

ADELAIDE INSTITUTE

PO Box 3300
Adelaide 5067

Australia

Mob: 61+401692057

Email: info@adelaideinstitute.org

Web: <http://www.adelaideinstitute.org>

Online
ISSN 1440-9828



November 2010 No 538

TALMUD ENCOURAGES JEWS TO DECEIVE

By Rev. Ted Pike, 11 October 2010

What kind of religion sanctions deception and immorality for the sake of political goals? Orthodox Talmudic Judaism. The Babylonian Talmud encourages Jews to cheat and deceive Gentiles whenever necessary! In fact, "by way of deception" is the motto of Israel's spy agency Mossad. Official license to deceive and even commit sexual immorality was seen in Israel this week.

Eminent [Orthodox Rabbi Ari Shvat responded](#) to a female student's question about the morality of seducing and sleeping with an enemy. "I was asked a question by a student of mine who was a religious girl that had been recruited by the Mossad. She wanted to know if a woman was allowed to do this kind of work." Shvat ruled yes and published an essay in *Tehumin*, an annual collection of articles on law and modernity. [The Jewish World summarizes](#): "A new Halachic study ruled that seducing an enemy for the sake of national security is an important mitzvah..." It is, in fact, an "utmost mitzvah" (legal command). Shvat's work was published by the Tzomet Institute, a non-profit organization dedicated to "seamlessly merging Judaism with modern Israeli life."

In the ruling, Shvat says women can be "used to seduce enemy agents in order to cajole information out of them or see them captured." *Jewish World* says such women were used to capture nuclear whistleblower Mordechai Vanunu and to assassinate a senior Hamas operative in Dubai last January. Such deception, says the rabbi, is "Halacha," or binding Talmudic law. Even with homicidal intent, he writes, "sexual intercourse with a Gentile for the sake of a national cause is not only sanctioned, but is a highly important mitzvah...Our Sages of Blessed Memory elevate such acts of dedication to the top of the Halacha's mitzvahs pyramid."

Rabbi Yisrael Rosen, head of Tzomet Institute and editor-in-chief of *Tehumin*, called the study "daring and important...Although it is highly unlikely that Mossad agents will seek rabbinical advice, this essay is very important and courageous. The author is versed in religious discourse and even conservative rabbis would surely agree with his thesis."

Shvat's ruling, reported by a major Jewish news agency, is presented without criticism. It reveals a disturbing, even ominous fact: Talmudic Judaism encourages Jews to ensnare and deceive Gentiles in order to advance Jews and Jewish causes, as long as they can get away with it. If they are caught and Israel is embarrassed, the "holy name of God" (synonymous with Israel's good reputation) may be blasphemed. If that is a real possibility, the Talmud tells Jews to back

off. But in order to save the Jewish nation it is even morally permitted to murder and commit adultery.

God "Outlawed" the Gentiles

The Talmudic position concerning deception of Gentiles is embodied in the Halachic dictum, "It is permitted to deceive a goy (Gentile)." [1] In legal and business matters, the Talmud says Gentiles are beneath equality with Jews. As the 1905 *Jewish Encyclopedia* explains [2], the Gentiles were "outlawed" by God from the beginning.

The passage in Moses' farewell address: 'The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran'. . . indicates that the Almighty offered the Torah to the Gentile nations also, but, since they refused to accept it, He withdrew His 'shining' legal protection from them, and transferred their property rights to Israel, who observed His law. A passage in Habakkuk is quoted as confirming this claim: 'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran. . .He stood and measured the earth he beheld, and drove asunder ["outlawed"] the nations.' . . the Talmud adds that He had observed how the Gentile nations steadfastly refused to obey the seven moral Noachian precepts, and hence He decided to outlaw them." (Baba Kama 38a).

The rabbis believed Gentiles demonstrated their stupidity by thinking their own laws were worthy of obeying. The Talmud denies the Gentile status as a "man," so they are also excluded from being the Jews' neighbor.

Another reason for discrimination was the vile and vicious character of the Gentiles... With such a character... it would naturally be quite unsafe to trust a Gentile as a witness... He could not be depended upon to keep his promise or word of honor like a Jew." (Bek. 13b) A Gentile. . . is not a 'neighbor' in the sense of reciprocating and being responsible for damages caused by his negligence; nor does he watch over his cattle. Even the best Gentile laws were too crude to admit of reciprocity.

The meaning of these passages is obvious: As animals cannot be "neighbors" to men and as the behavior and laws of the animal world do not require observance by humans, so the Gentile world is beneath the Jewish. This source confirms: "The Torah outlawed the issue of a Gentile as that of a beast."

In a Jewish Courtroom

Jewish contempt for Gentile law was best illustrated in the courtroom. Imagine a Jewish court in Babylon in 350 A.D. as the *Jewish Encyclopedia* describes:

It sometimes happened that the Gentile, wishing to take advantage of the liberal Jewish laws, summoned

his Jewish opponent to a Jewish court. In such cases the Gentile would gain little benefit, as he would be dealt with by the Jewish or Gentile laws, as might be least advantageous to him. The judge would say: 'This is in accordance with our law' or 'with your law' as the case might be. If this was not satisfactory to the Gentile, legal quibbles and circumventions might be employed against him.

The primary source for the above quote, Baba Kama 113a (Soncino edition), elaborates:

Where a suit arises between an Israelite and a heathen, if you can satisfy the former according to the laws of Israel, justify him and say: 'this is our law'; so also if you can justify him by the laws of the heathens justify him and say (to the other party): 'This is your law; but if this cannot be done, we use subterfuges to circumvent them. This is the view of R. Ishmael, but R. Akiba said that we could not attempt to circumvent them on account of the sanctification of the Name.

