

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. 39, No. 7

JULY 1973

THE MODERN-DAY NEROS AND THE FINANCIAL HOLOCAUST

History, more than once, has illustrated the perverse inclination of human beings to bury their heads in the sand when danger looms, or, like the first Queen Elizabeth, who Kipling tells us found such difficulty in facing the "cruel looking glass", to pretend that nemesis does not inevitably await the deviate. One recalls the frivolous and endless argument about trivia in the Roman Senate, while the great Hannibal made his way remorselessly across the Alps, and the example given by Wurmbrand in his "Tortured for Christ" of the medieval Church leaders in Europe who refused to believe that the Barbarians constituted any threat, and who indulged in pedantic discussion on such topics as "the colours of the eyes of the Angels", while the enemy closed in upon them. Nearer to our own times we can remember the pacifist advocacy of disarmament in Britain and the United States during the thirties, while Hitler, with his "guns before butter" economic credo, was feverishly re-arming in Germany—all of which is very similar to the broad and, one suspects, stage-managed discussion of the moment.

Setting aside the question of military preparedness and deployment—a drastic enough subject on its own—the air of unreality, which surrounds economic discussion at the moment, is quite astounding. As the inflationary fires get hotter, so do the voices claiming that all is well increase in number. Such blind self-delusion would have no difficulty in mistaking Armageddon for the Millennium, nor Pandora's Box for Black Magic chocolates.

That is not to say that everyone is so bemused, and while the modern Neros fiddle with increasing abandon, a few more realistic voices can be expected to speak up. Such conflict of opinion thus engendered will do little to dispel the confusion until events themselves point the way to reality. Looking at the financial situation, it won't take long. Thus, as we pass the halfway mark in 1973, a prominent body of economic pundits is busily assuring everybody that the problem of inflation is purely marginal and incidental; at the same time, one or two voices are now speaking out on the imminent disaster. *The Australian Financial Review*, 6/7/73 carried an article by C. Gordon Tether of the *Financial Times*, which does not make pleasant reading, although as a statement of the problem, it fits the facts: "The evidence that the fires of Britain's inflation are being generously stoked by the rising costs of commodity imports provides the Government with at least a partial alibi for the fact that its 1970 election undertaking to slow the advance in the cost of living "at a stroke" now looks in a sorrier state than ever. And it naturally cannot be blamed for availing itself of it. What does warrant serious criticism is that, like the Governments of other major countries, it is behaving as though the terrifying build-up of inflation in the world at large is a kind of natural disaster, which nobody can do anything about. For unless the principal countries face up to their collective responsibility to tackle this phenomenon, along with such closely related

questions as the Euro-currency excesses which feed upon it, we may soon be travelling at an even more alarming pace towards a global inflation disaster of the ill-famed Weimar Republic type. One simple fact graphically illustrates the gravity of the situation that has been created by the steep rise in the prices of food and raw material imports. It is that it is more than cancelling out, almost everywhere, the impact of the intensified campaigns to contain domestic inflationary pressures widely launched in the closing months of 1972. The experience of the EEC countries illustrates this vividly. Late last year they agreed to aim to bring the pace of inflation down to six per cent in 1973. In the event, nearly all of them are now finding the rate threatening to break into double figures, if it has not already done so. Moreover, with the delayed-action effect of the past year's spectacular upsurge in wage rates (it averages almost 15 percent) reinforcing the impact on prices of steeply rising import costs, there is little hope of the advance being halted—let alone reversed—in the months ahead. The situation of other countries is no better.

WEIMAR REPUBLIC TRAGEDY

"The latest IMF figures show that the industrial heavyweights as a whole now have an average inflation rate of eight percent plus, compared with six percent in the middle of last year. Few other advanced countries can point to lower figures, while in the less developed group they are very much the exception, 10 to 20 percent being typical. Remembering that the faster its pace the more difficult it becomes to stop inflation feeding upon itself and that—as Mr. Heath's present plight shows—the problem of finding salvation becomes infinitely more complicated when the imported variety enters the picture in a big way, the danger in which the world now stands becomes all too painfully apparent. Put bluntly, we have now created the basis for a global repetition of the

