

# THE NEW TIMES

Registered at the G.P.O., Melbourne, for transmission by post as a newspaper.

\$5.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

*"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free"*

Vol. 36, No. 4

APRIL 1970

## GOVERNMENT INTENSIFIES ECONOMIC WARFARE

### INCREASED INTEREST BURDEN FORCES UP COSTS

If there were any better indication that politicians do not decide policy, it would be difficult to find a clearer example than the recent rises in interest charges. A government struggling to rebuild its tattered public image after a near fatal electoral debacle is hardly likely to embark upon such unpopular and disastrous policies unless reacting to tremendous pressure from those controlling financial policy. Proof of the unpopularity of the measure with the Government is the furore caused by the exemption of farmers from the increase in bank overdraft rates. In this instance it is reported the Prime Minister insisted on the exemption against the advice of those imposing the new policy. No doubt he realised it would have been the last straw for the farmers already struggling to survive against rising costs. In which case there is little doubt the unpopularity of such a move in other sections of the community is not unrealised by the political leaders. But like well-trained puppets they hasten to justify the policies of their real masters, the financial bureaucrats controlling financial policy in the Treasury and the Reserve Bank.

Basically the policy behind forcing up interest rates is a clear case of financial dishonesty. However the premise on which this policy has been established has so long been accepted as orthodox practice that few people now question the premise and the principle on which it is based, and argument is confined to a question of degree, the degree to which government may take it upon itself to force up the price of obtaining money for the lawful business activities of the community.

#### DISHONEST POLICIES

The dishonesty begins at the point where those controlling the flow of money ensure there is never sufficient at any given time to satisfy the demand for goods and services. The dishonesty is further compounded when such persons ensure that the money that is released, whether it is in the form of overdraft loans or any other form of negotiable financial instrument, immediately loses value through the financing of increased costs brought about by increased prices. These irresponsible perpetrators of disaster know full well that their action of releasing increased volumes of money to finance increased wage demands and the costs which flow from such demands will inevitably, as surely as night follows day, result in further price increases and increasing dissatisfaction within the community as people find their purchasing power, their savings and their economic security continuously eroded and destroyed by inflation.

When public agitation reaches a sufficient pitch of indignation the Government is prevailed upon by these same architects of disaster to "take appropriate measures" to halt the process. There is never any suggestion the fundamental problem should be rectified, but the economy, which has become "overheated", must be "cooled down". Mr. Bury is describing the present position as being "overheated". The demand for labour is too high forcing

up costs, there is "too much money chasing too few goods" and to cool down this overheated situation it is necessary to reduce the amount of money available within the community. Therefore he justifies the raising of the overdraft rate and the raising of interest on building. The building industry is enjoying a boom he tells us. Evidently we don't want to see the demand for homes satisfied, so the trick is to make the loans needed to buy

<i>Strange Cure for Overheating</i> ....	....	....Page 2
<i>Chinks of Light</i> ....		....Page 3
<i>Give Us Barabbas</i> .....		Page 4
<i>Letter from Geoffrey Dobbs</i> ....		Page 8
<i>Fuel for the Engines of War</i> ....		....Page 5

a home much dearer so that the individuals concerned will stay in the money lenders grip for a longer period. He will therefore think twice about incurring such a debt and the building industry will slacken off.

Incurring an extra debt burden of \$1,500 for an average priced home makes a mockery of the \$500 tax free gift available to those who meet the specified conditions—yards of red tape—imposed. The majority of home builders come also from the middle income tax bracket, that group which Mr. Gorton promised some paltry tax relief during his election campaign, but which promise he is now side-stepping under the pressure of his financial advisers to "cool" the economy by robbing the individual of purchasing power.

Forcing up the interest rate is a vicious form of economic warfare against the community. It forces up costs irredeemably. That this is so is clear from post-war history. In 1945 the general overdraft rate was 4½ per cent, and has risen in jumps to 5, to 6, to 7, back to 6½ to 7, to 7¼, to 7½, to 7¾, to 8¼ percent. Costs have risen with the climb in the interest rate even

though our economic advisers plead that they must increase the rate to bring down costs and halt inflation. Paying extra for loan money brings a permanent increase in costs from which it is impossible to recover as the individual and the business world is forced to include the higher charge in their own costs and charge it to the public.