However, the same source comments: "but were there no infringement of the sanctification of the Name, we could circumvent him."

By "sanctification of the Name," Rabbi Akiba refers to the dignity and reputation of God's name in the eyes of the world. If lying in the court may bring disrespect to Israel and thus to the God of the Hebrews will, then it had better not be done. The real question about perverting justice against a Gentile is whether a Jew can get away with it. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* summarizes the majority opinion, stating: "The Mishnah. . . declares that if a Gentile sue an Israelite, the verdict is the for defendant; if the Israelite is the plaintiff, he obtains full damages." [3]

The Divine Right of Cheating

Outright robbery of a Gentile is not endorsed, but the Talmud makes broad provision for indirect thievery; a Jew doesn't need to return a lost article to a Gentile. Baba Kama 113b continues: "And with all lost things of thy brother's: it is to your brother that you make restoration, but you need not make restoration to a heathen."

As Rabbi Akiba warned, the Jew must avoid bringing God's name into dishonor by cheating Gentiles. Yet, as a passage in B.K. 113b, 114a reveals, Rabbi Samuel was not above cheating a Gentile out of the full price of a gold bowl, while Rabbi Kahana cheated a Gentile out of both the number and price of a quantity of barrels.

A passage from the Talmud describes with praise how the head of a famous Talmudic academy cheated a Gentile out of a gold bowl for less than even a copper one was worth. This passage continues with examples of cheating from the likes of Rabina and Ashi, sages from the academy at Sura in Babylonia, and the two most important figures in the final editing of the Talmud.

"Public Property"

Despite the fear that defrauding Gentiles might bring dishonor God's name, the Talmud generally upholds the right of Jews to Gentiles' property. God "outlawed" Gentiles at Mt. Sinai and their property rights were now Israel's. The Rabbis by their own decree could at least theoretically declare the property of Gentiles to be ownerless. The *Jewish Encyclopedia* (p. 621) summarizes:

All retaliation or measures of reprisal are based on the Jewish legal maxim of eminent domain, 'the judicial authority can annul the right to the possession of property and declare such property ownerless.'

Pharisees: The Original Racists

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of Rabbinic bias against the Gentile was that, in most cases, there is no mention of the possibility that the "goy" is doing his best or is the rightful owner of his property. He is viewed as a member of a class with known characteristics: The Jew is good, the Gentile bad; the Jew must be acquitted, the Gentile convicted. An essentially racist view of human nature was assumed. Indeed, the Pharisees were the original racists. Few religions possess such racist undertones as rabbinic Judaism.

The bad example of the most respected sages of Israel had a widespread and corrosive effect on the relations of Jews with

their neighbors. One wonders if the Gentiles were aware of their position as fair game to predatory Jews. Choschen Ham spells out some of the ground rules for exploiting Gentiles:

If a Jew is doing good business with an Akum [Gentile] it is not allowed to other Jews in other places to come and do business with the same Akum. In other places, however, it is different, where another Jew is allowed to go to the same Akum, lead him in, do business with him and to deceive him and take his money. For the wealth of the Akum is to be regarded as common property and belongs to the first who can get it.

And again:

If a Jew is doing business with an Akum and a fellow Israelite comes along and defrauds the Akum, either by false measure, weight, or number, he must divide his profit with his fellow Israelite, since both had a part in the deal, and also to help him along. [4]

Secret Hatred

Just as the Talmud gives Jews the right to cheat Gentiles, so any inquiry into its true teachings by Gentiles is answered deceptively. This continues today. Jews must maintain a well-meaning appearance in order to dwell and trade among Gentiles. A commentary in Abodah Zarah (I, 2, fol. 7b) laments: "Since we are in captivity, we cannot live without trading with them, and we depend upon them for our food, and we must fear them. . . ." (Pranaitis, p. 65) For this reason, Jews were encouraged to practice philanthropy, even toward Gentiles. "Needy Gentiles may be helped as well as needy Jews," for the sake of peace. [5] Yet such expedients are to be employed only when there is no alternative.

"Therefore," the Talmud says,

If you enter a town and find them celebrating a feast, you may pretend to rejoice with them in order to hide your hatred. Those, however, who care about the salvation of their souls, should keep away from such celebrations. You should make it known that it is a hateful thing to rejoice with them, if you can do it without incurring their enmity. [6]

Also:

No one is allowed to praise them or say how good an Akum is. How much less to praise what they do or to recount anything about them which would redound to their glory. If, however, while praising them you intend to give glory to God, namely, because he has created comely creatures, then it is allowed to do so. [7]

Gentiles: Keep Out

Separatism between Jew and the corrupting Canaanites had a divinely sanctioned purpose in the time of Joshua. But the Pharisees nourished and intensified racism long after its usefulness was done. Gentiles were forbidden from becoming acquainted with the Jewish religion—an instruction *never* given by God. The Pharisees considered a Gentile so far beneath a Jew that hospitality or religious instruction were forbidden to him. In Sanh. 104a, "Hezekiah b. Hiyya deduces from II Kings XX.18 that he who shows hospitality to a heathen brings the penalty of exile upon his children." The *Jewish Encyclopedia* article on "Gentiles" (p. 621) heartily agrees:

The Talmud comments on the untruthfulness of Gentiles (a band of strange children whose mouth speaketh vanity, and their right [in raising it to take an oath] is a right hand of falsehood) and contrasts it with the reputation of a Jew: The remnant of Israel shall not do iniquity nor speak lies; neither shall a deceitful tongue be found in their mouth. (Zeph. iii. 13) [8]

Such holiness may be facilitated by following this suggestion from the Talmud as related by the *Jewish Encyclopedia*, p. 617, "Judah ben Illai recommends the daily recital of the benediction 'Blessed be thou... who hast not made me a goy.'"