Weimar Republic's total inflation tragedy. Experience has shown that once an inflation rate moves well into double figures, a country's chances of averting the near or total collapse of its currency are apt to be decidedly slim—this even when it is in full command of its own fortunes. Clearly, when each and every country is aggravating its neighbour's problems in serious fashion, as now, they must become even more tenuous. Do the leading advanced countries intend to stand idly by while the world moves further and further down the slippery slope that could precipitate it into this final cataclysm? To judge by the air of helplessness British Ministers are affecting towards the inflation threat from without, we obviously cannot count on our own Government recognising the peril in time. Indeed, the fact that the Prime Minister (Mr. Heath) was talking in the House of Commons on Tuesday as though everything in the economic sense is "coming up roses" suggests that the penny has not yet even begun to drop in Whitehall. With the Nixon Administration paralysed by Watergate, and seemingly not all that bothered anyway, the hope must be that other countries will come forward to call for urgent and extensive collaboration to beat off the threat. Inevitably, there are limits to what can be done at this late hour. But that is not to say that there is nothing. Immediate action to prevent the Euro-currency market continuing to add to the world's money-goods gap by creating vast quantities of additional credit out of excess dollars could do wonders, for a start. And given recognition in key centres like London that there are some things that are more important than making money out of international financial traffic, it could be organised tomorrow."

DEBT AND INTEREST COMPOUND

While Mr. Tether's suggestion that an "International" squeeze will start the cure, is a reversion to the orthodox errors of the economic "establishment", nevertheless it is true that the volume of money on a world basis has expanded alarmingly. His reference to the Weimar Republic is significant, and those who have studied the world financial situation during the first half of this century would recall that the Germans, rather than meet wartime expenditure from taxation in 1914, paid for their war almost entirely from loans; whereas Great Britain raised 20 percent of her war expenses through taxation, the Germans raised only six percent of theirs. It was their purpose, as the Imperial Secretary of State pointed out in the Reichstag on August 28, 1915, when victory had been gained, to transfer to their defeated enemies the task of repaying these loans. Thus, in 1910, the German National Debt was 5,013,500,000 marks. In 1920 it was 183,183,195,300 marks—about 4½ times as great as the total income of the German people. Having lost the war, Germany had to meet these debts herself, together with reparations, under the Treaty of Versailles, of some 225 thousand million marks. There was not the faintest chance that the Germans could meet this debt bill. In fact, they had to increase borrowings to meet interest

commitments, plus day-to-day expenditure. The National Debt, which in 1920 stood at 183,183,195,300 marks, had risen by 1923 to 661,075,607,800 marks—a situation that caused such an internal loss of confidence in Germany that inflation raged completely out of control, until in November 1923, a gold mark was introduced to replace the old paper marks, which had become virtually worthless.

In Australia's case there has been a continuing acceleration in the volume of money, reaching not far short of a 20% increase between March 1972 and March, 1973, when the volume of money rose from \$17,438,000,000 to \$21,347,000,000. Under existing rules, which mean an inevitable corresponding increase in the volume of debt and interest charges, this has led to a wild spiralling of inflation in Australia, with the subsequent demands for wage increases, and industrial disruption if these are not met.

The "Labor" Government, under Prime Minister Whitlam, campaigned prior to the last Federal election on the promise that taxes would not be increased. Already this promise has been partially broken with the reduction in financial allocations to the States, which will have to increase taxation themselves. But it is extremely doubtful now that Mr. Whitlam will keep his promise in the forthcoming Budget. Already the Reserve Bank has taken the first steps in the imminent "squeeze", with an increase in the bond rate, and a further increase in the ratio of Statutory Reserve Deposits, which the Trading Banks are required to lodge with the Reserve Bank. Economist Kenneth Davidson, writing in *The Australian*, July 7, under the heading "Brutal Measures used to Dampen Red-hot Economy", described the atmosphere at the Labor Party convention being held in Surfers Paradise: "Despite the festive atmosphere in Surfers Paradise this week, the Whitlam Government has been badly shaken by some preliminary figuring on the possible shape of its first Budget this August. From its various departments the Government has obtained preliminary estimates of expenditures based on normal growth plus the additional expenditures needed to meet firm commitments made in the August Budget. As I understand it, these estimates indicate the Government could be facing a deficit of close to \$1800 million. Clearly this is such a huge gap that it cannot be closed simply by printing more money on the Reserve Bank presses unless the Government is prepared to live with an inflationary rate of Indonesian proportions . . ."

