believe that is a rational approach as well as being more fair and respectful to the community being vilified than the proposed wording.

We would prefer that the last part "not by the standards of any particular group within the Australian community" be removed as it could be seen as offensive by many community members.

Subsection 4 is in effect an exemption of words etc which are communicated "in the course of participating in the public discussion of any political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter."

The most serious problem we have with the Exposure Draft is subsection 4. It excludes vilification and intimidation if "in the course of participating in the public discussion of any political, social, cultural, religious, artistic, academic or scientific matter." We believe that this is far too broad. Racial vilification and intimidation as defined should not be tolerated under any circumstances and we would want subsection 4 as it stands to be deleted. The proposed subsection 4 would exclude most imaginable situations making the proposed legislation completely ineffectual and a virtual full repeal of the protections for which the RDA was designed.

We understand that subsection 4 aims to ensure that free speech, public discussion and debate are not inhibited by subsection 1. However, we believe that the 'reasonable or in good faith' protection in the existing s.18D provides a reasonable and adequate protection to freedom of expression. Hence, the 'reasonable or in good faith' should be maintained and not deleted.

18E (Vicarious liability) - to be deleted entirely.

We do not have strong opinions about the repeal of s.18E.

18F - State and Territory laws are not to be affected.

We believe that it is very important that the Federal RDA does not seek to exclude or limit any concurrent State or Territory laws. We see the State laws as critically important and as complementary to the RDA.

Additional statements of support from Endorsing Organisations

"We should be doing more to say to people, 'it's not acceptable to be racist'... That's the message we want to get across to

politicians, legislators, but also to the broader community."

- *Joseph Caputo, Chairman of the Federation of Ethnic Communities Councils of Australia*

"Freedom of speech is a cornerstone of our democratic society, and must be defended. However, we must also ensure that this does not come at the expense of protections against acts of discrimination, hatred and vilification. The right balance needs to be met to safeguard the rights of all members of our society,"

- *Eddie Micallef, Chairperson of the Ethnic Communities' Council of Victoria*

"Racial and religious intolerance, vilification, incitement of hatred and intimidation are lines that should not be crossed."

- *Nina Bassat AM, President of the Jewish Community Council of Victoria*

"The proposed changes to the RDA are unacceptable, as they would virtually make the RDA useless. Moreover, we reject the argument that individuals who are subjected to racist hate speech will be able to effectively counter such speech by using their own right to free speech, given the power imbalance that often exists between those who make racist verbal attacks and the targets of such attacks."

- *Dr Chris Popov of the Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee*

"As the great Mahatma Ghandi once conveyed, we should look at any proposed amendments through the eyes of those most vulnerable and least powerful."

- *Bishop Philip Huggins, Chair of the Anglican Social Responsibilities Committee*

"For more than 30 years, the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission has been on the frontlines, fighting anti-Semitism and other forms of racism whenever and wherever they occur. Racism is still a pervasive problem in our community and legal protections against racial vilification are essential in combatting bigotry and protecting individuals. We know through our work that strong and effective racial vilification laws such as section 18C of the RDA are a vital and necessary tool in addressing and countering the unique harm caused by bias-motivated hate speech."

- *Dr Dvir Abramovich, Chair of the B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission*

"Mental and emotional harm can cause physical harm through substance abuse, self-harm and potentially suicide: these outcomes also need to be avoided. This has serious implications for the individual and the community."

- *Dr Andre Oboler, CEO of the Online Hate Prevention Institute*

"No to racism and to racist elements in our society."

- *Dr Berhan Ahmed, Chairperson of the African Think Tank Inc.*

"Civility is key to society and civilization, and mutual respect is key to civility. No robust discussion requires the denigration and dehumanisation of the other."

- *Professor Emeritus Gary Bouma AM, UNESCO Chair in Interreligious and Intercultural Relations - Asia Pacific*

"Just as defamation law acts as an exception to the principle of freedom of speech, to allow those whose reputation are unfairly affected by falsehoods, so too should there continue to be recourse for a group being unfairly racially vilified. Protecting speech made in the wide range of public discussions named in subsection (4), **without requiring any truthfulness or good faith to be proven, simply allows people to spread racial hatred in a form of collective defamation, and would likely open the legal door for all kinds of racist accusations including Holocaust denial.**

Modern-day racism and bigotry often exists not in mere name-calling or unexplained distaste, but spreading falsehoods about a minority race, religion, ethnicity or nationality - a comment made without any factual basis or objective good faith should not be protected as free speech - it can most certainly spread intolerance and racial hatred, which many of our communities sadly understand.

Australia is by and large a good, tolerant and decent place. We need to preserve that, not give a potential green light to those waiting to spread misinformation about vulnerable members of our society. Section 18C of the RDA has acted effectively over 20 years, mostly in conciliation, and that is why

most mainstream Australians wish it to remain as is."

- ***Dean Sherr, President of the Australian Union of Jewish Students (Vic)***

"Thomas Paine supported that liberty was only the freedom to do what did not harm another and that law should prohibit actions which are harmful to society."

- *Dan Wootton, Moderator, Uniting Church in Australia, Synod of Victoria and Tasmania*

"The CCJ Vic is the oldest inter faith organisation in Australia and has fought for 30 years to create understanding and respect between faiths and communities. We see at the cutting edge what harm and division, racism and bigotry can create. Anything that dilutes the present legislation can only harm community relations in this country and opens a Pandora's box in which no one can predict the outcome."

- *Philip Bliss, Vice Chair and Chair of Programming, Council of Christians and Jews Vic*

Endorsed by the Following Organisations:

African Think Tank Inc.

Asian Australian Alliance (AAA)

Australasian Centre for Human Rights and Health

Australian Macedonian Human Rights Committee (AMHRC) (national organisation)

Australian Union of Jewish Students (AUJS) (Vic)

B'nai B'rith Anti-Defamation Commission (ADC)

Chair of the Social Responsibilities Committee of the Anglican Diocese of Melbourne

Chinese Association of Victoria Inc

Chinese Community Society of Victoria

Council of Christians and Jews (CCJ)

Ethnic Communities' Council of Victoria (ECCV)

Federation of Chinese Associations Inc (Vic)

Federation of Ethnic Communities' Councils of Australia (FECCA)

Hindu Council of Australia (HCA)

Hindu Foundation of Australia

Hindu Swayamsevak Sangh (HSS)

Interfaith Centre of Melbourne

Islamic Council of Victoria (ICV)

Jewish Christian Muslim Association (JCMA)

Jewish Community Council of Victoria (JCCV)

Knox Interfaith Network
National Liaison Council of Chinese
Australians
Online Hate Prevention Institute (OHPI)
Progressive Judaism Victoria (PJV)
Rabbinical Council of Victoria (RCV)
SEWA International
Sikh Interfaith Council of Victoria Inc.

UNESCO Chair in Interreligious and
Intercultural Relations – Asia Pacific
Uniting Church in Australia, Synod of
Victoria and Tasmania
Victorian Council of Churches
Vishva Hindu Parishad (VHP)
<http://www.jwire.com.au/news/what-we-think/41934>

Fredrick Töben reviews
Richard Wagner's
Das Judenthum in der Musik

*

Wagner's music is better than it sounds.

Mark Twain

*



1. Introduction: ONE

Whenever the great Irish – Anglo-Irish – playwright, socialist, co-founder of *The London School of Economics*, and the 1925 recipient of the Nobel Prize for Literature, George Bernard Shaw, wrote a play he would write a preface that was usually as long, if not longer, than the actual play itself, and wherein he would explain his theorising about the issues presented in the play. I well recall studying his *Androcles and the Lion* in 1962, my final school year, wherein Christianity and the Roman Empire are critically evaluated.