Why Have Jews Been So Persecuted?

What if these passages from the Talmud weren't written in the Talmud by authority of the Pharisees but in the New Testament by authority of Jesus? If they were, Jesus' followers would have become the most despised and mistrusted of men. Christians (if any survived) would have faced discrimination and even banishment from civilized

society. People today would laugh at any Christian reply that their sufferings were caused by bigoted nations.

Yet history books in our educational system describe the long saga of Jewish suffering as primarily caused by *Christian* "anti-semitic" bigotry against "innocent" Jews.

Why have the Jews been exiled from 60 countries since they began to follow the leadership of the Pharisees nearly two millennia ago? It's because of something toxic within the religion of the Pharisees.

Jesus put it most directly: Rabbinic Judaism is the "synagogue of Satan" (Rev 3:9)—the church that Satan goes to, the religion he inspired and owns.

(Adapted from *Israel: Our Duty...Our Dilemma* by Rev Ted Pike. This 345-page book is available for \$24.90, post-paid, online at www.truthtellers.org or from National Prayer Network, P.O. Box 828, Clackamas, OR, 97015.)

Footnotes:

1. Baba Kama 113b, quoted in "The Talmud Unmasked," by Rev. I. B. Pranaitis. This volatile passage is paraphrased or omitted in Jewish translations of the Talmud meant for modern audiences. However scholars of Hebrew and Aramaic have translated passages by Pranaitis for me and found them more accurate than Jewish translations for the public.

2. "Gentile," p. 620.

3. Ibid. Pg. 620.

4. Choschen Ham 156, 5 Hagah, 183 Hagah, Pranaitis, pp. 72-73. Choschen Ham is a rabbinic treatise not part of the Talmud proper, but of comparable authority. Since the Pranaitis translation is consistent with views expressed in the Talmud and *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I have included it.

5. Gittin 61a, quoted from the *Jewish Encyclopedia* article, "Gentile," p. 623.

6. Iore Deah 147, 12 Hagah, Pranaitis, p. 69. Iore Deah is part of a compendium of Jewish law first formulated by Maimonides. Again, I feel that the Pranaitis translation from the Krakow edition is trustworthy.

7. Ibid. 151, 14 Hagah.

~ ~ ~ ~ ~

Rev. Ted Pike is director of the National Prayer Network, a Christian/conservative watchdog organization.

TALK SHOW HOSTS: Interview Rev. Ted Pike on this subject. Call (503) 631-3808.

The freedom-saving outreach of Rev. Ted Pike and the National Prayer Network is solely supported by sale of books, videos and your financial support. All gifts are tax-deductible.

NATIONAL PRAYER NETWORK, P.O. Box 828, Clackamas, OR 97015 www.truthtellers.org

From: Fredrick Toben toben@toben.biz

Sent: Sunday, 10 October 2010 11:40 PM

To: Adelaide Institute info@adelaideinstitute.org

Subject: Even in the bush - Toben can't help himself - needs to express his concerns

Cheers from FT on this magic date 10.10.10

Letter to the Editor

Wimmera Mail-Times

Horsham 3400

newsdesk@mailtimes.com.au

10.10.10

Sir

Your editorial of 8 October 2010 'Totally powerless' and the only Letters To The Editor for the day, 'Alarming planning', struck a chord because the latter's inclusion indicated to me that you revised your letters length policy - but not only. Your comment about how a once public utility now in private hands fails to deliver the goods is indeed an indication how we have become powerless when it comes to ensuring a secure electricity supply. Then, giving Mr Griffiths a space of 23-paragraphs, wherein he ventilates his concerns about local planning procedures, indicates to me you are worried - and that is good because local complacency fuelled by political double-speak needs to be shaken up. If this does not occur, then of course, we'll have the scapegoaters who bell the cat only after the catastrophe has decimated local communities.

I have just returned from visiting Hope Vale, that Aboriginal town 45 Km north of Cooktown where Mr Noel Pearson is trying to get the locals off their 'pity-pot', feeling sorry for themselves and instead to become self-determining. One of his relatives who grew up at Hope Vale, which was a former Lutheran Mission Station, cannot get a suitable job because outsiders are preferred if scarce jobs become available. Yes, the locals are ignored but the political rhetoric says otherwise. The question is why does Federal and Queensland government policy still bring into such communities outsiders from Cairns who stay at Hope Vale for three days, then return home?

Most locals in the Wimmera can relate to the blow-ins who settle down into the area for a few years, do their government allocated job, then leave with their pension entitlements guaranteed because obediently they fed into the

community what their political masters in Melbourne deemed important.

These blow-ins are the 'useful idiots' or handmaidens of politicians who impose on local communities things that are foreign to them. But because such imposition enables the administrators to secure their own retirement benefits that will ultimately take them away from the local community which they are supposed to be serving. All too often federal and state government policies are not in the interest of the local community.

We have the more striking current example of the Murray-Darling irrigation shut-down. This is because world politics and world economics as so deceptively sold to Australians as a must-economic model of 'the level playing field' ideology that deems it unprofitable to keep this system of food production going. Remember when during the 1990s the Australian wool industry was decimated? This was followed by the Wheat Board and its alleged 'corruption' scandal in Iraq, and all the while other market contenders muscled in who were operating NOT on a level playing field as was Australia to its own detriment.

But then the New World Order has deemed a reduction in farmers' numbers for Australia, and our politicians, helped by well-meaning conservation and moral watch dogs, are assisting in shutting down our primary food industry. In a few years' time we'll be just a quarry for those nations still producing consumer goods.