### **GOVERNMENT SHOULD CHALLENGE THE BUREAUCRATS**

When announcing the differential rate to farmers which is up to 1½ percent lower than paid by the rest of the community. Chairman of the Reserve Bank, Mr. J. G. Phillips, announced that the bank was virtually ordered by the Prime Minister to exempt primary producers from the recent increase. That Mr. Phillips had the temerity to make such an announcement public indicates the contempt of this top bureaucrat for the Government. He as good as told the Government it would rue the day for enforcing such a policy and he and his fellow financiers would ensure the government was brought under strong attack for insisting that Government policy should prevail. *The Age*, Melbourne carried a warning to this effect on April 3.

What the financial bureaucrats are afraid of is not so much the preferential treatment to farmers, but the realisation from other sections of the community that if it is a good thing to keep down the costs of farmers it is also a good thing to keep down their costs, and then the whole community would benefit. The bureaucrats resent any challenge to their inflationary policies. That they will receive such a challenge on an increasing scale we can assure them will be so. Especially when the views of practical working economies, like those we have reported elsewhere of Mr. H. W. Herbert are made known.

### **GIGANTIC MONOPOLY PROFITS**

The Treasury and the Reserve Bank, more so than the private banks operate a gigantic monopoly imposing extortionate profits from which the Australian people can only be protected by their parliamentary representatives. For a start the note issue branch charges face value prices for the notes and coins it issues to the public. We may well ask the cost of production of a \$10 bill. In the quantities produced it is doubtful whether it would cost more than 2 cents, a profit of 500 percent. It has never been easy to estimate the cost in clerical staff, premises, bank equipment, etc., involved in the process of issuing credit in the form of bank overdrafts. Sir Henry Bolte made a lucrative profit from charging one cent in every \$10 in the form of receipts tax. While he did not have to supply cheque forms, exchange houses and bank branches readily available to the public, it nevertheless gives some concept of the comparative ease of supplying what is in essence a routine clerical service.

It is time the whole process of supplying sufficient money to finance production to the benefit of the consumer, without destroying his economic and personal security, was re-examined to ensure economic justice, not brigandage by anonymous and irresponsible bureaucrats.

## **TWO IMPORTANT BOOKS**

**SOCIAL DYNAMICS** by Eric Butler. \$1.05 posted. The handbook of the Australian League of Rights establishing fundamental principles of organisation, politics and economics, in a Christian society.

**RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT IN A FREE SOCIETY** by Geoffrey Dobbs. 55c posted. A brilliant analysis of the proper functions of government.

Heritage Bookshop, Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.

## **STRANGE CURE FOR OVERHEATING** **An ECONOMIST'S VIEW**

**Mr. H. W. Herbert, the Queensland Economist, contributes a column to the Brisbane "Sunday Mail". Some of the views expressed in his column of March 22 make interesting reading and are directly critical of present policies imposed by the Federal Government.**

Mr. Bury fears "overheating" of the economy due to labour shortages forcing up costs and prices.

So the cure is to **raise** interest rates.

Later, we are told, it may be necessary to raise postal charges, and petrol prices, and sales taxes. Steel and car prices have already risen.

The ordinary citizen is understandably confused. "How can you lessen the rise in costs and prices," he says, "by deliberately raising them?"

Back in the 1930s people asked the same sort of primitive question: "How can you cure depression and unemployment by cutting government spending and bank credit and wages?"

It turned out that the ordinary people were right, but it took some years of misery to prove it.

**I believe that the common view on inflation will prove right—you can't cure it by raising costs and prices.**

Preventing inflation has been an outstanding failure in the post-war period in most countries. In Australia we have only had two and a half years of price stability (1961-3) in 25, and that at the cost of a sharp recession.

The argument for a rise in interest rates to cool the economy is the tenuous one that higher interest will discourage borrowing (and hence spending) and encourage saving. For the argument to be sound borrowing would have to fall off very sharply to be deflationary enough to outweigh the increase in costs from higher interest charges.

My sounding of business opinion is that this won't happen. Most borrowers will regard the higher interest as an extra cost to be passed on where possible. Bank credit will still have to be rationed, as it has been all along. Hence a tighter restraint on bank advances would have achieved more than the interest rise, without adding to costs.

NEW TIMES—APRIL 1970

## CHINKS OF LIGHT?

Within the last six months *Time* magazine has reported at least two interesting economic concepts. It is interesting to contemplate the reasons for *Time* giving space to such ideas for irrespective of what else may be said about this pseudo-conservative magazine it scrupulously follows the orthodox financial policies which are instrumental in destroying Western civilisation. However as that civilisation writhes in the concluding tremors of its struggle for life it is conceivable that some small voice penetrates the cacophony of continuous babble which goes on in the mass media, with concepts which could lead to reversing the disastrous financial policies which destroy the individual, his rights, his security and his will to resist. Some understanding of the need to restore these important principles came through in the two reports we mention.