Shaw would also augment his plays with an *Afterword*, and in the above play he makes a couple of interesting comments about his play's essential message, the censorship of ideas that threaten the "Have-and-Holders":

In this play I have represented one of the Roman persecutions of the early Christians, not as the conflict of a false theology with a true, but as what all such persecutions essentially are: an attempt to suppress a propaganda that seemed to threaten the interests involved in the established law and order, organized and maintained in the name of religion and justice by politicians who are pure opportunist Have-and-Holders. People who are shown by their inner light the possibility of a better world based on the demand of the spirit for a nobler and more abundant life, not for themselves at the expense of others, but for everybody, are naturally dreaded and therefore hated by the Have-and-Holders, who keep always in reserve two sure weapons against them. The first is a persecution effected by the provocation, organization, and arming of that herd instinct which makes men abhor all departures from custom, and, by the most cruel punishments and the wildest calumnies, force eccentric people to behave and profess exactly as other people do. The second is by leading the herd to war, which immediately and infallibly makes them forget everything, even their most cherished and hardwon public liberties and private interests, in the irresistible surge of their pugnacity and the tense pre-occupation of their terror..... There is no reason to believe that there was anything more in the Roman persecutions than this. The attitude of the Roman Emperor and the officers of his staff towards the opinions at issue were much the same as those of a modern British Home Secretary towards members of the lower middle classes when some pious policeman charges them with Bad Taste, technically called blasphemy: Bad Taste being a violation of Good Taste, which in

such matters practically means Hypocrisy. The Home Secretary and the judges who try the case are usually far more sceptical and blasphemous than the poor men whom they persecute; and their professions of horror at the blunt utterance of their own opinions are revolting to those behind the scenes who have any genuine religious sensibility; but the thing is done because the governing classes, provided only the law against blasphemy is not applied to themselves, strongly approve of such persecution because it enables them to represent their own privileges as part of the religion of the country....It was currently reported in the Berlin newspapers that when Androcles was first performed in Berlin, the Crown Prince rose and left the house, unable to endure the (I hope) very clear and fair exposition of autocratic Imperialism given by the Roman captain to his Christian prisoners. No English Imperialist was intelligent and earnest enough to do the same in London. If the report is correct, I confirm the logic of the Crown Prince, and am glad to find myself so well understood. But I can assure him that the Empire which served for my model when I wrote Androcles was, as he is now finding to his cost, much nearer my home than the German one.

Like Richard Wagner, G B Shaw was critical of just about anyone who crossed his path, and he saw this as an essential characteristic of individuals who share and have benevolent attitudes towards our shared common humanity.

I now feel that the introductory comment to my review will turn out to be longer than the actual review of the German dramatic composer – if that is the correct designation – Richard Wagner's *Das Judenthum in der Music*, which usually is translated as *Judaism in Music*, but of late has changed to *Jewishness in Music*, and recently to *Jewry in Music*.

While mentioning Shaw, it is interesting that *Götterdämmerung -Twilight of the Gods* – was also translated as *The Dusk of the Gods*, but Shaw's translation is: *Night Falls on the Gods*. I surmise that this variation is a result of the translator grappling with the German noun *Dämmerung*. *Dusk*, *Twilight* and *Dawn* also refers to *Zwielicht* in German, and *Zwielicht* is a synonym for *Dämmerung*, and so *Götterdämmerung* implies that extra dimensional meaning of a new beginning, which Shaw's title does not suggest. After all, when all of Valhalla comes crashing down the Rhein maidens regain their Golden ring and the

purification process can begin anew in the Rhein River – literally the ‘cleansing’ River Rhein, a play on the word rein/sauber-clean/purify. It is only Loge, the tamed fire god who does not join in the procession to Valhalla at the end of *Das Rheingold*, and his somewhat ambiguous exclamation: ‘Wer weiss was ich tu – who knows what I’ll do!’ is a reminder that this musical drama is wide open to interpretation.

Of interest is also Shaw’s noted and quite definitive essay on Wagner that he wrote in 1883, the year of Wagner’s death: ***The Perfect Wagnerite: A Commentary on the Nibelung’s Ring***. Again his *Preface* just bristles with “insults” that in today’s politically correct climate could get one to front up before a Human Rights tribunal, which are structured much like those Soviet tribunals where a guilty verdict was a foregone conclusion – and I need not stress that these Soviet tribunals are, as are the current crop of Human Rights Tribunals in Australia, Canada and some other “free and democratic” western countries, largely the product of Jews determining their legal structures. This is, of course, the result of Jews having successfully split the various mono-cultural societies into multi-cultural societies. But now to Shaw’s 1883 *Preface*:

This book is a commentary on The Ring of the Nibelungs, Wagner's chief work. I offer it to those enthusiastic admirers of Wagner who are unable to follow his ideas, and do not in the least understand the dilemma of Wotan, though they are filled with indignation at the irreverence of the Philistines who frankly avow that they find the remarks of the god too often tedious and nonsensical. Now to be devoted to Wagner merely as a dog is devoted to his master, sharing a few elementary ideas, appetites and emotions with him, and, for the rest, reverencing his superiority without understanding it, is no true Wagnerism. Yet nothing better is possible without a stock of ideas common to master and disciple. Unfortunately, the ideas of the revolutionary Wagner of 1848 are taught neither by the education nor the experience of English and American gentlemen-amateurs, who are almost always political mugwumps, and hardly ever associate with revolutionists. The earlier attempts to translate his numerous pamphlets and essays into English, resulted in ludicrous mixtures of pure nonsense with the absurdest distortions of his ideas into the ideas of the translators. We now have a translation which is a masterpiece of interpretation and an eminent addition to our literature; but that is not because its author, Mr. Ashton Ellis, knows the German dictionary better than his predecessors. He

is simply in possession of Wagner's ideas, which were to them inconceivable.

All I pretend to do in this book is to impart the ideas which are most likely to be lacking in the conventional Englishman's equipment. I came by them myself much as Wagner did, having learnt more about music than about anything else in my youth, and sown my political wild oats subsequently in the revolutionary school. This combination is not common in England; and as I seem, so far, to be the only publicly articulate result of it, I venture to add my commentary to what has already been written by musicians who are no revolutionists, and revolutionists who are no musicians.

Interestingly, Shaw’s universalism didn’t quite address the crux of the problem, and this is confirmed when another individual is brought into the limelight, a German socialist, anarchist, nationalist...whatever he may be labelled, but Wilhelm Marr did address the “Jewish Problem” in two essays/pamphlets: 1879 – ***Der Sieg des Judenthums über das Germanenthum - The Victory of Judaism over Germanism***, and a year later: ***Der Weg zum Sieg des Germanenthum über das Judenthum - The path to Victory of Germanism over Judaism***.

Just to get the feel of his style of writing I shall reproduce some paragraphs from his first work:

This is not the power of the Jewish religious faith. The Jew has no real religion, he has a business contract with Jehovah and pays his god with statutes and formulations and in return is charged with the pleasant task of exterminating all that is not Jewish. It is the powerful expression of a conscious, characteristic realism which we must admit exists in Judaism and which we encounter in its pathos and its satire. As far as the actual modalities of business and trade are concerned, we Germans hardly differ any more from the Jews; what we don’t have is the drive of the Semitic people. On account of our tribal organization we shall never be able to acquire such a drive and because cultural development knows no pause, our outlook is none other than a time when we Germans will live as slaves under the legal and political feudalism of Judaism. – p. 14

Nobody thought that the Jewish question might be a social-political one. That with which one had deceived oneself for 1800 years, namely that one was dealing with a question of religious freedom and conscience, continued to be the subject of self deception and that is how the social-political inroads

of Judaism into German society obtained their legal consecration.

An already de facto existing foreign rule was legally recognized. A foreign rule, which to express it in commonplace terms, had gotten so far as to have seized dictatorial control of the state's financial system, that is of the *nervus rerum gerendarum* (nerve center of business activity), and had imbued it with the Jewish spirit of arranging and manipulating.

What Jewry had secured long ago, the domination of Jewish realism at the expense of all idealism, was now not only to be safeguarded but expanded beyond all bounds. To this end Jewry needed equal rights in creating laws and administering the very same state which it negated on religious grounds.- p. 17.

The same goal, disintegration of the Germanic state for the benefit of Jewish interests, is consistently pursued everywhere. The daily press is predominantly in Jewish hands, which have transformed journalism into an object of speculation and industrial production, into a business with public opinion; critique of theater, of art in general --- is to three quarters in the hands of Jews. Writing about politics and even religion is --- in Jewish hands. Let us think about it for a moment.

Once emancipation had been won, instinct demanded that it be consolidated and reinforced. This could only be achieved by using the press and unionism. Consequently Jewry flooded into both like high tide. It acted like it was extraordinarily intellectual and free of bias. It went as far as engaging in sarcastic irony of self; but while the highly gifted E. Dohm offered the most precious jokes about Israel in "Kladdaradatsch", it turned out that it was not advisable for a non-Jew to do the same. Using the word "Knoblauch" sufficed to accuse us Teutons of being religious haters. Well, at least my name protects me from such reproaches *). - p. 19.