Add to that the nonsense about the climate change and carbon tax necessity, then your editorial and Mr Griffiths' thoughts touch on a raw nerve that Pauline Hanson's ONE NATION addressed, and for which she was sent to prison. What was her crime? She opposed deceptive multiculturalism that is dividing our nation and she advocated Australian national self-interest; meaning that we should follow a policy of autarky - self-sufficiency instead of globalism!

Systematically Australia's economic life is being switched off to the detriment of its large viable middle class that gives the

country stability and imbues its future generations with a purpose other than hedonistic consumerism, which has already enabled so many young minds to embrace nihilistic thought patterns. Soon we'll have a country of have and have-nots where the super rich are served by the super poor – Master-Servant relationships that a Nationalist policy would do away with.

I would like to include the following personal word-snapshot as an example how communities operated before the 1970s was grasped by these internationalist ideologues. When I turned 18 I wanted my drivers licence. What did I do? My twin brother and I drove our parents' VW to the local police station where we presented ourselves to Mr Hager who knew everyone in the community. He knew we had been practising our driving on the farm for a number of years, and so he asked one of us to get into the back seat while he sat in the passenger's seat, then asked to be driven to the Post Office where it was a matter of showing him our parking and reversing skills. After half an hour of this and some pertinent questions about road safety we received our licence.

Both my brother and I would have been ashamed to have had an accident in the following years and so we became cautious drivers because we would wish to break the trust Mr Hager had extended to us by giving us our much-valued car licence. Nowadays the young claim it is their right to get that licence, then play the victim when things go wrong. But then a host of counsellors are waiting to give these stropky young advice and begin to label them, which will haunt the young for a life-

time through the process of documenting their growing up, instead of the police – and teachers – having the right to use a short, sharp, non-negotiable instrument of discipline to set them on their way to adulthood.

So, too, it is with local communities who have been bludgeoned into silence through economic pressures and then give up on themselves because the pressure is destroying trust and relationships – AND BUSINESSES - on account of dishonest foreign policies being forced upon them from external sources that have no real vested interests in assisting local communities. It is always easy to blame the victim when a business fails.

Instructive here is the example from history. The USA began as a colony that broke away to seek freedom from oppressive taxation because its resources were being used without local interests getting its fair share in return for producing them.

So, too, now in Australia, and the mechanism employed by outsiders to win over locals is the trusted and safe formula: divide and rule, play off one local against another, and when it gets tough, pull the race card on your opponent.

It is time, again, to cry out: This far and no further – as is suggested by you and Mr Griffiths.

Dr Fredrick Töben
21 Church Street
Goroke – 3412
M: 0417088217
E: toben@toben.biz

The New York Times defends assassinations - 11 October 2010

In its main editorial Sunday, the *New York Times*, the major voice of what passes for liberalism in America, openly defends the right of the US government to assassinate anyone it pleases. The only restriction the *Times* suggests is that the president should be required to have his selection of murder victims rubber-stamped by a secret court like the one that now approves 99.99 percent of all electronic eavesdropping requests.

The apologia for killing begins with a blatant lie about the US assassination program using missiles fired from CIA-operated drone aircraft flying along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border. The *Times* claims, citing official US government sources: "The drone program has been effective, killing more than 400 Al Qaeda militants this year alone, according to American officials, but fewer than 10 noncombatants."

Actually, Pakistani government officials estimated the number of civilians killed by drone attacks in 2009 alone at more than 700, with an even higher figure this year, as the Obama administration has rained missiles and bombs on the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region. (See "[US drone missiles slaughtered 700 Pakistani civilians in 2009](#)".)

A report in the Pakistani newspaper *Dawn* concluded, "For each Al-Qaeda and Taliban terrorist killed by US drones, 140 innocent Pakistanis also had to die. Over 90 per cent of those killed in the deadly missile strikes were civilians, claim authorities."

The *Times* editors cannot be unaware of these well-established figures, since their own journalists have reported a civilian death toll from US missile strikes in Pakistan of some 500 by April 2009, and 100 to 500 more through April 2010. They lie shamelessly and deliberately in order to conceal the significance of their endorsement of such widespread killing.

The editorial claims that US drone missile attacks are legal under international law as self-defense, but this is flatly rejected by human rights groups and legal experts, except

those who work as paid apologists for the CIA and Pentagon. The United States is not at war with Afghanistan, Pakistan, Yemen or Somalia, but US missiles have struck the territory of all these countries and annihilated their citizens.

In a 29-page report to the United Nations Human Rights Council in June, the UN Special Rapporteur on extrajudicial executions, Philip Alston, rejected the doctrine of "preemptive self-defense" employed by the Bush and Obama administrations, as well as the state of Israel, and declared that a targeted killing outside actual warfare "is almost never likely to be legal." In an accompanying statement, Alston pointed out the consequences if such a doctrine were to become universal. He declared: "If invoked by other states, in pursuit of those they deem to be terrorists and to have attacked them, it would cause chaos."

The *Times* concedes, "it is not within the power of a commander in chief to simply declare anyone anywhere a combatant and kill them, without the slightest advance independent oversight." The editorial argues that such arbitrary killings can be prevented through procedural safeguards of a purely cosmetic character.

These would include the Obama administration making public "its standards for putting people on terrorist or assassination lists," limiting targets to "only people who are actively planning or participating in terror, or who are leaders of Al Qaeda or the Taliban"; capturing instead of killing, where possible; and "oversight outside the administration," i.e., the aforementioned judicial review by a body like the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court. Yes, if only the Nazis had followed "proper procedures."