### MR. MILTON FRIEDMAN

On December 19, 1969, *Time* ran one of those highly spiced cover stories on Mr. Milton Friedman who is being hailed as the doyen of progressive economists. Mr. Friedman says Keynesian economics has had its day. His followers are variously called Friedmanites, Friedmanists, etc. Mr. Friedman was reputed to be Mr. Nixon's chief economic adviser during his election campaign, but he refused to take an official position in Washington after Nixon won the election saying he preferred to remain "a lone wolf".

The interesting item in the voluminous *Time* report, other from that which mainly revealed Mr. Friedman's orthodoxy on most things economic, was Mr. Friedman's departure from precedent on the payment of social service benefits, payments to the unemployed, and other methods they have of making conditional payments with strings attached. Food stamps issued to the poor by which they can buy food and nothing else but food is a case in point. According to *Time* Friedman would abolish most types of aid to the poor and substitute what he calls **the income guarantee**. Taking the principle further Friedman criticises food stamps and says, "There is nothing you can do with stamps that you cannot do better by giving people money."

### MR. PATRICK MOYNIHAN

On March 16 1970, *Time* ran another eulogy on another Nixon supporter, Mr. Patrick Moynihan who is President Nixon's counsellor on Urban Affairs, described by *Time* "as a man singularly well equipped to speak to both liberals and conservatives—and to infuriate both". He is a former member of John Kennedy's **New Frontier**, a successor to Roosevelt's **New Deal**. Whether Moynihan is revolting against socialism is a matter of conjecture. The *Time* report contained large doses of socialist ideology. But Moynihan was also critical of the American liberal-socialist whom he described as "**a well-educated, middle-class person with an immense feeling of security and status and an almost impervious conditioning. This has led to an extraordinary decline in the**

**sensitivity of liberal political thinking. Liberals have come to view the working-class experience as somehow debasing, and that amounts to a debasement of the only experience most people have. I have the feeling that behind a great deal of liberal posturing is nothing more than a Tory will to power."** The *Time* report made a similar claim for Moynihan as it made for Friedman, that with Nixon he "wants to keep the Federal Government from interfering excessively in individual lives. Thus, he (Moynihan) proposes an "income strategy" to replace the "service strategy" traditionally favoured by the liberals. Instead of government providing the services—and the red tape—funds would go directly to the individual citizen who would decide himself how to spend them. Moynihan would, in fact, restore a market economy for federal services; a recipient of federal aid would be able to choose among competing suppliers of services, whether housing, schools or medical care."

It is well realised there are many questions left unanswered in these reports. But to even establish at some level of society that the individual has a right to an independent income, which he is entitled to spend as he thinks, fit is a step in the right direction. There would be a great saving in staff in the federal bureaucracy in Australia in both the medical and educational fields if the principle was applied here. After the important principle was accepted the argument about the source from which funds are obtained, at what price and in what volume and value the finance was supplied, whether inflation was inevitable or could be challenged, such

Continued on Page 8

## BOOK NOW FOR 1970 ANNUAL DINNER

The Annual "New Times" Dinner is a very special "family" function, and it is essential that it be kept that way. We must therefore restrict guests to "hard-core" supporters and their families. Seats will as usual be allocated in order of bookings, and we trust that with our new policy we can take all supporters wishing to attend the 1970 Dinner. This year's Dinner is on Friday, September 18. Bookings may be made from now on. Donation is \$5 per person. State if receipt is required. With three special overseas guests last year, unfortunately there was not the usual amount of time for fellowship amongst guests. There will be adequate time allocated this year. Country and interstate guests requiring private hospitality should make their requests as early as possible.

The Annual League of Rights Seminar will be held on Saturday, September 19, the theme being "Centralisation". Readers should plan ahead for these annual highlights of the year's activities. Do not leave booking until the last minute.

**Dinner bookings to New Times Ltd., Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.**

# GIVE US BARABBAS

BY D. WATTS

If the present state of affairs in the world be any criterion, the clergy has not done so well for either the Church or society as to be in the position to be disdainful of suggestions from onlookers; but it is certainly startling to see it seeking those from the elements whose values are derived from a denial of spiritual values, and tacitly accepting direction from materialists.