From the very beginning of emancipation Judaism had been declared a subject off-limits for us Germans.

After Jewish hustle and bustle had reduced journalism to a trivial but commercially successful enterprise directed at the mob's liking of gossip and scandal, it had found the largest possible audience for its attempts at Judaizing. Centuries of a factual predominance of Jewish realism had done its preparatory work. Jewry dictated public opinion in the press.

But let us now look at the non plus ultra of arrogance of the Jewish victor!

The "culture struggle" had begun. While we Germans had been banned and outlawed by the press since 1848 if we considered as much as criticism of anything Jewish, Jewry now involved itself in our religious and cultural struggles with Ultramontanism and, it is hard to believe, even did all the talking. While Jewry searched anxiously to find for its satirical journals anything which they might ridicule as a "Jewish witch-hunt", it unleashed

its torrents upon Ultramontanism. --- Well! The latter opposed Judaism in the battle for world domination! Here one may certainly not speak of Judaic tactfulness, which in turn demands from us that we treat it like delicate glass or like a *Mimosa pudica*.

....

Just try to comment upon Jewish rituals and statutes. You will find that not even the Pope is more infallible and unimpeachable. To comment upon their rituals is "hatred", but if the Jew takes it upon himself to pronounce the last word in our religious and state affairs, then it is quite a different matter. - p.20

Footnote *) Not being of any religious denomination has helped me but little. When at the beginning of the sixties, upset about the consequences of Jewish emancipation, I fought in my "Judenspiegel" (Hamburg, Otto Meissner) passionately but impartially against the Judaizing of society, a gale against me arose, as though the band of Jericho had been reenforced by a thousand trumpets. An attempt was made to push me out of "Journalism" and even today I am unable to utter an independent thought on any question whatsoever in the Judaized press. I was put down as a common religious fanatic crying "Hepp-Hepp" even though every line in my "Judenspiegel" demonstrated the opposite. I had stirred up a hornet's nest.

But -- let's not speak of myself -- where would Richard Wagner have been without the assistance of the King of Bavaria? Has there ever lived an artist who was more the object of attack by Jewry than Wagner? I am not referring to the musical experts who opposed him, but of the pack of scribblers and theater hounds, who did not forgive him for his views of Judaism, even if these might have been mistaken. And from among the very same people in Israel, who had complained about the "lack of melody" in "Tannhäuser" and "Lohengrin", a crowd rendered homage to him in Bayreuth -- yes in Bayreuth --, to play even there the first violin, just as it is "the custom in Israel", after Wagner had, in spite of it all forged his way. -- Even here there were two or three exceptions, Jews who had from the start shown friendly sentiments for the master's work, but it is the exception which makes the rule.

These are all historical-cultural facts, so unique in their aspects, so awesome, that it is impossible to dispute them using everyday polemics.

The proud Roman Empire has not been able to win such triumphs with all the might of its arms, as has typical Semitism won in the Occident and particularly in Germany.

Among all the European states only Russia is left to still resist the frank foreign invasion. The most recent example of coming action against this last bulwark was set by Jewry in the case of Rumania. As current events and circumstances indicate the final surrender of Russia is only a question of time.

In this multifaceted, huge state Jewry will find the cardinal point which it needs, to completely unhinge the Western world. P. 24.

- **The Victory of Judaism over Germanism, Viewed from a Nonreligious Point of View, by Wilhelm Marr. Vae Victis! Eighth Edition, Bern, Rudolph Costenoble 1879.**



Some commentators on this matter feel because Marr had a number of marriages to Jewish women, that this somehow devalues his expressed thoughts. This kind of an attempt to deflect from the substance of the criticism levelled at the Jewish thought processes is also taken up by individuals who delight in pointing out that a number of National Socialist functionaries were involved with "Jewish women". Such motivated individuals cannot

understand that a separation from the Jewish mindset that is grounded in Talmud, is a generational task where each successive generation needs to work on this task. Of course, if one thinks of Gottfried Wagner, Richard's great grandson – who is still running around the world proclaiming that his great-grandfather's music gave rise to Adolf Hitler and the alleged Auschwitz homicidal gas chambers, then it becomes clear that in this instance Judaism won over Germanism.

Perhaps Shaw's comments about the German's idealism, that somewhat inflexible attitude of mind comes into play here – the drive for purity, absolutism, perfection in physical work and a host of other values. Again, if one has a definite set of values, then why should such be abandoned for the sake of so-called "tolerance"?

This was something the Frankfurt School latched on to and had Theodor W Adorno, et al., write and publish in 1950 *The Authoritarian Personality*, which had as its premise that Hitler and the National Socialists attempted to exterminate European Jewry. But if you take away this Holocaust homicidal gassing premise, then their work becomes nothing but noise, or as Wagner would perhaps have described it: gargling in the synagogue.

This obsession of Jews to make the world in their image is, like portrayed in Machiavelli's *The Prince* – and popularised in *The Protocols of Zion*, nothing unusual, except that their *Babylonian* and *Jerusalem Talmud* dictates there be no compromise. Anyone who has read various passages from *Talmud*, as I did in 1994 at The University of Adelaide library, then a charge of racist thinking is easily made out against Jews. When, at the December 2013 Wagner Ring performance at Melbourne, the Victorian Wagner Society hosted a symposium and John Deathridge ended his participation in a round table discussion on Wagner's anti-Semitism, I reminded him that in using the term racism in this context to describe aspects of Wagner's works would, for the sake of balance, require Deathridge to mention the Jewish racism contained in the *Babylonian Talmud*. For obvious reasons Deathridge did not respond to my comment.

The Talmudic dialectic is an imperative that runs on the win-lose dialectic, much like the Marxist-Feminist fighting-to-the-death dialectic, as opposed to the Hegelian life-giving win-win dialectic. Physically this is exemplified in the man-woman-child end-product where the opposites do not fight to the death but merge in a synthesis to share and to conserve the differences that make up the thesis-man and antithesis-woman. That the capitalist mode of reasoning is likewise structured on *Talmudic* thinking, into profit and loss, gives rise to the movements that under the National Socialists attempted to reign in this kind of ruthless usury model and develop something along the line of a more humanely structured society where the primitive natural Darwinian imperative, or even Nietzsche's will to power, is tempered by a civilising moral framework.

2. Introduction: TWO

Now back to Wagner's *Das Judentum in der Musik*, and let's begin with some humour:

**When Roses are reddish
And Violets are bluish,
If it wasn't for Jesus
We'd all be Jewish!**

The expressed sentiment within this flippant quatrain sets the tone for those who wish to remain ethnocentrically locked into a mindset that always fanatically asks a basic question whenever anything arises within human affairs: Is it good for the Jews?

If public discourse dares critically comment on matters of morals and manners, and the object of attention that gives rise to such a discussion is in the slightest way associated with things Jewish, then an immediate uproar ensues wherein open debate is ruthlessly stifled.

Continuing on from the early 20th Century and moving noisily in the 21st Century this elementary, if not somewhat infantile self-centred approach, has succeeded in shutting down debate on vital public issues by using specific shut-up words such as, "hater", "Holocaust denier", "Antisemite" and "racist". Except for "hater", the other three concepts

are in a number of so-called free-and-democratic western countries legally actionable. Especially "Antisemite", which it must be recalled, was the first term that the Bolshevik Revolutionaries in Soviet Russia in 1917 criminalised, and anyone thus labelled was summarily shot.

But from the above Marr item we know that the use of such concepts to silence any open debate about things Jewish, in particular the power used by Jews to impose their value system on the non-Jews, is nothing new. I see Wagner's writings as an attempt to clarify this problem of how to resist such an imposition of foreign values upon the German psyche.

And so in 1850 Richard Wagner first published anonymously – as K Freigedank/K Freethought – his critical thoughts about the Jewish influence on German culture, then again in 1869 under his own name. By this time, it is thought by some commentators, that Wagner was independent enough to take on the Jewish problem. This is confirmed when he insisted over the advice of some of his colleagues that it be included in his autobiography of 1880, *Mein Leben*. Since then Jewish individuals, and their sympathisers, within the world of music have not rested in personally attacking Wagner for having dared to criticise the Jews.