In the mealy-mouthed language that has become typical of the *Times* as it provides "liberal" justifications for the crimes of US imperialism, the editors insist that in the case of US citizens, "the government needs to employ some due process before depriving someone of life," adding that, "If practical, the

United States should get permission from a foreign government before carrying out an attack on its soil."

The *Times* editorial admits that in the much-publicized case of Anwar al-Awlaki, the US-born Muslim cleric now living in Yemen, the Obama administration has acted in a manner diametrically opposed to the procedure the newspaper claims to favor. Awlaki has been targeted for assassination, based on criteria that are secret and unreviewable. The Justice Department has gone to court to assert the "state secrets" privilege to quash a lawsuit brought by the American Civil Liberties Union, on behalf of Awlaki's father, seeking to compel the government to justify or rescind its death sentence.

No evidence has been presented that Awlaki, a longtime publicist for Islamic fundamentalism, has engaged in actual terrorist actions. And as the *Times* itself admits, "If the United States starts killing every Islamic radical who has called for jihad, there will be no end to the violence." But the editors are

nonetheless willing to place their confidence in the Obama administration, even to the point of giving it powers of life and death over citizens of the US and other countries alike.

The *Times* editorial reeks of cynicism. It advances arguments that convince no one, and are not intended to convince, only to provide a screen of words for a policy of imperialist barbarism and reaction. It is one more demonstration that, within the US financial aristocracy, there is no constituency whatsoever for the defense of democratic rights.

The open reactionaries like the *Wall Street Journal* and Fox News display their bloodlust unashamedly. The "liberals" like the *Times* prefer a dose of hypocritical moralizing and legalistic quibbling. The consequences for humanity are the same.

Patrick Martin

The author also recommends:

[Obama orders assassination of US citizen](#)

<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2010/oct2010/pers-o11.shtml>

John Pilger: Chile's Ghosts Are Not Being Rescued

t r u t h o u t, Op-Ed, 13 October 2010, <http://www.truth-out.org/chiles-ghosts-are-not-being-rescued64160>

The rescue of 33 miners in Chile is an extraordinary drama filled with pathos and heroism. It is also a media windfall for the Chilean government, whose every beneficence is recorded by a forest of cameras. One cannot fail to be impressed. However, like all great media events, it is a facade.

The accident that trapped the miners is not unusual in Chile and is the inevitable consequence of a ruthless economic system that has barely changed since the dictatorship of Gen. Augusto Pinochet. Copper is Chile's gold, and the frequency of mining disasters keeps pace with prices and profits. There are, on average, 39 fatal accidents every year in Chile's privatized mines. The San Jose mine, where the trapped men work, became so unsafe in 2007 it had to be closed - but not for long. On 30 July last, a labor department report warned again of "serious safety deficiencies," but the minister took no action. Six days later, the men were entombed.

For all the media circus at the rescue site, contemporary Chile is a country of the unspoken. At the Villa Grimaldi, in the suburbs of the capital Santiago, a sign says: "The forgotten past is full of memory." This was the torture center where hundreds of people were murdered and disappeared for opposing the fascism that General Pinochet and his business allies brought to Chile. Its ghostly presence is overseen by the beauty of the Andes, and the man who unlocks the gate used to live nearby and remembers the screams.

I was taken there one wintry morning in 2006 by Sara De Witt, who was imprisoned as a student activist and now lives in London. She was electrocuted and beaten, yet survived. Later, we drove to the home of Salvador Allende, the great democrat and reformer who perished when Pinochet seized power on 11 September 1973 - Latin America's own 9/11. His house is a silent white building without a sign or a plaque.

Everywhere, it seems, Allende's name has been eliminated. Only in the lone memorial in the cemetery are the words engraved "*Presidente de la Republica*" as part of a remembrance of the "*ejecutados Politicos*": those "executed for political reasons." Allende died by his own hand while Pinochet bombed the presidential palace with British planes as the American ambassador watched.

Today, Chile is a democracy, though many would dispute that, notably those in the barrios forced to scavenge for food and steal electricity. In 1990, Pinochet bequeathed a constitutionally compromised system as a condition of his retirement and the military's withdrawal to the political shadows. This ensures that the broadly reformist parties,

known as Concertacion, are permanently divided or drawn into legitimizing the economic designs of the heirs of the dictator. At the last election, the right-wing Coalition for Change, the creation of Pinochet's ideologue Jaime Guzman, took power under President Sebastian Piñera. The bloody extinction of true democracy that began with the death of Allende was, by stealth, complete.

Piñera is a billionaire who controls a slice of the mining, energy and retail industries. He made his fortune in the aftermath of Pinochet's coup and during the free-market "experiments" of the zealots from the University of Chicago, known as the Chicago Boys. His brother and former business partner, Jose Piñera, a labor minister under Pinochet, privatized mining and state pensions and all but destroyed the trade unions. This was applauded in Washington as an "economic miracle," a model of the new cult of neoliberalism that would sweep the continent and ensure control from the north.

Today, Chile is critical to President Barack Obama's rollback of the independent democracies in Ecuador, Bolivia and Venezuela. Piñera's closest ally is Washington's main man, Juan Manuel Santos, the new president of Colombia, home to seven US bases and an infamous human rights record familiar to Chileans who suffered under Pinochet's terror.

Post-Pinochet Chile has kept its own enduring abuses in shadow. The families still attempting to recover from the torture or disappearance of a loved one bear the prejudice of the state and employers. Those not silent are the Mapuche people, the only indigenous nation the Spanish conquistadors could not defeat. In the late 19th century, the European settlers of an independent Chile waged their racist War of Extermination against the Mapuche who were left as impoverished outsiders. During Allende's thousand days in power, this began to change. Some Mapuche lands were returned and a debt of justice was recognized.