STRAITJACKET THINKING

In that last sentence is summed up the incredible dilemma of the classic orthodox thinker, and one sees again the blinkers which a drab and strait-jacket Keynesian training has placed on the decidedly sorry-looking horse between the shafts of the modern inflationary stagecoach—the contemporary economist. Sooner or later, surely, someone between the shafts is going to see that if we can create apparently limitless sums of new credit through

the debt system which is tacked on to every cost in the community as a flow-on presenting the consumer with ever-spiralling prices that he cannot possibly meet, then the creation of a modest, debt-free volume of credit which is injected into the economy in such a way as to reduce taxes, rates and rents, subsidise prices below cost of production if necessary, and provide the consumer, for once, with a genuinely non-inflationary increase in purchasing power might just be the answer? On the answer to that question hangs the fate of civilisation.

The Financial Editor of *The Sunday Telegraph*, while echoing the warnings of Mr. Davidson, adds the rider: "It (the squeeze) will have to be supported by a determined reduction in the level of proposed government spending when the Government brings down its first Budget in August . . ." The truth is that in only six months we have seen a burgeoning of governmental spending, and a consequential proliferation of committees, commissions, boards and departments which would be regarded with open-mouthed admiration in the Soviet Union. One small example among many is the new Albury-Wodonga growth centre complex. Government bodies already involved in this nightmarish example of centralised idealism include: the new Ministerial Council; the Federal Department of Urban and Regional Development; the New South Wales Department of Decentralisation and Development; the Victorian Department of Development and Decentralisation; the Cities Commission; the New South Wales State Planning Authority; the Victorian Town and Country Planning Board; the New South Wales Development Corporation; the Albury-Wodonga Development Corporation; the Victorian Development Corporation; the Albury City Council, Wodonga Shire Council and Shires of Hume, Chiltern, Beechworth, Yackandandah and Towong; the Albury Promotion Council; the Murray Valley Development League, and the Wodonga Development Committee. In a recent Ministerial Council meeting, a former mayor of Albury Alderman Cleaver Bunton, interrupted a press conference given by the Ministers to say that uncertainty over Government plans was causing chaos. An article in *The Sunday Telegraph*, 8/7/73, dealing with the multitude of abuses already apparent as a result of speculation in the new complex, concluded by saying: ". . . What was expected to be a smooth tripartite enterprise faces jeopardy because of power politics. Should political wrangling sabotage Albury-Wodonga, Australians are not likely ever again to take politicians seriously when they preach about decentralisation." To which the only possible reply is that no politician, including the trio which make up the Ministerial Council have yet preached true decentralisation, which is the decentralisation of power. The Albury-Wodonga debacle is a manifestation of centralism, and the sooner this is realised the better.

QUICKENING REGRESSION

Add together the factors which make up society in Western countries at the moment—the sum makes a

retrogressive total, and the speed of regression is compounding. The politico-gravitational field is drawing events towards what Douglas called the critical moment. The only modern historian and thinker to predict correctly the current situation (if we exclude those who planned it) Douglas also understood the effect that this will have on men—a strange and paralysing inertia which the first view of "bigness" always has upon the individual—(it's too big to stop—what can the individual do? —don't beat your head against the wall). However, instead of submitting to the apparent logic of this stance, Douglas also foresaw that in the last analysis "bigness" inflicted on organised evil its greatest vulnerability. He saw at once the impossibility of halting a heavy machine once momentum has been gathered, and at the same time the ease with which it can be deflected, the more so if its own weight is used in the deflection.

He who stands braced before an onrushing train is inevitably crushed; whereas a relatively small stone on the rail can topple the train into destruction. An example only this week comes to mind. As the organised campaign against France continues, it was obviously felt that an innocuous protest to the communist Chinese would serve to keep the masses bemused. Who, then, would have thought that one trade union might overstep the bounds of obedience, and demand trade sanctions against the Chinese? Such a small action has much larger consequences than one might imagine. It is obvious that the Union will not get its way—but the fact alone will be silently noted, and produce a reaction, who knows, a year hence? All this made up Douglas's concept of long-term strategy—"a small body of men who know what to do, and how to do it"—notice the inclusion of the word "small"? A shepherd boy, the right-shaped stone, a sling, and a Goliath will fall.

The thing that Social Crediters must fear and oppose is that inertia—there are signs of it, and it is what the enemy is banking on. As the critical moment approaches, we must shake ourselves out of the ranks of conventional sloth, and into the never-ending variety of applied social engineering.