Now we have a problem emerging, as if we needed more in this already problematic field! The English title of Wagner's booklet was given by its translator W Ashton Ellis: *Judaism in Music*, then in 2001 Barry Millington changed it to: *Jewishness in Music*, and in 2012 David Conway called it: *Jewry in Music*.

Joseph Goebbels would have talked about *Jüdische Spitzfindigkeit* – *Jewish sophistry* already entering into the Wagner argument through this change in title, and I would agree with such an assessment.

In any critical assessment of human behaviour the question should be not violent opposition but thoughtful self-reflection to ascertain whether what is being said about a person is

true or not. It thus gets down to a fine line of values and manners, and as G B Shaw indicated above, it is inevitable for disagreements between individuals to arise.

Let me give a personal example here. I have this year begun to refer to Adolf Hitler as one of the greatest Freedom Fighters of the 20th Century, for which some colleagues of German background who vehemently "hate" Hitler, have taken me to task. One gentleman hates the Jews as well, and the other would like to bring Germans and Jews together. In both instances I cannot agree with either of them on how they evaluate the role Hitler played in history and on what the relationship between the Germans and Jews should be.

Both disagree with my assessment of Hitler's decision that to let the British army return home at Dunkirk was a moral decision reflecting his civilized approach towards war and conflict generally. The fact that the Crimeans, after a successful referendum of 95.5 per cent, have separated from Ukraine territory and returned home to Mother Russia, is a blow to the World War Two Allies and to the world order that was established since 1945. The media has already reminded opponents of this referendum result that Hitler did the same when a referendum returned the Sudeten Germans, the Rheinland and Austrians to the German Reich.

It will be interesting to see how Russian politicians will deflect the "Nazi" charge that western politicians have already levelled against them. Interestingly, the Russians are deflecting criticism of their Ukrainian involvement by pointing to so-called extreme Ukrainian right-wing political groups as "Nazis". That the current interim Ukrainian political elite has been funded by the US to the tune of some \$5b. and is openly controlled by Jews, remains the unpredictable variable in this scenario. Whether historical World War Two parallels can be drawn upon is also uncertain. That the west did the same with Kosovo is conveniently forgotten by those who now cry out against

Russia's action of re-uniting the Crimean peninsula on the Black Seas with Russia.

Then there is the matter of Jewish circumcision, the branding of boys as if they are cattle, which does have psychological implications, with some surmising it creates deficiency thinking, i.e., the immature and emotionally non-empathetic victim status that generates perpetual infantilism in thought and in deed. The other matter is that Talmud is the moral guide of Jews and therein it is quite clearly stated that there be separation from the non-Jewish world.

As Marr mentions in the above quoted extract, this separation brings with it the concept of god-chosenness, never mind what non-believing Jews, half-Jews, converted-Jews, et al, may claim. Such thinking cannot develop universal values because the premise on which it rests denies universality to the non-Jews, who are seen as lesser being. Only recently the spiritual guardian of Jews in Israel, politician Rabbi Eli Ben Dahan, claims that gay Jews have 'higher souls' than gay non-Jews.

It must be noted here that the only academic of world standing, who has dared to analyze the Jewish quest for global domination, is Kevin MacDonald, professor of psychology at California State University, Long Beach, USA. His published books and other writings on the Jewish "group evolutionary strategy" remains unsurpassed.

3. Wagner's *Das Judenthum in der Musik* – preliminary comment

Within the previous pages I have attempted to bring some basic background information into focus that certainly influences my take on Wagner's work, but also brings into focus the significant Jewish swirl against him as a person and as a creative artist at that time, and continuing to this day. And so there is certainly no pretence in this review to achieve some kind of fictitious objectivity, perhaps save for the attempt to clearly state my views on the issue as expressed in my now somewhat well-

known maxim: *Don't only blame the Jews; also blame those that bend to their pressure.*

The only Revisionist of note, who to date has rigorously followed through this expressed sentiment by employing the Hegelian dialectic method, is 78-year-old German Horst Mahler, a man who once embraced the 1969 revolutionary protest movement that swept Europe then, and who now sits in a Berlin prison for over ten years for daring openly to focus on things Jewish and how this relates to an enslavement of the German people. That he seeks a return to the mindset that gave rise to Adolf Hitler successfully disconnecting the German monetary system from the international financial cannibals does not endear him to the judiciary, the German servants of the current status-quo enslaved to the IMF, which is currently in March-April 2014 also beginning to cannibalise Ukrainians.

Wagner's mindset was always plagued by financial burdens, and not until 1864 when King Ludwig of Bavaria invited him to come to Munich and offered him financial support did Wagner have the luxury of focusing on his creative passions rather than having to worry about how next he was going to pay for his family's upkeep. But there were also the loyal friends and supporters who, even before Wagner had established a firm reputation, stood by him. For example, Franz Liszt stood by Wagner until the end because he knew that Wagner was indeed a skull-splitting genius.

Even Wagner's enemies, who decry the composer for his blatant "anti-Semitism" and "racism", cannot but acknowledge Wagner's creative genius. At the Melbourne December 2013 Wagner Symposium it was Professor Eva Rieger who expressed her mental agony in having to accept both Wagner's horrible "anti-Semitism" and his wonderful musical creations. As I mentioned earlier, at the same symposium Professor John Deathridge liberally used the terms in order to evaluate Wagner's contributions, and when I reminded him that when using the term "racist" we need to point to the racism contained in the Jewish *Babylonian Talmud*, he remained silent.

The question for me is not whether Wagner was an anti-Semite or a racist but why he

wrote *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, and what specifically he had to say about Jewish behaviour. Thus the use of the linguistic term "anti-Semite", which aims to defame a person, is for me a sign of someone uncritically dismissing a person's legitimate criticism of a specific individual or group, in this instance those individuals who call themselves Jews and who see themselves as acting collectively for some kind of "Jewish cause".

Much has been written about how Adolf Hitler and the National Socialists appropriated Richard Wagner's music and writings for their own political cause, but that kind of thought is exactly an elaboration of what Wagner focused on when he squared off, among just one of many, with influences that crossed his personal and creative life's journey. Today the use of the concepts "anti-Semite" and "racist" are designed usually to appropriate subject matters for a Jewish cause, and thus cannot illuminate specific problems.

During the above-mentioned Wagner Symposium at Melbourne in 2013 I pointed out to a PhD student that her reference to Theodor Adorno's negative comment about Richard Wagner being an "anti-Semite", et al, can easily be classified: Adorno needed Wagner but Wagner would never have needed Adorno. It is much like Walter Benjamin, Friedrich Nietzsche, Claude Debussy and Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky, et al, exhibiting their self-absorbed emotional mutational approach that cannot cope with Wagner's full dimensional approach.

4. What does Wagner say in *Das Judenthum in der Musik*

*

***The first reaction to truth is hatred.
The moment it appears, it is treated as an enemy.***

Tertullian, Apologeticus, c.197 CE

*

Although conceived, written and published anonymously in the Leipzig-based *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* in September 1850 Wagner's thoughts on this subject must have

developed before that date. When he was 17 Wagner began his basic musical instruction under Cantor Weinlich in Leipzig and so was aware, as anyone at that age could be of things Jewish. And so he was fully aware of the ramifications such an article would have had were it to have appeared under his name, namely ensuing personal attacks on his person. The *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* magazine received a formal letter of complaint from a group of academics at the Leipzig Conservatory of Music objecting to the anti-Jewish sentiments expressed in the article. The Conservatory was founded in 1843 by Felix Mendelssohn and Wagner felt this centre and Leipzig itself was becoming a centre of Jewish music where the presence of "blond musicians" had become rare, where German life and patriotism was also becoming a rarity. He calls this defamation and persecution process that began when his anonymous article appeared a process of "inverse Jewish persecution". For example, his 1850 performance of *Lohengrin* was well reviewed by notable critics – but only once, and then the media would give him the silent treatment. It became known that the article written by K Freigedank had in fact been authored by Wagner, something the editor of the magazine and friend of Wagner's, Franz Brendel, had justified in publishing on grounds that Germany had academic freedom. The fact that Wagner then, against friends' advice, re-published the 20-odd page essay under his name in 1869 together with an equally sized Addendum, reflects a realization that Wagner had to clarify for himself, in writing, the role Jews played in German culture. Also, he was able to expose the tactics used by his critics who wished Wagner's experience of Jewish machinations behind the scene to remain hidden. Then, as today, such written justification is seen as Wagner's great leap into open "Antisemitism"; but such a view is unhelpful if we wish to understand what Wagner was trying to clarify by focusing on things Jewish in German music. His rather flippant remark on page two of his essay made me smile: '*...in this respect we have rather had to regret that Herr von Rothschild was too keen-witted to make*

himself King of the Jews, preferring, as is well known, to remain "the Jew of the Kings".' Wagner sharpens this comment to the "Creditor of Kings" becomes the "King of Creeds", and thus is set the scene for a rather contentious analysis, of Wagner's musings on the role Jews are playing in German society, and how Liberal self-deception enables Jews to integrate within it.