Since then, a vicious, largely unreported war has been waged against the Mapuche. Forestry corporations have been allowed to take their land, and their resistance has been met with murders, disappearances and arbitrary prosecutions under "anti terrorism" laws enacted by the dictatorship. In their campaigns of civil disobedience, none of the Mapuche has harmed anyone. The mere accusation of a landowner or businessman that the Mapuche "might" trespass on their own ancestral lands is often enough for the police to charge them with offenses that lead to Kafkaesque trials with faceless

witnesses and prison sentences of up to 20 years. They are, in effect, political prisoners.

While the world rejoices at the spectacle of the miners' rescue, 38 Mapuche hunger strikers have not been news. They are demanding an end to the Pinochet laws used against them, such as "terrorist arson," and the justice of a real democracy.

On 9 October, all but one of the hunger strikers ended their protest after 90 days without food. A young Mapuche, Luis Marileo, says he will go on. On 18 October, President Piñera is due to give a lecture on "current events" at the London School of Economics. He should be reminded of their ordeal and why.

US physics professor:

'Global warming is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life'

By James Delingpole, *Telegraph*, October 9th, 2010

Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, former Chairman; Former member Defense Science Board, chmn of Technology panel; Chairman DSB study on Nuclear Winter; Former member Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Former member, President's Nuclear Safety Oversight Committee; Chairman



Newton: "Fie on you, Hansen, Mann, Jones et al! You are not worthy of the name scientists! May the pox consume your shrivelled peterkins!"

Harold Lewis is Emeritus Professor of Physics at the University of California, Santa Barbara. Here is his letter of resignation to Curtis G. Callan Jr, Princeton University, President of the American Physical Society.

Anthony Watts describes it thus:

This is an important moment in science history. I would describe it as a letter on the scale of Martin Luther, nailing his 95 theses to the Wittenburg church door. It is worthy of repeating this letter in entirety on every blog that discusses science.

It's so utterly damning that I'm going to run it in full without further comment. (H/T GWPF, Richard Brearley).

Dear Curt:

When I first joined the American Physical Society sixty-seven years ago it was much smaller, much gentler, and as yet uncorrupted by the money flood (a threat against which Dwight Eisenhower warned a half-century ago). Indeed, the choice of physics as a profession was then a guarantor of a life of poverty and abstinence—it was World War II that changed all that. The prospect of worldly gain drove few physicists. As recently as thirty-five years ago, when I chaired the first APS study of a contentious social/scientific issue, The Reactor Safety Study, though there were zealots aplenty on the outside there was no hint of inordinate pressure on us as physicists. We were therefore able to produce what I believe was and is an honest appraisal of the situation at that time. We were further enabled by the presence of an oversight committee consisting of Pief Panofsky, Vicki Weisskopf, and Hans Bethe, all towering physicists beyond reproach. I was proud of what we did in a charged atmosphere. In the end the oversight committee, in its report to the APS President,

APS study on Nuclear Reactor Safety Chairman Risk Assessment Review Group; Co-founder and former Chairman of JASON; Former member USAF Scientific Advisory Board; Served in US Navy in WW II; books: Technological Risk (about, surprise, technological risk) and Why Flip a Coin (about decision making)

noted the complete independence in which we did the job, and predicted that the report would be attacked from both sides. What greater tribute could there be?

How different it is now. The giants no longer walk the earth, and the money flood has become the *raison d'être* of much physics research, the vital sustenance of much more, and it provides the support for untold numbers of professional jobs. For reasons that will soon become clear my former pride at being an APS Fellow all these years has been turned into shame, and I am forced, with no pleasure at all, to offer you my resignation from the Society.

It is of course, the global warming scam, with the (literally) trillions of dollars driving it, that has corrupted so many scientists, and has carried APS before it like a rogue wave. It is the greatest and most successful pseudoscientific fraud I have seen in my long life as a physicist. Anyone who has the faintest doubt that this is so should force himself to read the ClimateGate documents, which lay it bare. (Montford's book organizes the facts very well.) I don't believe that any real physicist, nay scientist, can read that stuff without revulsion. I would almost make that revulsion a definition of the word scientist.

So what has the APS, as an organization, done in the face of this challenge? It has accepted the corruption as the norm, and gone along with it. For example:

1. About a year ago a few of us sent an e-mail on the subject to a fraction of the membership. APS ignored the issues, but the then President immediately launched a hostile investigation of where we got the e-mail addresses. In its better days, APS used to encourage discussion of important issues, and indeed the Constitution cites that as its principal purpose. No more. Everything that has been done in the last year has been designed to silence debate

2. The appallingly tendentious APS statement on Climate Change was apparently written in a hurry by a few people over lunch, and is certainly not representative of the talents of APS members as I have long known them. So a few of us petitioned the Council to reconsider it. One of the outstanding marks of (in)distinction in the Statement was the poison word incontrovertible, which describes few items in physics, certainly not this one. In response APS appointed a secret committee that never met, never troubled to speak to any skeptics, yet endorsed the Statement in its entirety. (They did admit that the tone was a bit strong, but amazingly kept the poison word incontrovertible to describe the evidence, a position supported by no one.) In the end, the Council kept the original statement, word for word, but approved a far longer "explanatory" screed, admitting that there were uncertainties, but brushing them aside to give blanket

approval to the original. The original Statement, which still stands as the APS position, also contains what I consider pompous and asinine advice to all world governments, as if the APS were master of the universe. It is not, and I am embarrassed that our leaders seem to think it is. This is not fun and games, these are serious matters involving vast fractions of our national substance, and the reputation of the Society as a scientific society is at stake.