There seem to be many clergymen who imagine that they are being very tolerant and brotherly when they make common cause with communists and admit prelates from the State-controlled Greek Orthodox Church in the U.S.S.R. and its satellites to membership of the World Council of Churches, and even have them on its Central Committee. Actually they are joining forces with the intolerant.

The Church, using the term collectively, has a long history of intolerance. I, for one, would never judge it by that alone, and ignore all the rest of the good that it has done. Nor would I jump to the conclusion that because religious organisations have so often been intolerant, religion must necessarily promote intolerance. That cramping sin comes, not especially from religion, but from the nature of men, and is to be found in all departments of human experience and expression.

At the same time, if those so enthusiastic about organising an ecumenical movement under the auspices of various Councils of Churches have the idea that thereby they are doing something to increase tolerance among men they have not emerged from the past. In Western countries the battle for religious tolerance was fought and won long ago, and not by the clergy. The battle now on our hands is for intellectual and political tolerance.

## ATTRACTION OF COMMUNISM

Those churchmen who feel that the Church has a duty to influence political trends and action would serve their Church and mankind better by righting the battle that needs to be won than by ostentatiously exercising a virtue that carries no penalty. Instead, we see some of the most influential of Church leaders simply moving from a position of religious intolerance to one of ideological intolerance. The W.C.C. exhibits symptoms of the onset of an intolerant dictatorship of a political nature. The ecumenical movement seems to be sliding towards the establishment of a religious organisation on the communist pattern.

It is to be asked what it is in the socialist and communist theories that appeal to so many clergymen; and why it is that they cannot use the good that they find in those teachings without being themselves used by the bad, or positively evil, that is inherent in both the doctrines and the practical application of them. The answer to the first question is to be found in the deceptive nature of theoretical Communism; and the answer to the second is in the nature of organisation together with the temperament and mentality of those who naturally become heads of organisations. Let us examine, first, the tenets of Communism that many clergymen and other churchmen find so attractive.

1. There is a belief that human Equality (Communism) is the essential condition of a Brotherhood of Man (Christian).

2. Communist Humanism is often identified with Christian Humanitarianism.
3. Communist Proletarianism has for many the appearance of being the same as Christian care and protection of the needy and the weak.

## EQUALITY

It is abstract things such as quantities, qualities, powers, capacities and values that are equal or unequal. To say that concrete things such as men or races are either equal or unequal is absurd. These may be equal or unequal in abstracts like abilities or qualities; and usually in those they are unequal; but that is irrelevant to brotherliness. There can be brotherliness between those unequally endowed by nature or fortune. If men feel that they must be equal in order to be brotherly, then the need comes, not from brotherliness, but from envy or arrogance. Very little brotherly feeling is likely to be engendered in those who, for the sake of equality, are unnaturally degraded or, measured by their abilities, underprivileged.

## HUMANISM

Much humanitarian effort today is basically humanist. That may be good as far as it goes. Certainly Man is, as humanists aver, the centre of the human world; but it would be strange if he were the centre of the Universe. What is central to some particular creation would almost surely be centered upon some Universal Reality. That is, Man, the centre of his own world, would be, himself, centered upon God.

I am inclined to think that the clergy, more than the rationalists and materialists, are responsible for making God appear to be, instead of central to humanity's being and effort, so remote from Man as to be almost beyond human interest. However that may be, a human world in which there is no divine centre, is a material or physical one, so that in it humane efforts are likely to be directed entirely towards making men physically comfortable. True, according to some schools of materialist thought, Matter is not all, but the physical machine which is a man in some way converts physical energy into mental and emotional action; and a great many humanists are as anxious for the mental and emotional as for the physical comfort of their fellows; but there is insufficient brake in that upon a slide to the purely materialist outlook of the communists who believe that thought and emotion which is not directed to serve material purposes, and especially the material purposes

## FUEL FOR THE ENGINES OF WAR

In the last few weeks the League has expanded the number of weapons we can offer those fighting the battle for individual freedom. Those weapons have been in the form of special publications and books, which must be made available to supporters and the general public so that we all may be better informed. There has been Mr. Pat Walsh's invaluable booklet, *Behind the World-Wide Student Power Movement*, and a reprint of his *Secret Communists Who Have Changed the Course of History*, Mr. Eric D. Butler's *Social Dynamics*, the basic philosophic textbook of the League, is now available. Sir Reginald Sholl's talk to Australian Students is also available. Another Booklet we believe will be of tremendous value in the battle now raging for a true understanding of the question of Centralism is *Responsible Government and the Individual* by Dr. Geoffrey Dobbs. *Enterprise* the new quarterly publication of *The Institute of Economic Democracy* was published for the first time in March, and the Institute itself has put out three important pamphlets on the question of the farmer and the cost-price squeeze. The League has probably never been engaged in a more important domestic issue, as a breakthrough to realistic financial policies affecting rural industries could bring a heavy defeat for socialist planners, and change economic policies throughout the nation.