But Wagner wants to get to deeper issues that help to explain why he feels an – involuntary repulsion – an antipathy towards the nature and personality of the Jews. This is the motivational factor that Wagner claims makes it imperative for Germans to emancipate themselves from Jewish domination because: *the Jew in truth is already more than emancipated: he rules, and will rule, so long as Money remains the power before which all our doings and our dealings lose their force. That the historical adversity of the Jews and the rapacious rawness of Christian-German potentates have brought this power within the hands of Israel's sons – this needs no argument of ours to prove...that this has also brought the public Art-taste of our time between the busy fingers of the Jew, however, is the matter whose ground we have to consider somewhat closer...But emancipation from the yoke of Judaism appears to us the greatest of necessities, we must hold it weighty above all to prove our forces for this war of liberation.*

We know, of course, that Judaism as an alien culture resting on *Talmud*, among other things, instinctively sets out to appropriate the culture wherein Jews decide to integrate. Now that he had become financially independent through King Ludwig's support, Wagner could essentially afford honestly to appraise the musical impulses that emanated from those who claim to be Jews.

Wagner states that because the Jew is alien to a culture within which he resides, it is not possible for him to feel the depths of passion of that society: *Song is just Talk aroused to highest passion: Music is the speech of Passion. All that worked repellently upon us in his outward appearance and his speech, makes us take to our heels at last in his Song,*

providing we are not held prisoners by the very ridicule of this phenomenon.

Interestingly, any cultural comparison is standard fare when other cultural impulses are evaluated, and no-one objects to any lively debates, except for the Jews who are always quick to pull out the Antisemitism label as a defence against the minutest criticism. When after World War Two Marxist-Jewish cultural relativism gained the upper hand the immediate push by adherents, for example, of the Frankfurt School, was to relativise cultural achievements, and under this political influence all cultures are now regarded to be of equal value. This kind of hypocritical evaluation is, of course, a sign of cultural decadence, and perhaps we can give Oswald Spengler full marks in getting it right about Occidental Culture – we find ourselves in the Untergang-Götterdämmerung!

That Wagner had critical words about everyone he met is often forgotten, especially when it is noted that in this essay Wagner, for example, explicitly focused on composer Felix Mendelssohn-Bartholdy, who had died three years before its publication. It did not help Mendelssohn that his parents had converted and had integrated into the Christian-German cultural-political landscape, even going so far as not to have had their son circumcised. This is because the equation that Wagner insisted on for music was a mono-Germanic mindset and not one where multi-cultural impulses played a role, such as that could give rise to the claim to be a Jewish German, or indeed a German Jew producing German-Jewish music.

As to Wagner's relationship with Giacomo Meyerbeer, who died in 1864 just 14 years after Wagner published his essay in 1850, much is made of Meyerbeer's initial supporting Wagner's endeavours and Wagner then turning on him. This relationship also matured Wagner, and it was Andrew Gray who said that Meyerbeer was the Andrew Lloyd Webber of his days, which speaks for itself. And so indirectly through Meyerbeer Wagner was enabled to begin his monumental task of beginning his particular Germanic music liberation from Jewish influences, which today is generally called an act of "Antisemitism".

The Jewish influence has become a reality for Wagner because of the defects and weaknesses of the German social system. He mentions his experience in dealing with the administrators of Europe's two largest court theatres, at Berlin and Vienna, who refused to perform *Die Meistersinger*, then went to extraordinary lengths to ensure the opera was not performed elsewhere. And he states that all this is owing to the matters he raised in his 1850 essay, i.e. the feebleness and incapacity of the post-Beethovenian period of German music-making to stand up to Music-Jewdom – that "let them belong to any nationality they pleased".

He speaks of the "Jewish dialectic jargon" that has been transplanted to discussions about German Aesthetics, which through the use of the Hegelian dialectic ends in abstractions and then fractures German creativity. Surprisingly, Wagner states what factors he considers enabled this to occur: The German innate naivety and goodness mixed with a lack of fire, or marked by *Trägheit* – sluggishness – that prevents an individual from tapping into the loftier regions of his German spirit, thereby unconsciously losing his noble freedom, and is thereby easily borne in triumph by the Music-Jews as one of their own. Wagner claims that this befell Robert Schumann when he failed to make a stand against the restless, busy spirit of the Jews that is so ruthless in its defaming of anyone who dares raise a critical voice against their behaviour.

I am reminded of my own maxim that some friends scoffed at when I formulated it: *Don't only blame the Jews, also blame those that bend to their pressure.* Wagner, indeed, did not bend to Jewish pressure, and in fact had many Jews around him who flourished through his musical creations, as conductors for example. This, of course, went against the grain, especially wherever Jews saw themselves as the messengers of enlightenment supremacism as dictated by *Talmud*.

In the 1869 edition of his essay Wagner appended to the reprinted 1850 version a final paragraph wherein he proposes a solution to the Jewish Problem by stating that Jewish redemption from the curse – "Ahasuerus –

going under”, i.e redemption of The Wanderung Jew/Ewige Jude, is only possible when Jews cease to be Jews. He even animated his favourite conductor Hermann Levi to convert to Christianity, which Levi refused, and a break in relationship occurred– but Wagner asked him back and so Levi conducted *Parsifal*, Wagner’s final opera, at Bayreuth in 1882.

I am reminded of the current musical scene in America where Deric Muhammad writes about *The Secret Relationship Between Rappers and Jews*, then mentions that “recently Public Enemy front-man, Chuck-D, filed a \$100 million lawsuit in San Francisco Federal Court against Jewish owned Universal Music Group alleging the underpaying of royalties on digital downloads.”

http://www.finalcall.com/artman/publish/Entertainment_News_5/article_8500.shtml

Interestingly, even in 2014 this reaction to criticism of things Jewish has not changed. Those offended by so-called “anti-Semitic” criticism make no attempt to evaluate the criticism for truth content, which is something that is usually done when other individuals are criticised, and this tactic at resolving public disputes also bothered Wagner because it was always an attack on the person and not on what was being said.

To mention a current example of someone daring to criticise Jews, on Wednesday, 9 April 2014 former Australian Foreign Minister, Bob Carr, launched his book *Diary of Foreign Minister* wherein he claims that Australia’s Melbourne-based Israel lobby had an ‘unhealthy influence’ on former Prime Minister Julia Gillard. The ensuing storm will pass because Carr is now a retired politician and he is in no danger of losing his job. He is lucky because in Germany retirees are hauled before the courts for even lesser indiscretions and then processed for “defaming the memory of the dead”!

Or, the other example is journalist Andrew Bolt who is being pilloried by former *The Age* editor, Michael Gawenda, who has taken Bolt to task in his article: ‘Why Andrew Bolt's distress is truly

uncomfortable’: <http://www.businessspectator.com.au/article/2014/4/2/politics/why-andrew-bolts-distress-truly-uncomfortable>

And so the question of whether Richard Wagner and his works are anti-Semitic is an irrelevant question because the use of this concept is designed to impose on his works some kind of Jewish interest angle. I am reminded of Professor Arthur Butz’s comment about Jewish Supremacism as such. He says that the problem of the parasite is that if it becomes too greedy, then it kills the host and it, too, dies. The tragedy is that some Jews are not capable of knowing when to stop.