"THE NEW EDUCATION"—THEME OF ANNUAL NATIONAL SEMINAR

Throughout Australia reports come in of parental concern about the perversion, and in cases the breakdown of education. This year's seminar could be the most significant that the League has ever held, as a team of three brilliant speakers is assembled to provide a new insight and lead on this crucial problem. This will be a seminar not only for parents, but with especial significance for young people, too. Date: Saturday, September 22. Place: I. Younger Ross Hall, Carlton, Melbourne. Make a note of this date now.

TO THE POINT

The news that two Canadian girl tourists were shot dead by Zambian troops has been played down in the media, but the father of one of the girls, Mr. Oscar Drijber, in a press interview, said that statements made by President Kaunda on the shooting "prove he is the biggest liar and hypocrite I have ever seen in my life. I am convinced this was plain-blooded murder." He added: "I think it is a shame the Canadian Government is still considering giving aid to Zambia." It is a fairly safe bet that the political pundits in the media will do little to emphasise the tragedy, as they did to the well-publicised Peer Niesewand case."

* * *

The Australian Financial Review (6/7/73) states: "When making the TV Commercial for the new Paul Hamlyn series "Australia's Wildlife Heritage", Mrs. Whitlam may have taken on the task believing she was doing it only because it was a genuine Australian product. But her endorsement of the biggest ever-publishing venture in Australia and the launch participation of the Prime Minister have very much angered the printing industry — both employers and unionists alike. Why? Because the \$1.5 million project is being printed outside the country."

* * *

Mr. Whitlam's National Anthem Quest is earning some surprising critics. The editorial in *The Australian* (4/7/73) said. "Mr. Whitlam's decision to hold a national anthem competition, and to pay \$5000 to the winner, was a rash and silly experiment. Rash because the lessons of history is that the best anthems are born, not made. And silly because it assumes that an anthem can be promoted like a pop song into a position of public acceptance. If anyone had any lingering doubts on this score, they should be resolved by the six songs, which have been selected in the first stage of the competition. One and all, they are mediocre. The best of them lack real inspiration; the worst are overblown with their high sentiments and awful self-importance . . . in cold print the six suggested anthems make God Save the Queen sound genuinely inspired. And that, surely, cannot be what Mr. Whitlam intended."

The Sun, Melbourne (4/7/73) reported the remarks of a leading poet, Professor A. D. Hope: "As verse, they are ridiculous, comic stuff," he said. "The sixth one, by poet Douglas Stewart, is touching verse, but it has nothing to do with a national anthem. I have spoken with the judges, and I know that these are the best of a lot of rubbish."

* * *

The words of his socialist colleague, Mr. Harold Wilson, must have been ringing in the ears of A.C.T.U. President, Bob Hawke, when he returned from Geneva with the news that the world trade unions would impose economic sanctions against South Africa: "The decision was a unanimous one, and called for trade union sanctions against South Africa," Mr. Hawke said, *The Age* (2/7/73). "I

believe this is the most important decision ever made against apartheid, and once the boycotts are in operation it must bring the South African Government to its knees — where it belongs." In three weeks, Mr. Hawke?

* * *

The recent massive increases in Federal Parliamentary salaries are only part of the benefits involved. *The Australian* (28/6/73) reports: "Federal MPs' wives soon will be able to take overseas trips at taxpayers' expense under new government arrangements. The Minister for Services and Property, Mr. Daly, outlined the plan in a letter to all Federal parliamentarians. At present the wives are entitled to four free trips to Canberra a year. Under the new arrangements they will also be able to take one free interstate trip. If they do not take advantage of these offers, valued at \$350 a year, the trip entitlement will be cumulative. This will mean that after several years, MPs' wives would be able to go with their husbands on a free round the world trip. Mr. Daly has also promised backbenchers that they will be able to make more use of Commonwealth cars. Their phone and stamp requirements are also expected to be increased soon. Mr. Daly told MPs that further benefits are still being considered."

* * *

The Advertiser, Adelaide (22/6/73): "The new Federal Government's style of getting things done is to create new commissions and committees. So far, the total of new commissions, committees and enquiries is 47 . . . there are enough straws in the wind to suggest that committees beget commissions and commissions beget more boards. For example, the Australian Council for the Arts will have seven separate boards when it is officially created by legislation . . . The Department of Labour has shed its "National Service" wing with the abolition of national service. But public service sources in Canberra say that the saving in staff from this could be largely absorbed by an increase in the numbers of inspectors to enforce awards in industry more vigorously . . . No one in Canberra is asking whether we may not have too many public servants already. Britain (with more people if less land to cover) had an estimated 789,000 public employees in 1971-72, against our 987,000 Federal and State public servants and employees last year. Canada, with a population almost double ours, had 379,000 Federal and 349,000 Provincial (State) public servants in 1970."