In addition, League speakers have addressed audiences in the past six months from the tip of Northern Queensland to the coastline of Western Australia. See report on W.A. tour elsewhere in this issue. The growth of the foundations of the organisation goes on apace. The move of Mr. Don Martin to England will bring an acceleration of the influence of The League. This move in conjunction with the establishment of the League in New Zealand on a firm footing is the result of many years of hard work by the Australian organisation, especially in the support given to National Director, Mr. Eric Butler, now campaigning in Canada and the U.S.A.

### THRESHOLD OF MAJOR EXPANSION

It must be obvious that the roots we have put down over the years are now beginning to support an increasingly powerful structure. It is therefore essential that we push forward unhindered by such mundane things as the lack of sufficient finance. However the hard facts are that before June of 1970 we need over \$10,000 to meet our yearly commitments. Much of our traditional support has been hit by drought and rising costs in the country, and rising costs in the city and provincial towns. Nevertheless we know that many hundreds of our supporters have not yet made that yearly contribution, which added together, would more than meet our requirements. Without such funds we are in danger of being forced to restrict our activities. Therefore we ask all those who have not yet assessed their part in this task to do so without delay. Help make the Deficiency Fund a Sufficiency Fund.

of the State, is so much waste and something which, for the good of mankind, were better eliminated.

Although the Churches have not followed the communist lead quite as far as that, we do see many of their members following the humanist pattern of humanitarianism and placing their emphasis on earthly well-being. Of course that is extremely important. The Churches always have been charitable, caring for the sick and needy in the fashion of the times; but in these days such humane activities are among the major interests of secular elements in advanced societies. The little more that the Churches can do in that direction is by no means to be despised; but that which it is the Church's chief purpose to give is not being successfully given — the immensely comforting and humane assurance that experience in this world is part of an eternal experience, and that spiritual realities are just as real as are material realities. That is, there is a type of humanity of which humanists are incapable, and in which, for some reason, clergymen are failing.

### PROLETARIANISM

Christianity is chivalrous. One of its teachings is protection of the weak. The feeling that this is right comes from a recognition of the individuality of men, of the absoluteness of each man's experience to himself and

so of his oneness with God that makes him precious to God.

When, as too often happens, there are men in the community who are over-worked and under-paid, the chivalrous Christian impulse is to come to their rescue. It might seem to some of those seeking to succour that Marxian Proletarianism is similarly inspired, since it is concerned with the men in the lowest places and with the least money; but this is not so. The communist interest is in the group, not in the individuals. For the communist, individuals even in the proletariat do not count. His interest is in a form of organisation rather than in men. To think that Proletarianism is the same as, or even nearly related to, the Christian concept of the value of even the most abject individual is to think carelessly.

### PSYCHOLOGY OF ORGANISERS

On account of the surface similarity between social idealism and communist materialism, not only professed Christians, but many others besides, have been deceived. Yet it might have been expected that those in high places in Christian organisations would have seen more clearly. In seeking the reason why they have not, and why they are, in many cases, permitting the Churches to become the tools of communist proselytizers, we need

to go into human psychology, at least a little. Only a couple of aspects of the psychology of heads of organisations are here briefly examined.

To begin with, in every man is an absolute reality, which can be called by many names, and every name will be properly applicable. This ultimate human reality can be called the immortal soul, or the identity, or God-in-Man, or the point of Truth or other. Here we will call it Truth. As conscious Truth it is the absolute Knower. Our powers of mental and sensory perception are ways of knowing absolutely. It is the subjective knower, not the objective knowledge that is absolute. For instance, when we see something, the seeing is absolute, but what we see is only relative and may be a faulty representation of what is, and must be a limited one. Our vision of an object is always distorted, so that we see it in perspective, and not its actual shape and size. Nevertheless, the absolute knowing, the seeing, assures us that what we see is real even though the picture we have of it be imperfect.

