



# The World Tomorrow



By GARNER TED STRONGARM

Ladies and gentlemen, we are imperilled. Painful as it is to be always the bearer of bad tidings, I have something to tell you, something of great and immediate import. There is a crisis in our city, a crisis of provoked authority. Even as this column goes to press, it may be to late to prevent the pillage of our liberal heritage.

Up until the past five years, five years marked by the cancerous growth of treason and an unprecedented wave of insurgent activities, the administration of Universitas Dalhovsiana was a tender family affair. Back then, the left was simply the side of the road you didn't drive on. But times have changed, and while this was happening, the times changed. In the good old days, a newspaper editor could serenely anticipate a cozy fiefdom in his golden age. When his long association with the Canadian pulp industry came to a close, he could always run a school. Alas, this is no longer true. We have seen this demonstrated only last week, and we shall see it happen again if the proper authorities do not take the proper steps, mark my words.

L. D. Delay, one of the most distinguished editors that Halifax has ever been blessed with, and a man of truly sterling qualities, has long been contemplating retiring from newspaper work and returning to a search for the truth. "I feel the paper business has given me a great deal of satisfaction," he told me in an interview three days ago, "but I have also felt for a long time that my life lacks the richness of scholastic endeavor. After all, everyone knows that the REALLY big money is in university man-

agement."

Delay's voice was tinged with sadness and a hint of resignation. He had just been coerced into withdrawing his application for employment in the educational consortium of Hicks, Read, James & Beaverbrook, Ltd., by a fanatic dissident grouplet of law students led by Dalhousie University's brigand chief, one A. Randall Smith. Threatening a work stoppage by the Student Council, these outcasts successfully bludgeoned the university's administration into kowtowing to their fiendish manipulations. No fools at all, they saw the danger posed to their august authority by Mr. Delay, whose cumulative experience in maladministration far exceeds theirs in scope and bulk.

Council's letter to Dr. Hicks, a truly deceitful and petty smear of a great Canadian, reads as follows:

Dear Dr. Hicks:

You wonder why we don't love you. Reasons aplenty abound. Here you go messing around with outside people to run the U . . . . We shouldn't make it a policy to let every outside bureaucrat who wants to come to Dal do so; we should look out for our own first . . . . Delay's not the sort of man our organization really wants, anyway. Just look at all the fuss he stirred up about the SUB, anyway. Now we ask you, was he a good sport about that? No, of course not.

Anyway, Henry, I, the sublime center of Dal, have teamed up with Bill Brine, the divine right of King's. If you hire Delay, Bill and I are going to hold our breath until you fire him. So there.

Yr. most humble & obdt. servant  
A. Randall Smith

President Hicks was not available for comment, but Mr. Delay was. He indicated that he was dismayed at the lack of official reaction to this brazen attempt at power politics. "Obviously, if they feel that they can get away with this, there'll be no stopping them. Power is an immensely addicting thing. That's why I'd feel a lot better if it were wisely concentrated in the hands of a few, instead of infecting the whole campus."

As I talked with Mr. Delay, it became increasingly obvious that he was bitterly disappointed at this unethical slap in the face. He mentioned that "I've never up until now realized exactly how extensive the conspiracy had become. If this sort of thing is allowed to go on much longer, its quite obvious that Canada will become totally uninhabitable. I'm not really worried that much about my own immediate future: the New York Daily News and the USIA have both made very generous offers to me. The tragedy is in the people who are blind to all this happening around them."

Growing reflective, he added, "But you know, it really is a dog-eat-dog world out there. Those poor slob just don't have the sense to realize where their next meal is coming from, and get in the first bite."

I would add that the real tragedy lies in Halifax losing men of Mr. Delay's caliber. How long, O Lord, how long can we afford to let this disastrous state of affairs go on?

His answer is written in The Book.

## letters to the editor:

### *"if war crime trials cannot be made fair and universal..."*

To the Editor:

Perhaps it would have been best to end the war crime trials and forget about them. However, not that the United Nations has decided that they continue, we should take a closer look at them.

Since all war crime trials are based on the Nuremberg trials, let us first examine them.

The two books, THE NUREMBERG TRIALS by August von Knieriem and THE TRIAL OF THE GERMANS by Eugene Davidson show how unfair and one-sided the Nuremberg trials really were.

First, the court was made up of exclusively persons of the victors. In other words, the court was not impartial.

Second, since the victors could have hardly convicted the vanquished by international law, they prepared their own statute and called it international law although it was only partly and loosely based on international law. The fact that they prepared that statute themselves and the fact that they did so only after the deeds to be tried were done, did not bother the victors.

Third, only persons of the vanquished were tried by that statute, although many persons of the victors were also guilty under it. This was obviously wrong. Since the victors called their statute international law, they should have also applied it to their own countrymen. If international law is to mean anything at all, it must be applied to victor and vanquished alike. But this principle was violated at Nuremberg. The vanquished were simply not permitted to compare some of the deeds they were condemned for with similar ones committed by the victors. Whenever they tried to do so, they were stopped and told the court was not interested in what the victors might have done.