BOOK NOW FOR 1973 "NEW TIMES" ANNUAL DINNER

Those who don't make an early booking are liable to be disappointed, as there is a limit to places. This is THE national function of the year. Date: Friday, September 21. Place: The Victoria, Little Collins Street, Melbourne. Donation: \$6, must accompany booking. Private hospitality, if required, for interstate visitors—prior notice essential.

THE DAY OF ATYPICAL WOMEN

By D. WATTS

Writing for women (8/6/72) a "Sydney Morning Herald" journalist, Martha DuBose, made a good point. She said that she would know how to bring up a daughter. She would assume that the girl was born not to fill a specific role, and would hope that she would become a woman of many parts with "the self-assurance to hand-tailor a role that suits her best". Further, the writer said that daughters should be taught not to expect to be provided for and protected by men. How then, she shrewdly asked, are sons, no longer needed as providers and protectors, to be brought up? She does not give the answer to her question, but it is an easy one. In the Brave New World of Liberated Women, men will be mere sex objects, to be married with a view to divorce.

Martha DuBose is still young enough to have the impression that history began when she was born. Nearly all of us, when we are young, are inclined to think that what is new and exciting to us is new to the world—in the realm of ideas, at least. That about women being more than wives and mothers, and about encouraging the girl child to develop inclinations that were allowed to lie dormant in the present young woman and her right to have a paid career outside the home and to be independent of men, is old stuff. The idea of women's liberation, in various forms, has been growing throughout recent centuries. It was a vigorous plant in an inclement climate during the nineteenth century and burst into gaudy flower in the late twenties and the thirties of this century.

The feminist doctrines have not changed in essentials for 50 years, but they have become increasingly dogmatic and exaggerated through constant repetition. Back in the thirties the youngest men and women were proclaiming that Youth was at the Helm, that they repudiated the stuffy conventions, shibboleths and clichés of their parents, that they, the young, the enlightened and the free, wiser than their forbears, would create a better world, one of the merits of which would be that in it, woman would be emancipated. The young ones of the thirties proclaimed that they would see to it that there would be no more wars, for these were brought about by old men who were jealous of young males, and used warfare as a means of killing them off. As for women, they were to rule the world, not by rocking cradles, but by casting votes. The youth of that period thought that there was a generation gap with the gaga fuddy-duddies on one side and the golden generation of young social saviours on the other.

The more "advanced" parents of the time taught their children to believe all this. It was a bad shock when they found that they, themselves, had moved into the fuddy-duddy category and that their children, faithful to the teaching they had received, were accusing their parents of not understanding how young people thought and felt and were asserting that they would throw off the shackles of the customs and manners of their elders and create a world better than the bad one into which they had been born and with which they had to contend though they had no part in its making.

ATTACK ON TRADITIONS

The successive generations, in these decades, have been

taught that they should rebel against old codes and conventions, so that each generation has rebelled against what their parents retained when they had rebelled, until there are but a few remnants of traditional moralities left to challenge. The no-code, permissive youngsters find themselves in a moral wilderness. They have almost no tradition of moral constructiveness; only one of moral destructiveness. Since there is so little left of old moral customs to flout, and rebellion is expected of them, they turn and rend the society that protects and nourishes them. In a slightly more subtle way, the Liberated Women make a special attack upon women's traditional world.

What is said above refers, not to the thousands of parents and children who have managed to preserve a large measure of commonsense in spite of all the assaults upon it, but to the brainy-bats who, intellectually, can hear but cannot see. The more perspicacious women thinkers have always claimed common rights as human beings and, besides, special rights as women. What is so degrading about that? Men claim special privileges on the grounds of their sex-determined contributions to society. That stand is philosophically and biologically sound. The more highly evolved a species is, the larger the number and more definite are the differences between the members. Amoebae are much less differentiated, one from another, than are human beings. Sex differentiation is an achievement of evolution and therefore lifts the individuals on to a higher plane than that of basic human sameness—equality. Masculinity and femininity are expressions of the potential of Being and the means of increasing the richness of individual and social experience.