It is this absolute knowing that makes us feel that our opinions and ideas are right, whatever they may be. It gives the less analytical a sense of infallibility. If we honestly look for truth, time and again we discover that what we thought was right is only partly right or wholly wrong; but though we change our opinions, we still feel sure that our new ones are right. We go a long way towards tolerance when we can bring ourselves, instead of saying positively, "I am right", to say, "Within the limits of my knowledge and to the best of my judgment, my ideas or opinions are right."

If a man move, as Church leaders usually do, almost entirely in a circle of men who think as he thinks, his sense of his infallibility, not only in absolute knowing, but in what he thinks about what he knows, receives very few humbling shocks; and such a man, on rising to a position of authority, has his feeling of his own infallible rightness strengthened.

Added to that is a particular peculiarity. Men of action, including organisers, are usually men of simple belief, and not profound thinkers. They may, especially in a scholastic or religious organisation, be very learned men and acute thinkers, but still not explorers, seeking the Truth, which is beyond the truth that they already have. They perhaps elaborate what they know within the limits of the beliefs that they have accepted; but as a rule they conform without much preliminary soul-searching, and seldom come to feel the need of any. Sometimes there arises a man, who is both a good organiser and a profound thinker, but such men are not common; and they certainly seem to be absent from the World Council of Churches.

This facility in accepting already formulated religious beliefs is almost sure to be also a facility in accepting current political beliefs. Men who rise to the highest positions in Church organisations are nearly always the best organisers. Their mentality not only makes conformity to the prevailing socialist and communist doc-

trines natural, but it also inclines them to feel that Communism, a theory of the efficacy of organisation, is attractive. These are trying to save the Churches by means of organisation instead of by means of fresh inspiration—hence the ecumenical movement in which it seems that denominational differences are to be flattened out, just as, theoretically, are class and sectional differences in a communist society.

#### **THE NATURE OF ORGANISATION**

The above described confusing of unity with uniformity is a blindness of dictators. It has something to do with the nature of organisation as well as with the psychology of organisers. One value of organisation is that it produces that order in which there can be creativeness. The elementary organisation consists of an organiser and a mass. This simple, primitive form is basically that of a communist society. When order is well enough established to enable men to be creative, grades and sections appear in the mass.

In the primitive form the organisers power is practically absolute: but in the well-developed form the sections impose small or great curbs upon the government. A man whose beliefs are simple and whose sense of infallibility has been bolstered up by his having attained a position of authority, will often have a predilection for the simple organisational form that corresponds to simple beliefs, and for the dictatorial powers which it seems should go with infallibility. He will naturally put his trust in organisation and his distrust in a complex mental and spiritual creativeness which threatens order unless there be great skill in government. Besides, his interest is in Form, so that he likes to organise thought into neat beliefs. In all that may be some explanation of the similarity between the W.C.C.'s political pronouncements and the teachings of Communism.

#### **FRESH INSPIRATION NEEDED**

There is some reason for fearing that the Ecumenical Movement, while it may temporarily strengthen the Church organisations, may eventually kill Christianity. Christianity has survived so far by means of periodic infusions of fresh inspiration. From time to time it has been endangered by the organisation.

A common assumption of pedestrian Christians is that the only men that God ever inspired were those whose teachings are recorded in the Old Testament. Often, by them, even the teachings of Christ are subordinated to the Jews' religious beliefs. Christ gave to the teachings of the Jewish prophets a spiritual content which, in His time, had been lost in formalism. He based His teachings upon those of the old Scriptures because new knowledge must always be built upon what is already known. Christ was speaking to a people whose sole education was in the teachings of the Old Testament. Any religious teaching that did not begin from the truth to be found in them would have been incomprehensible in the first place, and unacceptable in the second. Besides that, there is a great deal of spiritual truth in what the old prophets taught; and Christ was no communist to believe that

all the good of the past must be swept away to make place for the new good.

What may be called the secular morality of the New Testament is superior to the secular morality of the Old Testament, even as the latter is superior to primitive morality. The religious morality of the New Testament—the recognition of the oneness of goodness with godliness, and of the superiority of spiritual values to material values, is not beyond the grasp of the average, intelligent person. Christ's mystical and metaphysical teaching of the oneness between the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Man, the incarnation of the Spirit of God, and the spiritual conquest of the world must have been quite over the heads of most of His hearers, as apparently it is over the heads of most people today; but it is the eternal truth in those conceptions that gives validity to the moral teachings.