But I would hasten to add that this human trait is not an exclusively Jewish trait. In fact, the whole search for “anti-Semitic” impulses in Wagner and his works is a pathological quest for Jewish self-identity at the expense of another – that eternal universal battle-of-the-will. In the Jewish case the imperative comes from the Talmudic dialectic thinking process, i.e. *Talmud* the book that offers Jews their moral and ethical guidance, which divides the world into Jews and non-Jews, and which flippantly raises that self-serving, self-referential question: “Is it good for the Jews?”. If one reads, for example, the works of Marc A Weiner: *Richard Wagner and the Anti-Semitic Imagination*, 1995, Paul L Rose: *Wagner: Race and Revolution*, 1992, and Theodor Adorno: *In Search of Wagner*, 1952, then it is evident the human characteristics designated by these Jewish writers to be proof of Wagner’s anti-Semitism are also found among the general population and all over the world. It is a far stretch of the imagination to claim that Alberich, for example, is a “typical Jew”, when in fact he comes closer to the Norwegian Troll character. But I have met a number of Wagner’s flawed characters to which Adorno, Rose and Weiner claim possession as being Jewish – and they were not Jewish! This is Wagner’s achievement – he presented the whole spectrum of human nature interacting in a huge live musical drama from beginning to end. Imposing the term “racist” and “anti-Semite” on to him denies Wagner his claim to universality, much like Goethe, Shakespeare

and Dante, et al, wrote works that spelled out human nature at work and play.

It is thus doing Richard Wagner's works a great disservice by attempting to impose on them such labels as "anti-Semitism" and "racism" because these concepts are all too often used by individuals who cannot comprehend Wagner's depth of passion as expressed in his operas. Such critical individuals I label as suffering from the "emotional mutation syndrome" that so desperately attempts to compensate a psychological deficiency-threat through rationalistic sophistry. Not one of Wagner's critics asks the pertinent question: Are the negative characteristics of Jews, as allegedly depicted in Wagner's works, true or not? The next question would be: Are these characteristics exclusively Jewish? The answer to that question would be an emphatic: 'NO!'

5. Conclusion

Now a glance to the recent past. Certainly for German cultural integrity the works of Richard Wagner strike a chord that fitted well into the National Socialist ideals that propagated hard work, cleanliness, beauty and truth. Until the final year of his life Wagner also affirmed his strong support for the ideal of monogamy, and it is always interesting to see his detractors claim Wagner was a philanderer. But the work done by the post World-War-Two propaganda machine against Wagner and anything German, which has actually been running since 1914 at full steam, is difficult to influence, and only time will correct the distortions that run under the catch-cry: "anti-Semite" and "racist". That is why it was so refreshing when Richard Wagner's daughter-in-law, Winifred Wagner, stated quite clearly, and which to this day upsets the war-propaganda brainwashed individuals when they read her words – in a letter written in 1947: *I more or less remained faithful until the bitter end, only because I knew this man [Hitler] to be kind, noble, and helpful. It was the man and not the Party that held me, and in*

1975: I shall never disavow my friendship with [Hitler]; I cannot do it . . . I am able, I mean, perhaps no one understands, but I am able completely to separate the Hitler I knew from what he is accused of these days . . . The part of him I know, so to speak, I treasure as much today as before. If Hitler came in the door today, for example, I would be just as pleased and happy as ever to see him and to have him here.

It is the Wagnerian success at extricating himself from Jewish thought structures that Winifred Wagner clearly understood and valued in Adolf Hitler, who was determined to do likewise. This has led me to conclude that Adolf Hitler was one of the greatest freedom fighters of the twentieth century.

6. An Afterthought

Of interest is the Wikipedia entry on **Das Judenthum in der Musik** where the sentence in bold is quite extraordinary in its implications:

*Wagner may have meant no more than 'Jews must sacrifice their separate identity for the common good'; **the interpretation that he intended murder was never attributed to him before the Nazi policy of physical extermination, which remains conjecture without physical proof.** Because the Nazis deliberately took 'ownership' of Wagner for their own propaganda purposes, it does not follow logically that one should interpret the composer's writings only in the context of Nazi policies. Wagner died six years before Hitler was born in 1889.*

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Das_Judenthum_in_der_Musik#Recent_reception

It does not surprise to note that the 1983 centennial edition of Wagner's works excluded a reprinting of *Das Judenthum in der Musik*, but the 2000 edition included an annotated edition, a process of censorship much like that proposed will happen with Adolf Hitler's *Mein Kampf* when that copyright runs out this year.

Richard Wagner's personal and cultural Liberation Struggle – exemplified by current events

THE REASON FOR WORLD WAR TWO

This article recommends as a last step "to completely destroy the power of the banksters in Hungary, is for that country to implement a barter system for foreign exchange, as existed in Germany under the National Socialists". Murray Rothbard, a Jew and one of the founders of the Mises Institute of libertarian economists, stated in his book ***A History of Money and Banking in the United States*** that the reason we fought WW II was to destroy Hitler's international barter system.

<http://americanfreepress.net/?p=12418>

British opposition leader aims to be 'first Jewish PM' During visit to Jerusalem, Ed Miliband describes himself as 'Jewish atheist,' says important to tackle anti-Semitic elements in UK

By Times of Israel staff, Raphael Ahren contributed to this report. April 12, 2014, 5:49 pm [16](#)



Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu meets with British Labour Party leader Ed Miliband, at the Prime Minister's Office in Jerusalem on April 10, 2014. (Photo credit: Haim Zach / GPO/FLASH90)

British Labour party leader Ed Miliband said Friday he hopes to become the United Kingdom's first Jewish prime minister in the next elections, and won't be held back by anti-Semitism still present in Britain.

Speaking during his [visit to Jerusalem](#), Miliband, whose family is of Polish-Jewish origin, was quoted in the British media saying that he considers himself a "Jewish atheist."

"I have a particular faith. I describe myself as a Jewish atheist. I'm Jewish by birth origin and it's a part of who I am," the [Daily Mail](#) quoted him saying. ***"I don't believe in God, but I think faith is a really, really important thing to a lot of people. It provides nourishment for lots of people."***

The British opposition leader said that if his party wins the next UK general elections, which

are scheduled for May 2015, he would seek to tackle lingering anti-Semitism in the UK.

"That's one of the great things about Britain. There are elements of anti-Semitism, [and] it is really, really important to tackle those and have no truck with them," the [Telegraph](#) quoted him saying. "I have said I hope that I'll be the first Jewish prime minister if we win the election, but it is neither an advantage nor a disadvantage."

Miliband, 44, was in Israel for a three-day visit during which he met with senior Israeli and

Palestinian officials, including Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, Labor Party leader Isaac Herzog and Israel's chief peace negotiator Tzipi Livni. His visit was his first major foreign trip since he became the leader of the opposition in 2010.

In comments reported by Britain's Sky News Saturday, he criticized Israeli settlement building during a visit to a Bedouin encampment in the West Bank, saying, "The more we see an expansion of settlements, the more it becomes difficult to construct that (Palestinian) state."



UK opposition leader Ed Miliband speaking at the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, April 10, 2014 (photo credit: Hebrew University)

During a meeting with Israeli students at Hebrew University earlier in the trip, he said he considered Israel to be the "homeland for the Jewish people," but stopped short of calling himself a Zionist. He did, however, speak about his personal connection to the state of Israel.

"I come here very conscious of my family's history and also with a deep sense of gratitude to Israel for they did for my grandmother," Miliband said. "Israel was a sanctuary for her from the most indescribable grief. So it's a personal journey for me as well."

Miliband's aspiration to become the UK's first Jewish prime minister may not be strictly feasible, however. Benjamin Disraeli, Great

Britain's two-time prime minister during the mid-19th century, was born to Jewish parents, although he was baptized at the age of 12.

While he was a practicing Anglican during his adult life, he nonetheless identified himself as a Jew. Disraeli famously rebutted an opponent in parliament who raised his Jewish heritage [saying](#), "Yes, I am a Jew and when the ancestors of the right honorable gentleman were brutal savages in an unknown island, mine were priests in the temple of Solomon."

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/british-opposition-leader-says-aims-to-be-first-jewish-pm/>

“— the inherently moral and righteous Jews on the one hand, and the inherently immoral and wicked non-Jews on the other — ”

“— because the Jews by definition are incapable of engaging in totalitarianism, hatred and genocide,”

*

The Pathetic Apologetics of Caroline Glick

[Brenton Sanderson](#), April 11, 2014 —

Editor’s note: As someone who has written chapters on Jewish [apologia](#) and [self-deception](#), I have to say that Caroline Glick may be the most extreme case I have ever encountered. One struggles for words to describe her rabid ethnocentrism and how it blinds her to the most obvious realities. Jews are morally superior paragons of rationality, responsible for everything good in the world, including Western institutions of democracy and individual freedom. With only a few exceptions (non-Jews who accept the tutelage of Jews), non-Jews are, as Brenton Sanderson phrases it, “brutish and irrational embodiments of evil” while Jews are “reasoning, intelligent moral paragons.”