When we say that something is so of any group of human beings, we are speaking of what is usual or normal. In every instance there are exceptions. The big mistake made by female emancipationists has been to represent the female exception as being the general woman, and to work to make the exception the accepted pattern of women in general. One reason for this is that the atypical person feels the need of a social environment of her own kind to justify her own personal preferences. She therefore strives to make all women in the likeness of herself. Either she assumes that almost all women feel as she does or that if they don't, they should. One mark of a civilised society is a cherishing of the individual, so that in it there is a place of atypical men and women, but this is not made by supplanting the typical individuals.

SEXES JOINED FORCES

The female exceptions have had an amazing success in imposing their own pattern on the female half of advanced societies. How, one asks, has an atypical minority managed to overwhelm the typical majority? The simple answer is that the women joined forces with the male section, which has always hitherto been supreme over the female section. They accepted men's order of the importance of action and values and so metaphorically and sometimes actually adopting the males' uniform, were able to join forces with men in breaking down the weak defences put up by women to protect their world and to resist being forced into the predominantly male world as serving wenches in the public area. The atypical, anti-female women have not put men's cultural and social suzerainty in jeopardy, but they have, to no small extent, deprived women, as a sex, of the security that comes of being important.

Consideration of a neglected but universal and vital truth would have given typical women an argument against the masculinisation of women and even have led to the modification of certain political and social theories. That truth is that the whole concrete universe is one of opposites, which are complements. The dogma of equality that has become such a mind-dazzling idea that it has blotted out a good deal of mental honesty has done much harm to women's legitimate cause. Equality between men and women cannot be attained in either the male or the female complement. Nor is it to be found half way between the opposites, for there each opposite cancels out the other, leaving nothing concrete. Equality is achieved when the opposites have equal weight. That might not be practically possible in particular situations; but so long as the opposites are in balanced movement, the weight being sometimes on one side and sometimes on the other as circumstances demand, both men and women will have something better than equality—that is justice.

Being part of a universe of opposites, which are complements, the human society exists in a large number of complementary opposites, the basic one of which is the organisation-individual pair. The organisation should serve the individuals, but it cannot do that unless it is served by them. Which service is the more important depends largely upon which stage of civilisation has been reached, but more particularly upon which is most needed in given circumstances. Had the brainy-bats been able to grasp such obvious facts, we would not have been plagued by communistic theory and action—by the male superstition that the community complement should always dominate society.

The organised society is the public environment of the private individuals. Both men and women need a complementation of private and public experience. Normally, public living is predominantly the male occupation and private living the female interest; but neither complement can, in male or female experience, entirely eliminate the

need for, or the actuality of, its opposite. There cannot be any form or experience that is composed of only one of a pair of complements. We cannot have a human organisation without individuals nor a collection of interdependent individuals completely unorganised. Women, at their most private, still depend upon the organisation to protect and provide for them. Men have always needed, with their public life, a private one, though they may not always have recognised this and very seldom have realised to what extent they depend upon women to provide it for them.

In the early stages of social evolution the organisation's prime need is protection from external enemies and for internal stability. These are public necessities. A dominance of the male values and therefore of men is essential. As the organisation becomes safe and well ordered there is opportunity to enjoy a larger measure of private living. The stability, born of order, enables women to have greater freedom in the public sphere. At that stage it becomes fairly clear that while the male values are, in organisational expression, creative, the expressed female values are civilising.

REALISTIC PRIVATE VALUES

Under long and strong male domination women came to appreciate the male values and to recognise the importance of men's world to their own; but in recent historical times, among the more civilised peoples, the female values have been regarded with less contempt and have modified the shape of society. The private rights of individuals, the aesthetic quality of pleasant, private relations and a reverence for marital and parental love are expressions of private, individualistic values and have been given protection in public organisation. They are some of the gains that have been made by civilisation.