Thus, in the teachings of Christ there is something for all people at all stages of mental development and spiritual understanding. Even as He introduced new inspiration into old teachings, so from time to time, in a lesser way have prophets revived Christianity. To name only three: St. Augustine gave an intellectual interpretation to meet the intellectual needs of his time; St. Thomas Aquinas adapted the teachings to meet the requirements of new knowledge; Martin Luther gave the rational exposition that many people had come to need and incidentally, by compelling a corrupted Church organisation to pull itself together to meet the challenge of the Reformation, he was instrumental in saving the R.C. Church as well as Christianity.

As tunes change and different kinds of knowledge are acquired, religious teaching must be adapted to serve the needs of men in their new circumstances and with their increased knowledge. That does not mean that religious teachers must conform to the common beliefs and standards of their time, but that they should, through making use of new knowledge, discover in what spiritual qualities the age is weakest. It is not that, in a materialistic age they should present a materialistic version of Christianity, but that they should give a spiritual explanation of the material reality. One can sympathise with Naaman, a man of the world, for bowing down in the House of Rimmon; but one would be more than a little surprised to see Elisha doing the same. Yet that is what a good many of the clergy are doing; and not the least among them are members of the W.C.C.

#### INTOLERANT CONFORMITY

A member of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. is reported as having said, recently, that Communism is here to stay and the Church may as well learn to co-exist, and that Communism is just one phase of a technologically revolutionised world that—like it or not—must be accepted. That is conformity, not adaptability.

If what is quoted were just one man's opinion, it would not be particularly important; but his attitude is a reflection of that of many churchmen, and it is certainly the attitude of the W.C.C. The Ecumenical Movement is

towards conformity with the communist conception of organisation. That conception flouts organisational reality. The idea that what suits one should suit all is an amazingly ignorant one; yet it is an idea that many Church leaders seem to share with the communists. As an organisation develops, advancement is not uniform. Some people remain at the primitive stage, others are at successive stages till is reached that of the most advanced. There is need to give people at each stage just what they can understand—a simple set of rules to the most backward, and something that requires deep insight into meanings and values to the most advanced.

Also, with the advancement of civilisation the mental, emotional and spiritual needs of men become diverse. The division of the Church into different denominations has, from time to time, met special religious needs. The Ecumenical Movement, with its tendency to impose uniformity, is likely to end in a narrowness that will alienate all but those whose mental and spiritual needs are very simple—that is, the most intolerant.

Some few years ago, Dr. Carl McIntyre sought, on behalf of the Faith Theological Seminary, U.S.A., to purchase a radio station. A shower of protesting letters fell upon the chairman of the Federal Communications Commission. I do not know enough to form any opinion about the rights and wrongs of the case; but an analysis of letters sent from various religious organisations — Episcopalian, Baptist, Presbyterian, Methodist, Lutheran and the Council of Churches—is unconsciously revealing.

Disregarding those that simply stated didactically that it was not in the public interests to grant Dr. McIntyre's organisation permission to buy, I deal with the nineteen that gave reasons for their objection. The following are the reasons with the number that put them forward: that Dr. McIntyre criticised the U.N., 2; U.N.I.C.E.F., 3; American foreign policy, 2; Councils of Churches, 5; Religious groups, 7. Bad enough; but out of the 19, there were 17 that stated that Dr. McIntyre's application for a licence to purchase should not be granted for the reason that he was **divisive**.

If ecumenism be a new orthodoxy, divisiveness would naturally be a heresy; but, in view of the history of their own origins, it is decidedly odd to find Protestant Churches, and especially Nonconformist Churches, looking on the creation of divisions as a kind of wickedness to be stamped out.

In some six or seven of the letters the writers affirmed that they believed firmly in freedom of speech, but . . . What that amounts to is that they believe in freedom of speech for those who are not opposed to their policies and opinions, but not for those who criticise them. That much tolerance the intolerant always had. That is the Communist brand of tolerance. It seems to be indicated that the Church organisations have gained nothing in tolerance by associating with the intolerant.

Communism is the present-day Barabbas. Now Barabbas was a robber. He was guilty of sedition and murder. Communism is a robber. It robs men of their private

freedom and rights of private possession, and so of their dignity as individuals. It robs mankind of its highest intellectual and spiritual achievement. Next to deceptive propaganda, Communism's most powerful weapon is sedition. Communism drips with murder—with the murder of masses of men in purges and terrorist action, and of individuals by assassination. It murders family love and moral instincts and cultural attainment.