Truly breathtaking. It’s terrifying to think that such a person is a highly praised and powerful member not only of the Israeli political establishment but is also a well-established figure in neoconservative circles and the media in the US.

– **Prof Kevin MacDonald**

Caroline Glick is an American-born Israeli journalist and the deputy managing editor of *The Jerusalem Post*. She is also the Senior Fellow for Middle East Affairs of the Washington DC-based neoconservative Center for Security Policy. A radical Zionist, Glick migrated to Israel in 1991 and served in the Israeli Defense Force before going on to serve as assistant foreign policy advisor to Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu.

Glick has been showered with awards and praise from Zionist and Jewish organizations. In 2003 the Israeli newspaper Maariv named her the most prominent woman in Israel. She was the 2005 recipient of the Zionist Organization of America’s Ben Hecht award for Outstanding Journalism (previous recipients included A. M. Rosenthal, Sidney Zion and **Daniel Pipes**). She has also been awarded the Abramowitz Prize for Media Criticism by Israel Media Watch. In 2009 she received the Guardian of Zion Award from Bar Ilan University in Tel Aviv. In 2012 The David Horowitz Freedom Center announced the hiring of Glick as the Director of its “Israel Security Project.”



Inevitably, given the Jewish stranglehold over the American media, Glick is given a regular platform to espouse her Jewish supremacist views in *The Wall Street Journal*, the *National Review*, the *Boston Globe*, the *Chicago Sun-Times*, *The Washington Times* and many other newspapers and journals around the world. She is also a regular pundit on *MSNBC* and the *Fox News* channel. Given her wide exposure in the Jewish-controlled media, and the senior positions she holds within the neoconservative establishment (where she is touted as “a brilliant and outspoken Jewish academic”), one might expect Glick to possess a formidable intellect and have a knack for formulating intellectually sophisticated Jewish apologetics. Instead we find another Jewish mediocrity whose undeserved public prominence can only be ascribed to Jewish ethnic networking. Take, for example, [a speech](#) Glick recently gave to a neoconservative audience entitled “Why the Jews?” In this speech the “brilliant and outspoken” Glick explains to us the “roots of genocidal Jew hatred.” She begins by telling her audience that:

I don't want to talk specifically about the ideology of Islamic anti-Semites or genocidal Jew-haters or European or Leftist people who want to destroy Jewish power and make us all needy and begging for our very lives. I want to talk about what all of the enemies of the Jewish people throughout the ages share. Because one thing about the genocidal axis is that it's not new, it's been here throughout time and the members of the genocidal axis, they may change their accents, they may change the books that they read, they may change a million different things, the continents they live in, but one thing that they share across time is that over and over and over again the target of their genocidal blood-lust is the Jews.

So the “brilliant and out-spoken” Glick begins her speech with a tautology: that the enemies of the Jewish people throughout the ages all shared one thing in common — they regarded the Jews as their enemies. Glick melodramatically claims that anyone who has ever opposed Jewish influence or even discussed it critically necessarily harbored a “genocidal blood-lust” against the Jews. Of course, unmentioned by Glick is the fierce and implacable Jewish hostility to non-Jews that has echoed down through the ages—from the enthusiastic and vastly disproportionate [Jewish participation](#) in the Bolshevik mass murder of millions of Eastern Europeans in the early twentieth century to

the [fear and loathing](#) of White Christian America that results in overwhelming Jewish support for massive non-White immigration into Western nations.

Jewish hostility toward non-Jews is also exemplified by the egregious [moral double standard](#) which, as [Israel Shahak](#) notes, is alive and well in Glick’s favorite country:

Anyone who lives in Israel knows how deep and widespread these attitudes of hatred and cruelty to towards all Gentiles are among the majority of Israeli Jews. Normally these attitudes are disguised from the outside world, but since the establishment of the State of Israel, the 1967 war and the rise of Begin, a significant minority of Jews, both in Israel and abroad, have gradually become more open about such matters.

In recent years the inhuman precepts according to which servitude is the “natural” lot of Gentiles have been publicly quoted in Israel, even on TV, by Jewish farmers exploiting Arab labor, particularly child labor. [Gush Emunim](#) leaders have quoted religious precepts which enjoin Jews to oppress Gentiles, as a justification of the attempted assassination of Palestinian mayors and as divine authority for their own plan to expel all the Arabs from Palestine.

In the Jewish view, servitude and cruel treatment are the natural lot of non-Jews. Who are the haters?

In her speech Glick recounts the close friendship she shared with Benjamin Netanyahu’s father Benzion ([another Jewish intellectual activist and apologist](#)) and notes how the old man would “repeatedly and with the same impassioned anger” declare that “he could not stand the fixation on the Holocaust as some sort of singular moment in global history because there has been a holocaust of Jewry in every generation throughout the ages.” According to Glick, Netanyahu the elder believed:

That the same passions that inflamed the Germans and then spread out throughout Europe with this bloodlust of wanting to kill children like mine was due to a passion that moves through the ages, that there was nothing unique about that desire to shoot lead into Jewish babies. There is nothing unique about it. It's been going on since the time of the Ancient Greeks and the Ancient Egyptians. Just read the Bible, what is he [the Pharaoh] talking about? He wants to annihilate a people. It's not he wants to enslave them; he wants them gone — out! What's the difference

between Pharaoh and Hitler? Technology? That's it.

Conveniently, Glick has nothing to say about the genocidal Jewish hatred of non-Jews that pervades the very same Jewish Bible she cites. For instance, in Joshua 6:20-21, God helps the Israelites destroy Jericho, killing "men and women, young and old, cattle, sheep and donkeys." In Deuteronomy 2:32-35, God has the Israelites kill everyone in Heshbon, including children. In Deuteronomy 3:3-7, God has the Israelites do the same to the people of Bashan. In Numbers 31:7-18, the Israelites kill all the Midianites except for the virgins, whom they take as spoils of war. In 1 Samuel 15:1-9, God tells the Israelites to kill all the Amalekites — men, women, children, infants, and their cattle — for something the Amalekites' ancestors had done 400 years earlier. Ignoring all of this, Glick proposes that a "genocidal Jew hatred" is the "unifying force between Pharaoh and Ahmadinejad and Khomeini and yes the international Left which is the handmaiden of these monsters of the Islamic world, without which they could never, ever, march even one step forward."

The inconvenient reality for Glick is that Jews have, for well over a century, been [the intellectual, organizational and financial backbone of the Left](#). Furthermore, the only reason Jews are increasingly subject to Islamic anti-Semitism in countries like France is because of mass non-White immigration and multiculturalism — both of which are the malignant outgrowths of Jewish ethnic activism.

So what is this mysterious "force" that Glick believes unifies those who have opposed the Jews at any time and place throughout history? *It is the rejection of reason. ... What is it about reason and about choice and about the notion of moral choice and moral empowerment of individuals that stands at the root of the genocidal bloodlust against the Jews? The answer is that, from time immemorial, Judaism has been based, from the time that God first spoke to Abraham in Iraq and told him to leave his father's home after Abraham took down the idols from his father's store and broke them. Get thee to the land that I have promised you and your children. What was it about Abraham that God embraced at that time and about the Jews at every single generation since then that drives people bananas? It is the idea of good and evil, it is the idea that we as human beings have the responsibility to make a discernment between good and evil and to choose good in our lifetimes.*

In attributing anti-Semitism to the rejection of reason, one is reminded of the "argument" of Horkheimer and Adorno in their *Dialectic of the Enlightenment*, a basic text of the Frankfurt School:

Horkheimer and Adorno propose that modern fascism is basically the same as traditional Christianity because both involve opposition to and subjugation of nature. ... In an argument reminiscent of Freud's argument in Moses and Monotheism, religious anti-Semitism then arises because of hatred of those "who did not make the dull sacrifice of reason. . . .The adherents of the religion of the Father are hated by those who support the religion of the Son—hated as those who know better" (p. 179). (see [here](#), p. 156)

The notion that all non-Jews were mired in irrational amorality before the advent of the Jews is laughable. It is typical of hyper-ethnocentric Jewish activists like Glick to divide humanity into two groups — **the inherently moral and righteous Jews on the one hand, and the inherently immoral and wicked non-Jews on the other** — completely ignoring the ethical double standard that is absolutely central to Judaism as noted above. The origin of anti-Jewish sentiment, according to this conception, resides in the fundamental incapacity of non-Jews to exercise reason and moral discernment. As with Jewish apologetics stretching back to the ancient world, Glick once again presents us with the conception of the Jews as reasoning, intelligent moral paragons and non-Jews as brutish and irrational embodiments of evil. For Glick, what all of the anti-Semites throughout history simply cannot stand is:

A belief that defines us as a holy people, as a chosen people, [that] we accept, not divine salvation, but the notion of a life of hard choices, of constantly making a decision, and loyalty to a notion that it is our responsibility to do so, and that drives people to genocidal bloodlust because at the root of this bloodlust is a rejection of reason. It's a rejection of individualism, it's a rejection of responsibility, it's a rejection of the notion that we have to be good. Because that makes our lives a struggle, that makes our lives difficult.