However, this civilising movement was no more than in its uncertain beginning when it suffered three grave setbacks. One was the incidence of two major wars. That took the nations right back to the primary necessity of protecting, physically, the organisation. The primitive action brought with it an overwhelming dominance of the male value, resulting, when peace came, in revolt against the female, civilising values, with a consequent lawlessness which seemed to many to be freedom from narrow, puritanical restraints and a rejection of effeminate fastidiousness so unworthy of the robust male. Very soon nearly all common decency and good taste became labelled Puritanism and the primitive joy of battle was found in civil violence. The values most easily recognised as being female ones were once again despised. Women were bluffed into accepting it that male values are superior to female values and into renouncing their own way of life to come out of the private place into man's public world. The organisers of society felt that it was worth giving a few of them professions as a sprat to catch a mackerel—a large industrial and business work force. Nowadays the public world is held by the liberated men and women to be one to which the individual

should be subordinated. That brings us to the second great setback that civilisation has suffered in our time—communism.

FEMININE VALUES DENIED

Theoretical and practical communism expresses almost unadulterated masculinism. It is, on that account, calamitous for both men and women. In a communist State, private (feminine) values are anathema. In what is, in character, a masculine society there must be no private home-life and even the marriage relation must be merely incidental to community living. The beautiful relating of the female to the male value, as expressed in much of the creation of good literature, is something that communist organisers fear. According to their decree literature must always propound the State values and that, to them, is adulation of men's dominant values. The so-called sex equality as found in communist regimes is not equality between the sexes, but an attempt at instituting equality between men and women in man's world—yes, in the world of the male triumphant. It is really a humiliating defeat for women.

Very rare, if actually existent, is the atypical woman who is not a communist or, at least, communistically inclined. An example of such a woman's attraction towards that characteristically masculine form or organisation was afforded by Professor Coral Lansbury in an interview given to a *Sydney Morning Herald* journalist (6/7/72). It was with pleasant anticipation that I began to read the article entitled "A Saner Side of Sisterhood", but with a badly letdown feeling that I ended it. The Professor said some things that seemed good and true to me, especially as I had said them myself years ago, though with no acclaim that I know of by any but a very few female intellectuals. I quite agree with her, for example, that the converting of the struggle to win recognition for women's private and social rights into a battle between the sexes was a grave error; but her basing of her case for justice for women on a debatable right of women to wages or salaries equal to those of men may be as grave a one. Job and money equality with men would no more raise the status of the female sex than has the current tendency to regard wifehood and motherhood as an inferior contribution to the human society. There would be something resembling sex equality were the female values to find as great an expression in the male department of action as do male values in the feminine sphere.

The interviewer holds up to admiration the logicalness of Professor Lansbury's thinking; but logic does not lead to truth unless the premises are sound. Just how little logic, by itself, can do to save reason from unreality is shown in her argument in favour of separating young children from their mothers in order to set the latter free to earn money. She said that recent research at Oxford shows that preschool kindergartens have no ill effects upon children between two and four. The important consideration is what effect they will have when the

children are 12 and 14 or the adults they will be later on. Will the children, with all their successful adjustment to the public environment, be very successful in creating good, private, personal relations when they are 20 or over? The preschool alienation of children from their mothers is only one factor in causing matrimonial failure, the creating of generation gaps and the increasing neuroses, found more frequently in women than in men; but it may be a not inconsiderable one. The unnatural living by women in a man's world might be a greater one. Anyway, one should be wary of the finding of research groups. They usually look for what they want to find.

Another example of the Professor's logic, as reported, when discussing preschool upbringing in groups is ". . . not all women make good mothers. Some positively hate their children. Isn't it better to find the people who make good parents and have them bring up the children?"

PARENTAL ROLE NATURAL

To put it bluntly, when Professor Lansbury says that, she does not know what she is talking about. The affection a teacher—even a nursery school teacher—has for her charges is not maternal. The maternal love that the young child needs and a good mother gives is an intimately personal and particular love, a love that sets the beloved apart from others and makes an individual of him. To give one illustration, when the children whom a teacher has had in her class for some time pass out of it, soon to pass out of her life altogether, she may feel some regret and even a passing loss, but hers is not the agonising grief of a mother whose child is taken away from her. The really bad mother is not very common and the women who hate their children are rare; but there, again, is the suggestion of compelling the typical woman to adopt the atypical woman's preferred way of life.

The Professor, when advocating the separating of children from their mothers, was following on from what she had been saying in defence of the practice in Israeli kibbutzim where children are looked after from infancy by women other than their mothers. They turn out, she affirmed, better adjusted and far less aggressive and far less emotional.

"And less creative?" asked the interviewer.