The Churches' choice is between civilisation and Communism, between Christ and Barabbas. Surely the chief priests and the elders, members of the World Council of Churches, should pause and think before they move the people to cry, "Release unto us Barabbas".

## A LETTER TO THE EDITOR FROM GEOFFREY DOBBS

Dear Friends in Australia,

There are so many of you to whom I should like to write to thank you for making us so welcome in Australia during our recent stay, and there is so little time to do it, that I hope that the Editor will think this letter from Britain of sufficient interest to those whom we didn't have the pleasure of meeting at the Annual Dinner, or elsewhere, to put it in *The New Times*. (By us, I should explain that I mean my wife, Elizabeth, and her mother, Mrs. Hewlett Edwards, as well as myself.)

Though we have now been home for two months, we still feel "homesick" for South Australia, where we spent most of our four months visit. Every country has its special character, but about Australia there is something totally unique: the flowers, the trees, the birds (those chortling magpies!), the weird and appealing animals, the original people with their poetic imagination and art, and that unique variant of the British culture which is visibly emerging there.

There is a well-known poem about the magic of Mexican names: "Chimborazo, Cotopaxi, They have stolen my soul away!" but for me it is the sheer magic of Onkaparinga, Noarlunga and Willabalangaloo which will ring in my mind until the day I die. Was it only in December that I had that three-day trip into the real outback—a bit of saltbush country north of Yunta—and got a sense of the Great Australian Loneliness, which must be at the back of all your minds, even if you live in Sydney or Melbourne? Only once before have I had that feeling of space around me, and that was in the high Arctic, about as far from Australia as it is possible to be. But I also got a very definite impression that Australia, like Britain, is an island—the Greatest Island—and island with Space within it, but still an island, set in a sea, from what I could see of it, is purple and emerald and turquoise rather than silver. So don't imagine you are Continentals, even if Australia is as big as Europe or the U.S.A. You are still of the island breed!

You can see that Australia has left its mark on me, and after this it was a bit of a shock to get back to mid-winter in Britain, with snow on the ground at London

Airport, and a drive through sleet and slush. Still, that was only to be expected! What was harder to bear was the return to the daily, indeed hourly, assault in print, screen and broadcast upon everything we believe in and hold dear. This has now been going on for about ten years at a most fantastic intensity, and has now become openly vicious and sadistic. It is like a caricature of evil—one of those crude strip-cartoons in which the victim is strapped in a chair, being given "the treatment" by the Gestapo or the OGPU with their heavy boots and rubber truncheons. Take that! and that! and that! Bash, Kick, Wham, Whack, Thud, Thud, Wallop! in the face, the face, the belly, the genitals, the genitals, the genitals again—on and on and on without intermission: Down with small businesses, away with the family farm, centralise local government, herd the children into mass-conditioning centres, encourage pornography, murder, promiscuity, drug-taking, kill the unborn, euthanase the old and infirm, dose the water supply, raise food prices, tax any form of service to people, tax the inflation of savings, sell the nation's sovereignty. How long will the Monarchy last? Sneer! sneer! jeer! jeer! on and on with never a let up!

All right! So you think: "Poor old Britain! She's had it this time!" Don't you believe it! That's what they thought in 1940. But this is worse. Never have a people had such a mental battering. Consider the strength, which has stood up to it. And come up again, and hit back. Last October the Director of the Health Education Council admitted on TV that the Government's fluoridation Campaign had failed, and the tone of it has now gone up into shrill, hysterical abuse. The test polls on Britain's entry into the Common Market have been showing a steady rise against it—the last was 72% against. There is a definite "backlash" (as the sneerers call it) against pornography and abortionism.

"Hard pounding, gentlement; let's see who will pound longest!" as the Duke said at Waterloo. Or as Bill Shakespeare had it: "Hold fast is the only dog!"

God bless you all, Geoffrey Dobbs.

### INCREASE IN PRICE OF "NEW TIMES"

With the publication of a special quarterly supplement "Enterprise" in association with The Institute of Economic Democracy, the cost of producing "The New Times" was increased as from our last issue in March. We trust readers will cooperate and not overlook the increase of \$1.00 making the subscription \$5.00 yearly. As pointed out last month the increase of \$1.00 barely covers the cost of printing "Enterprise".

Continued from Page 3  
matters would remain to be settled, but one important principle would be established, that finance can be made available without strings attached, and that the moral responsibility for deciding how the money is spent belongs with the individual.