Fourth, the defence was not given a fair chance. Any attempt by them to show that the Treaty of Versailles was the real cause of Hitler and the Second World War was stifled in the bud. But even without Versailles the defence was not given a chance. Since the announcement of the indictment was delayed, the prosecution had much more time to prepare themselves than the defence. The defence counsels were denied access to the German and foreign archives, and most of the documents they asked for were not produced. The defence were not permitted to use most of their interrogated by the prosecution. The defence counsels lacked office space and furniture, they were not permitted to use electric light in the evening, all 180 of them had to share one telephone, they could not phone or travel to other countries to gather evidence, and their travelling freedom in Germany was limited.

Fifth, while the defence was thus hampered, the prosecution had all the liberties, documents, witnesses, and facilities they wanted. Furthermore, the prosecution could, unlike the defence, always surprise the defence with new witnesses. While the defence were hindered even with the little evidence they managed to collect, the prosecution could even present things as evidence which not another court in the world would have listened to. Since the prosecution did not show most of their documents to

the defence, they succeeded in distorting some of them.

Although the victors said the purpose of the Nuremberg trials was to do justice and to establish the truth, there can be no doubt that the real purpose was to punish the vanquished, distort the truth, and fix all guilt upon the vanquished.

Since the Nuremberg trials millions of Germans have been forced before courts most of which were even worse than that at Nuremberg. Not only have such trials been held by other countries, but also Germany was pressured to have them. Included in these millions of trials were also those held by the denazification courts, which were established by the victors and which were to a large degree composed of carpenters, criminals, Communists, and the like

who had no idea about law but who had a strong animosity toward society or toward Nazi Germany.

And now the United Nations had decided that the war crime trials continue. If this is indeed to be done then it is best to start all over again, establish a fair statute which would make no distinction between victor and vanquished, organize truly impartial and international courts, and have fair trials for victor and vanquished alike. Since these would be international courts, administering international law, they should obviously also hear cases of all other wars since the Second World War. On the other hand, if the war crime trials cannot be made fair and universal, then there should be none at all.

David Krahn

## Another letter on Christianity

To the Editor:

In the Jan. 9th issue of the Dal Gazette Miss Pearl Hebert came to God's defense concerning some points I raised in a talk reported in the Nov. 28 issue. Perhaps her remarks were to be taken as a rambling sermon but nevertheless I'd like to examine her arguments.

The first is less an argument than an indication and concerns the validity of the Bible on the grounds of its longevity and popularity. This can be turned against her. Since the Christian Bible is composed of Old and New Testaments but just the Jewish one of the Old, it follows that the Old Testament is acceptable to more people than the New. Now the Jews don't believe the New to be true and since their holy book is both older and more acceptable, where does this leave Miss Hebert and her argument?

Archaeology is supposed to back up the Bible so she points to the ruins of Jerico. The point at issue is not whether a miracle occurred to effect the collapse. You'll recall that a band of priests made like Louis Armstrong with their trumpets and brought the 'house' down. It would take some fancy archaeology to show trumpets were the cause.

As to the Bible's accuracy it is difficult to sort the history from the fairy tales because they are written in the same way. Leaving aside the Adam and Eve and Flood stories that are fobbed off on children as history, consider a duller but more objective example from the biblical record. Jeroham began his reign at 32 and died eight years later at 40 when his son Ahaziah began his rule at 42 years of age. This means that the son was 2 years older than his father. (2 Chron. 21:20 and 22:1-2).

The Amelekites will astound you. King Saul destroyed them all (1 Sam. 15:7, 8, 20) then later David killed them all again (1 Sam. 30:1, 2, 17) - then in Hezekiah's time (1 Chron. 4:43) they were done away with positively for the last time.

Miss Hebert thinks we'd be better off if we embraced the sex laws as found in Leviticus. Does

she really know what she's suggesting? I've summarized the ones I could find. Homosexuals are to be killed and the death penalty dished out for adultery as well. Other regulations reflect the savage's dread of menstrual blood and the need for purification after childbirth where one learns its twice as dirty to have a daughter as a son. Somewhere in Leviticus it says a father shouldn't make a daughter into a whore. While most of us agree with this it hardly needs a book and pretentious preamble to come up with a glimmer of good sense. Some rules are down right dangerous. If you are suspected of having leprosy of the genitals the priest has a look, locks you up for 7 days, and then takes another peek. The cure consists of putting a dead bird in a vessel and carrying out some inane ritual. Surely Miss Herbert would have us go to the Doctor. The last bit of sex advice is to marry a virgin and stay clear of widows, divorcees, and harlots who are lumped together, by the way. Miss Herbert might find it a sobering thought that if harlots didn't have children, we wouldn't have Jesus, because he had a tart or two in one of his genealogies (Rahab, Mathew 1:5). There would be a lot more bachelors in Halifax if men had to marry virgins.

I am afraid that Miss Herbert confounds the laws of science with the bogus Natural law of the theologians so that there is no use in discussing this.

She also champions the dietary laws of Leviticus from the rationalistic approach that certain meats are detrimental to one's health. Apart from the bad zoology of four-footed birds and hares that chew the cud, one wonders about prohibiting the eating of the inedible, e.g. owls and eagles. Uncomplimentary insight into these prohibitions comes from a study of totemism, rare<sup>ly</sup> embarked upon by believers.

If Miss Herbert doesn't think the priests invented God, then she should face up to the fact that God's responsible for composing the ruthless laws and silly ritualistic minutiae of the old testament.

Sincerely,  
David Chapman