3. In the interim the ClimateGate scandal broke into the news, and the machinations of the principal alarmists were revealed to the world. It was a fraud on a scale I have never seen, and I lack the words to describe its enormity. Effect on the APS position: none. None at all. This is not science; other forces are at work.

4. So a few of us tried to bring science into the act (that is, after all, the alleged and historic purpose of APS), and collected the necessary 200+ signatures to bring to the Council a proposal for a Topical Group on Climate Science, thinking that open discussion of the scientific issues, in the best tradition of physics, would be beneficial to all, and also a contribution to the nation. I might note that it was not easy to collect the signatures, since you denied us the use of the APS membership list. We conformed in every way with the requirements of the APS Constitution, and described in great detail what we had in mind—simply to bring the subject into the open.<

5. To our amazement, Constitution be damned, you declined to accept our petition, but instead used your own control of the mailing list to run a poll on the members' interest in a TG on Climate and the Environment. You did ask the members if they would sign a petition to form a TG on your yet-to-be-defined subject, but provided no petition, and got lots of affirmative responses. (If you had asked about sex you would have gotten more expressions of interest.) There was of course no such petition or proposal, and you have now dropped the Environment part, so the whole matter is moot. (Any lawyer will tell you that you cannot collect signatures on a vague petition, and then fill in whatever you like.) The entire purpose of this exercise was to avoid your constitutional responsibility to take our petition to the Council.

6. As of now you have formed still another secret and stacked committee to organize your own TG, simply ignoring our lawful petition. APS management has gamed the problem from the beginning, to suppress serious conversation about the merits of the climate change claims. Do you wonder that I have lost confidence in the organization?

I do feel the need to add one note, and this is conjecture, since it is always risky to discuss other people's motives. This scheming at APS HQ is so bizarre that there cannot be a simple explanation for it. Some have held that the physicists of today are not as smart as they used to be, but I don't think that is an issue. I think it is the money, exactly what Eisenhower warned about a half-century ago. There are indeed trillions of dollars involved, to say nothing of the fame and glory (and frequent trips to exotic islands) that go with being a member of the club. Your own Physics Department (of which you are chairman) would lose millions a year if the global warming bubble burst. When Penn State absolved Mike Mann of wrongdoing, and the University of East Anglia did the same for Phil Jones, they cannot have been unaware of the financial penalty for doing otherwise. As the old saying goes, you don't have to be a weatherman to know which way the wind is blowing. Since I am no philosopher, I'm not going to explore at just which point enlightened self-interest crosses the line into corruption, but a careful reading of the ClimateGate releases makes it clear that this is not an academic question.

I want no part of it, so please accept my resignation. APS no longer represents me, but I hope we are still friends.

Hal

Fredrick Töben leaves the following comment on James Delinpole's Blog: October 11, 2010 at 12:32 pm

Now it's time for you to get on to the Hoax of the 20th Century – the 'Holocaust', then you'll be even more despised for telling the truth about those false allegations that Germans exterminated the Jews.

<http://jamesdelingpole.com/blog/us-physics-professor-global-warming-is-the-greatest-and-most-successful-pseudoscientific-fraud-i-have-seen-in-my-long-life-1141/#comments>

John Izzard: The trial of Andrew Bolt, October 5, 2010

[Greg] Lehman agreed that the Aborigines would have perceived Kemp at first as one of themselves. "The old fellas didn't recognise an Other. They didn't see a Black or a White. They lived in a world where Homo Sapiens was all created out of the tail of a Kangaroo." A guiding dictum of Lehman's was a remark by a Cherokee Indian: There is no such thing as a non-indigenous person. "The basis of my belief in identity is that that there was never in this land any distinction between black and white."

In Tasmania by Nicholas Shakespeare (page 196)

With his ghost of a grey beard and his father's complexion Lehman was, he agreed, an improbable-looking Aborigine. His father was descended from Bavarians from the Black Forest; his mother from a convicted Irish axe-murderer called Chugg. But Lehman identified with his paternal grandmother called Molly Kennedy who had lived in the hamlet of North Motton in Tasmania's north-west. "I'm so lucky" he said, to be living in a landscape that my family has inhabited for 2,000 generations.

In Tasmania by Nicholas Shakespeare (page 197)

"What about this?" and I pointed to the rest of the tree. "What about your German roots? What about your Irish

roots?"

"That's mongrel", he said.

I looked away, frustrated by my inability to understand.

In Tasmania by Nicholas Shakespeare (page 199)

The trial of Andrew Bolt begins on December 13 with Justice Finkelstein of the Federal Court presiding. Bolt has been charged under the Racial Discrimination Act for two articles he wrote last year. [See [here](#) and [here](#)] One of the articles was headed "MEET the white face of a new black race—the political Aborigine". Like Nicholas Shakespeare, who "looked away, frustrated by my [his] inability to understand", Bolt has been charged for telling his readers of his inability to understand what is going on when the mind is apparently expected to defy what the eye sees—and questions that conflict.

Many Australians have also questioned (to themselves or to those who they feel confident in trusting their *politically incorrect* thoughts) the apparent enigma of people with obvious European features claiming to be Aboriginal. But only Andrew Bolt has had the courage to go public with his doubts and to have questioned the notion that certain "indigenous Australians" have the right to select from a smorgasbord of

ethnic ancestors, and expect the public to accept this proposition without asking serious questions.

It is a bit like the science of human-induced climate change—we all are expected to follow the line that the “science” of picking your ethnic background is “settled”. Well fortunately, thanks to Andrew Bolt the issue isn’t settled, and the Federal Court is now having to answer this question. Like the Oscar Wilde trial though, the nine “Aboriginal claimants” might regret that they have taken the legal advice from Joel Zyngier of Holding Redlich. If they don’t win, what is the standing of “designer ethnicity”?

