

that to you think of a nation which benefits the
worse by collection, and the number of babies

I found a number of the radio the other day saying
that we had a common-place in a large
country and had recently visited.

It was very early, and I clearly had some of the
was at the point. The subject that it was too
of the in countries who were being put to death,
they were less useful than they

How do you react to these things, assuming that
difficulties are there?

One thing that was particularly interesting was the
question of the interview on the radio programme.
These interviews are treated as if the question
which they're asked, and I think that's a
a real way. They're not at all
surprised to hear what the interviewer asked, and
was just the sort of question which we have all
discussed into thinking is important.

P.F. JENSEN:

I don't quote his exactly, but it went something like
this: "P.F. you saw these things... but what do
you see the right to criticize? After all, each country
has its own outcome. It's not up to us to judge it

Do you think that's fair comment? The woman he was
talking to did not say it. Her outrage at rape and
murder... it is the idea that
are many different standards of justice in the world
not for her the idea that it is permissible to murder
a child in Calcutta, even though it is frowned on in
Sydney.

"THE CHRISTIAN FAITH"

What do you think of a nation which permits the rape of women by policemen, and the murder of babies?

I heard a student on the radio the other day saying that these things were common-place in a large Asian country she had recently visited.

She was very angry; quite clearly her moral indignation was at boiling point. She alleged that it was baby girls in particular who were being put to death, since they were less useful than boys.

How do you react to news like this, assuming that the allegations are true?

One thing that was particularly interesting was the reaction of the interviewer on the radio programme. These interviewers are trained to put the questions which their audience would themselves like to ask. In a real way, they represent us. So I was not at all surprised to hear what the interviewer asked, since it was just the sort of question which we have all been brainwashed into thinking is important.

I can't quote him exactly, but it went something like this: 'O.K. you saw these things but what gives you the right to criticise? After all, each culture has its own customs. It's not up to us to judge them.'

Do you think that's fair comment? The woman he was talking to did not buy it. Her outrage at rape and murder was too strong to submit to the idea that there are many different standards of justice in the world. Not for her the idea that it is permissible to murder a child in Calcutta, even though it is frowned on in Sydney.

She repeated her condemnation in no uncertain terms. Just as the interviewer represented us in one way, she represented us in another. She gave voice to our own deep conviction that there are real standards of right and wrong in the world, and that men and women are responsible for obeying them.

Mind you, the other idea that right and wrong depend on where you live, is pretty persuasive. You can easily see why it appeals to us: if we can't judge the actions of others, then we can't be judged ourselves.

This is convenient and comfortable since we have our own national and personal sins for which we would rather not be responsible. Can you draw a distinction between killing a baby just after it has been born and aborting it before it is born? It's rather difficult. Or, what about our greed? Compared with others, we Australians are fabulously wealthy - but when it comes to giving away our money sacrificially, we are great misers. Or, how about the legacy of insecurity and fear that we are passing on to our children by making self-fulfilment the chief aim of family life, instead of love?

If rape and baby murder are wrong, it is because there is a Judge who has declared them wrong; if other people are responsible for their sins, so too are we, and with less excuse because we know God's Law. How ready are you to meet the Judge of all men, and to accept responsibility for what you have and have not done?

The reporter has conducted an impartial interview.
Just as the interview represented us in our way,
she represented us in another. She gave voice to our
own deep conviction that there are real standards of
right and wrong in the world, and that men and women are
responsible for choosing them.

And you, the other idea that right and wrong depend on
where you live, is pretty persuasive. You can easily see
why it appeals to us. If we can't judge the actions of
others, then we can't be judged ourselves.

THE CHRISTIAN FAITH
Is broadcast every Sunday at
7.05 p.m. over Radio 2CH

Copies of these weekly broadcasts may
be obtained (\$5 per year posted) by
writing to The Christian Faith, c/o
2CH, York Street, Sydney N.S.W. 2000

13/4/80 to 15/80

It is not our duty to judge others. It is our duty
to judge ourselves. If we are to be judged, we must
be judged by the same standard as we judge others.
How ready are you to
stand the judge of all men, and to accept responsibility
for what you have and have not done?