"That is true," agreed the Professor. Did she betray an emotional attachment to the particular feature of communism under discussion when she proposed a speculative hypothesis to explain away a flaw in results? Her surmise was that the kibbutzim children's lack of creativeness could be accounted for by the circumstance that people who tend to live in kibbutzim are likely to be farming people. If the kibbutzim really do attract mainly an uncreative type of person, that, from the point-of-view of culture, is a very black mark against them. But do they? I have never heard what percentage of Asian and North African farmers are in these settlements, but the impression given is that there are, besides, many men and women from Western Europe and America.

The Jews from those parts are almost invariably urban people. Though some of them may have adapted themselves to a farmer's life, nonetheless they are not of peasant stock. Among Europeans and Americans they have been, on the whole, outstandingly creative. If heredity were a determining factor, surely some of their children would be creative. A more likely explanation may be that the communal upbringing has resulted in a suppression of individuality.

EMOTIONAL DEFICIENCY

It should not be surprising that kibbutzim children would tend to grow up subdued, perhaps to the point of dullness; but another serious flaw in the system seems to be that, having been deprived almost entirely of the special, private love that parents give, they would be comparatively unemotional. To be emotionally deficient is every bit as bad as to be mentally deficient. One can imagine the atrocities that might be committed, with implacable logic, by unemotional disciplinarians.

Professor Lansbury concluded, "The point about living in kibbutzim is that you grow up belonging to a community". Yes, belonging almost completely to the public world, to man's world. That is not conducive to a liberation of women.

The third setback to civilisation is that by their alliance with men the atypical women have won the support of many influential men in their methodical destruction of women's world. Naturally believing the male values to be superior to female values and wanting to be fair, men could be persuaded that by forcing women out of their homes to become hirelings in man's world they would be doing them a good turn. Men organise the nation's economy. They formulate the canons of conventional culture. They are the publishers and publicists. Typical women have not a chance against them. They must rely on the chivalry of the few men if they can find them, who will give them a hearing and allow them to have their say.

Of course atypical women would not be atypical were they not in the minority. More women are obstinately feminine in their tastes and outlook and preference for private living. There is, also, a large section of women who, though feminine by nature, are yet docile accepters of prevailing ideas. They are "dumb-driven" by propaganda. They do and think, without question, what they are told is right. The atypical women and their champions do their best to win the ready-accepters to their side in order to create an atypical majority. That they have been successful appears in the compulsion put upon many reluctant women to go out to work at jobs that are in man's special province. That development is, for personal and social reasons, even worse than making no provision for atypical women to follow an occupation, which gives them a feeling of self-fulfilment.

CREATIVITY OF HOME-MAKING

Today, housekeeping and home making are widely looked on as being dreary occupations because girls and women have been trained to feel that they are; but many of the tasks are creative and so is the complete job. There is a great deal more variety in the work involved and a call for the loose kind of organisation for which many women have a genius. There is really less monotony and more freedom in running a home than there is in most factory or office work. To be sure, in the old days many women were overburdened, but now nearly all the heavy drudgery is taken out of housework by invented appliances and other conveniences. Indeed, the scientific inventions have presented women with the same problem as it has men—what to do with the increased leisure.

About the only suggestion with regard to that offered women is to seek a paid job. These paid jobs usually take up more time than the household conveniences save and make the looking after house and children a daily scramble and a weekend-devouring duty—sheer drudgery. Yet this state of affairs is meekly accepted because girls are brought up to depend upon the group. Their natural capacity to be self-dependent remains undeveloped so that when on their own they feel the loneliness of castaways. They therefore put up with being overburdened as the lesser evil and, as they are taught, blame their private, not their public, job for being the extra which is just too much.

Social and economic conditions are changing so fast that whatever parents and teachers do for the children there is a chance that it will be wrong and that the next generations will be resentful of the handicaps that their kind of upbringing has placed upon them. There may be a slowing down of change, but on the other hand there may be a reaction against the present way of life. The daughters may decide that the role of wife and mother is the one that suits them, while the future society may decide that it needs the assistance of wives and mothers more than it does that of factory hands and typists. Maybe the best that any parent can do is to discover the universal private and public moral values and train the youngsters to recognise these, while leaving them free to decide in what ways they should be applied to whatever experiences life may bring them. One mistake made by their own parents and grandparents and that they can avoid is to give the children the impression that everything they want is theirs by right just for wanting it and that perfection should have been their inheritance. They might teach them, instead, that they were born to contribute to the civilisation that the finest people of the past, little by little and in the face of dreadful obstacles, did their best to create.