Of course the good judge will not be deciding on the issue of “my right to select my own race”, a right denied all other non-indigenous Australians. What the good judge will have to decide is whether Australians have the right to discuss the issues involved. Freedom of speech, that pesky little *right* that so frustrates the likes of the Human Rights Commission in Australia, and their equivalents around the world, is the issue for Justice Finkelstein to decide.

The nine “Aboriginal” complainants want Andrew Bolt silenced on this issue, and of course that means any other writer, journalist and commentator who enjoys freedom of expression and thought in this country— and that is OUR right. One of the first people that Andrew Bolt apparently “offended” in his article “MEET the white face of a new black race— the political Aborigine” was Bindi Cole. **Bolt wrote:** *Meet, say, acclaimed St Kilda artist Bindi Cole, who was raised by her English-Jewish mother yet calls herself “Aboriginal but white”.*

She rarely saw her part-Aboriginal father, and could in truth join any one of several ethnic groups, but chose Aboriginal, insisting a racial identity you could only guess from her features. She also chose, incidentally, the one identity open to her that has political and career clout.

Strangely, in his fight for truth, justice and the Australian way, Andrew Bolt has attracted a couple of interesting supporters—sort of. In a piece for *Crikey* (September 23), Margaret Simons wrote:

Freedom of speech brings with it the presumption that we will be offended by some of what we see and hear. There is no right, in modern media-driven society, not to be offended.

When the Racial Discrimination Act was amended in the mid-1990s to include racial vilification, the legislation was controversial and the government had trouble getting it

through -- hence, no criminal penalties, and exemptions that you can drive a truck through.

The Act makes it unlawful for a person to “do an act” in public that is likely to “offend, insult, humiliate or intimidate another person or a group of people” on the basis of their race.

But the exemptions cover anything done in good faith in an artistic work, in academic debates and “fair comment on any event or matter of public interest, if the comment is an expression of a genuine belief held by the person making the comment”. Which would seem to me to give Bolt plenty of room to move.

Unfortunately, many politically active Aboriginal “claimants” do not recognise “the right to offend”. They will find offence at just about anything that doesn’t fit in with their own agendas. And they will use the power and force of white-fella’s laws to squash anyone who speaks their mind by challenging those agendas. Being “offended” by others, including fellow Aborigines, and payback rights, features highly in their culture.

Another supporter of Andrew Bolt — sort of — is Luke Walladge, who, in a piece on the ABC’s *The Drum* last month, announced that even though he thought Andrew Bolt was “a total flogger” and a “offensive, myopic, aggressively ignorant buffoon, and whose disingenuity, casuistry, strawmen [?] remarks and simple bias as to render them useless for anything other than lining a parrot cage” — thought that:

I love the fact that Andrew Bolt has the right to be so obnoxious, so ridiculous and so laughably nonsensical. Because his right to be a flogger means that I have the right to call him an offensive, myopic, aggressively ignorant buffoon whose popularity I have yet to find a decent explanation for. And I’ll be damned if I support any attempt to silence either of us.

So all of you conservative followers of Andrew Bolt, and believers in the right to freedom of speech — what about a little bit of support for Andrew. We can’t leave it all to Margaret Simons and Luke Walladge!

And remember:

“The basis of my belief in identity is that there was never in this land any distinction between black and white.”

Greg Lehman, Aboriginal academic: from *In Tasmania*, Nicholas Shakespeare

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/qed/2010/10/the-trial-of-andrew-bolt>

Andrew Bolt: Ahmadinejad whips up Hezbollah

Thursday, October 14, 2010 at 06:38am

What might this fascist do next to back his fighting words, aimed at supporters of an Islamist group with a terrorist wing?

Thousands of cheering Lebanese welcomed Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad to Lebanon on Wednesday, throwing rose petals and sweets at his motorcade during a visit that underscores the growing power of Tehran and its Lebanese ally, Hezbollah...

The exuberant welcome in the streets was largely organized by Hezbollah, who encouraged the mostly Shiite crowd to come out in droves. Ahmadinejad’s trip also includes a provocative excursion to the border with archenemy Israel on Thursday.

But the Iranian leader’s splashy arrival only exacerbates fears among many Lebanese - particularly Sunnis and Christians - that Hezbollah and Iran are trying to impose their will on the country and possibly pull Lebanon into a conflict with Israel.

Ahmadinejad said he was a friend of all Lebanese, while emphasizing the need to fight Israel...

He said both Lebanon and Iran “[oppose the occupation and aggression and the crimes committed by the Zionist enemy and those who support it.](#)”

Fredrick Töben responds:

Yawn, yawn - all this hot air about a man who dares question the lies that make up the ideology holding together our free and democratic western political system, namely, the Holocaust myth, while columnists and others fall into a frenzy when they meet individuals who will not bend to Jewish, et al, pressure, and proclaim: let’s look at the Holocaust narrative without labelling those - as racists, haters, deniers, antisemites, Nazis - who refuse blindly to believe in the three pillars that make up the myth: 6 million Jews killed, the German state did it systematically and the murder weapon was mainly a homicidal gas chamber. The quest for truth is an intellectual adventure that liberates individuals from mental rubbish. Dr Mahmoud Ahmadinejad has done likewise about the official 9:11 conspiracy theory, and the reaction was predictable: fear and disgust and loathing expressed by individuals who hate free expression.

http://blogs.news.com.au/heraldsun/andrewbolt/index.php/heraldsun/comments/ahmadinejad_whips_uo_hezbollah/