It takes a truckload of chutzpah from an ultra-Zionist like Glick to criticize those hostile to Jews for their "rejection of individualism" when the defining feature of Jewish history has been that group interests, rather than individual interests, have been of primary importance. Judaism is the prime historical example of how the [rejection of individualism](#) leads to group

evolutionary success. In Glick's condemnation of non-Jews who reject individualism we hear echoes of the [Frankfurt School's promotion](#) of radical individualism as the epitome of psychological health for Europeans. The sane and well-adjusted White person was characterized by these Jewish intellectual activists as an individual who had broken free from the traditional Western shaming code, and who realized their human potential without relying on membership in collectivist groups. This promotion of radical individualism among non-Jews was, of course, intended to undermine the group cohesion of Europeans and thereby weaken their capacity to compete effectively with Jews.

The reality is that hostility between Jews and non-Jews stems from conflicts of interests. However, for Glick, the existence of anti-Jewish sentiment is attributable to the fact that these hostile non-Jews are unreasoning, irrational brutes who only oppose Jewish power because "reasoning" is simply too hard for them. Moreover, those who have the capacity to reason still hate Jews because they are irresponsible and simply do not want to be good. According to Glick:

It's all about what does it mean to be a human being, and if you come down on that question, understanding that to be a human being means to be a moral agent, not an object, then you're with the Jews, and you're opposing totalitarianism, and you're opposing hatred, and you're opposing genocide. And if you come down on that question: "I want somebody else to tell me what to do, I don't know, I'm too weak, I'm too lazy, I'm too uneducated, I'm too ignorant to recognize the meaning of freedom," then you're a slave, then you can run around saying "Liberate Palestine."

It takes a real talent for casuistry, married with a profound dishonesty, to offer up the kind of moral inversion Glick gives us here. If you're a reasoning moral agent you're with the Jews and against totalitarianism, hatred and genocide — **because the Jews by definition are incapable of engaging in totalitarianism, hatred and genocide**, despite their egregious historical track record with regard to all three. If you oppose the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians in Israel you are a brain dead slave, despite the fact that this descriptor more aptly applies to the millions of people who uncritically accept the lies and cultural subversion offered them by the Jewish controlled media and entertainment industries. So what does Glick make of those more individualistic nations like United States

that have been far less effective in resisting Jewish domination?

Now what was it that made the United States the only country (to date) that didn't have the same genocidal Jew-hatred at the root of its identity that we saw in country after country in Europe, [and] that we see in Arab world? It was that the United States, its forefathers, had this idea that was based on the Torah, of rule of law, of limited government, of the responsibility of the individual to make that decision between good and evil, and to choose good, and to have the liberty from that government to make that choice. The whole concept of the modern state is based on the philosophical works of men like John Selden and John Locke, and Thomas Hobbes who were Hebrew scholars, who based their whole concept of the modern state, that these men put together, on the rule of law, on divine law, that man could not be a totalitarian because we are not God.

Here Glick engages in a long-standing but utterly bogus Jewish intellectual tradition: that of **Jews seeking to take credit for Western civilization** (or at least the features of it amenable to Jews). (See, e.g., [Andrew Joyce's classic work](#) on Spinoza in which he debunks the idea promoted by Jewish activist scholars that Spinoza had a crucial influence on the Enlightenment stemming from his Jewish background.) Thus, the only reason the United States is any good, according to Glick, is that its intellectual and political founders were steeped in the lore and traditions of the Jews — all roads lead to Jerusalem. Non-Jews are mostly irrational and wicked Jew-haters, and their few redeeming qualities can ultimately be traced the positive influence exerted by the Jews. Forget Plato and Aristotle and 2,500 years of Western philosophy; the best features of Western civilization find their wellspring in the mythology of the Hebrews. Indeed Glick even goes so far as to claim that: "The whole concept of the modern state was based on the Hebrew Bible and it was transported from the British enlightenment to the new world through the American forefathers."

Glick is deeply troubled by the rising anti-Jewish sentiment among sections of the academic left in the United States. Of course, this as an entirely predictable response to the increasingly radical actions of an increasingly ruthless and rabidly ethno-nationalist Israeli government and its Zionist supporters in the United States — actions which include the ethnic cleansing of the Palestinians, a state-

sponsored policy of ethnic apartheid, and the deportation of non-Jewish "enemy infiltrators" from Africa. Glick totally ignores this obvious fact and instead argues that hostility to Israel and its Zionist supporters stems from a rejection of American values and (because America was in her view created by Hebrew scholars) a rejection of righteous Jewish values.

What do we see today? Why is it that we see more and more and more Jew hatred and attacks on Jews in US universities, in political circles, on the left? Because the left is introducing an ideology that is fundamentally un-American, that is based on the totalitarian idea of a governing power that is absolute, that knows better than an individual what's good from him or her. And if you know better than I do what's good for me, what's good for my children, then you're an absolute power, and if you're an absolute power you have to reject Jews. Because absolute powers must reject Jews who understand that there's no authority except God and you're not Him.

Anti-Zionist sentiment is growing, according to Glick, not because of the increasingly indefensible actions of the Israeli government (cheered on by their hypocritical Zionist cheerleaders in the West), but because the Zionist establishment in America is declining in influence.

We are faced with this wave, because the strength of people in this room, and unfortunately outside this room, seems to be waning. And the wave that is rising throughout the world is a wave of hatred, of bloodlust, of totalitarianism, and again this is familiar, this is known, we understand what we're dealing with.

The ongoing Zionist outrages (despite the endless compensatory stream of "Holocaust" propaganda from Hollywood), has led to the erosion of Jewish moral legitimacy over recent years and has resulted in an unprecedented situation that Glick finds extremely disturbing, namely that:

The new thing in this generation is that we see Americans confused for the first time about what side they're supposed to be on. We see that there is a question about "Is Israel evil for standing up for existing, for being different from all of its unaesthetic, misogynistic, totalitarian neighbors? Are we bad for being loyal to everything that we've stood for four thousand years?" How can you question that? Because Americans are beginning to question what it means to be an American.

For Glick, what it means to be American is to obsequiously accept the total Jewish domination of their nation and to support Israel to the last dollar and the last drop of American blood. For Glick, as for all of the "Israel-firsters" of the neocon establishment, Israel's interests and America's interests are indistinguishable. She thus concludes her speech with such shameless lies as: **"You want a foreign policy that is coherent, that advances American interests? Then stand with Israel. You want to figure out how to ensure that America is safe? Stand with Israel."**

Jewish supremacists like Glick are increasingly disturbed that the old lies and hypocrisy simply don't wash with growing numbers of people. If White nations are "evil for existing," and for being different from their "unaesthetic, misogynistic, totalitarian neighbors" — as we are constantly told by the Jewish-dominated intellectual establishment — then Israel is necessarily evil too. How can Jews be anything but "bad" for "being loyal to everything that they've stood for four thousand years," when Europeans are told they are evil for being loyal to everything they've represented for thousands of years. Glick's utterly dishonest speech, aside from revealing her status as one of the most overrated figures among the Jewish activist ranks, also reveals how Israel is very much the Achilles heel of Jewish power and moral legitimacy.

<http://www.theoccidentobserver.net/2014/04/the-pathetic-apologetics-of-caroline-glick/>