

THE NEW TIMES

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

\$7.00 per annum post-free. Box 1226L, G.P.O., Melbourne.

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

Vol. 41, No. 12

DECEMBER 1976.

DELIVER US FROM EVIL

By Eric D. Butler

C.H. Douglas once remarked on how an eminent Christian theologian had told him that the generally publicised sins of people were but pimples on the surface compared with fundamental evil. The central dogma of Christianity is that genuine freedom, the right to make choices without compulsion, is a spiritual necessity. Only when the individual has freedom of choice, and accepts personal responsibility for the choices made, can he develop his creative attributes. The flowering of the human personality is stunted when the individual is robbed of freedom to make free choices in conformity with reality. Those who exercise power to deny the individual the opportunity to make free choices are those guilty of diabolical wickedness. The fact that they may be pleasant personalities merely masks this reality.

The major problem in examining fundamental evil is that it does not conform to what most people have been conditioned to accept as evil. Large numbers have heard of Lord Acton's famous observation concerning the corruption of power, but comparatively few have heard of, or considered, his statement that nearly all "great" men are evil men. Acton was insisting that "great" men have possessed power far in excess of what any human being should possess. The question was explored by Aldous Huxley in his famous work, *Grey Eminence*, in which he propounded the thesis that all "great" politics are essentially bad politics. Huxley insisted that all politics are bad, and that man's primary business should be with himself, not with politics.

Caesar and God

And yet politics cannot be ignored by individuals living together in societies. The basic issue is power, and how to prevent its abuse. The pre-Christian philosophers like Socrates and Aristotle grappled with the problem of how to balance power in some way, which would protect the liberties of the individual. But the problem was never adequately resolved until Christianity gave substance to Christ's advice, "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and unto God the things that are God's." Christ gave the State both legitimacy and also set limits. The traditional role of the Church, as witnessed by Magna Carta, was to curb the power of the State. Speaking with Christian Authority at Runnymede, the great Archbishop Langton insisted, not that complete power should be taken from King John and given to the barons, but that power should be divided and subjected to God's law. Every individual counted.

The subtle temptation of evil in the form of power is clearly

outlined in the *New Testament's* account of the Devil tempting Christ on the high mountain. Countless numbers, including politicians, succumbed to the temptation: "If only I had enough power think of all the good I could do." Today there are even large numbers of Christian clergy who, instead of striving tirelessly to limit the powers of the State, are urging that society be reformed by the power of the State. They are in fact appealing from God to Caesar. Every increase in the power of the State inevitably reduces the power of the individual to exercise free will and is a retreat from Christianity.

"The Road to Hell" ..

In his *Idiocy of Idealism*, the distinguished Jewish writer, Dr. Oscar Levy, demonstrated the truth of the observation that the ideal is the enemy of the real. Like many old sayings, the statement that the road to hell is paved with good intentions, is one of great wisdom. How often we hear the claim, "But so-and-so is so sincere." Dealing with the threat of Utopias

CHRISTMAS GREETINGS

In this our last issue for 1976 we take the opportunity of wishing all readers a Happy and Holy Christmas. 1976 has been a year of rapidly increasing tensions, but one in which League supporters played a magnificent role in shaping the destiny of Australia. During the next twelve months Christian Truths will be required as never before. We trust that readers can suitably refresh themselves, both spiritually and physically for the trying but challenging days ahead.

being imposed by sincere idealists, Douglas observed: "When we accuse the great financiers of being merely conscienceless buccaneers, there is a sense in which we do them less than justice, and at the same time fail to recognise the deadly danger which they embody. The great financier is in most cases a great idealist, and sooner or later constructs a Utopia, which it is his constant endeavour to impose upon the world. No single Utopia is possible because of the reality of human differences. Attempts to impose a Utopia require highly centralised controls and power. Hitler was sincere, as was Stalin. Many who knew Hitler intimately claimed that he loved nature and children. In his *Gulag Archipelago*, Solzhenitsyn describes the cultured Soviet judge, a man who loved gardening, the birds and flowers, but who sent thousands to the hell of the concentration camps.

Then there is the case of that well-known international financier, Mr. David Rockefeller, who after establishing his Chase National Bank in Communist China in 1973, wrote a eulogy of Communist China in the *New York Times*, which would have made even some Communists blush. Chairman Mao was engaged in the most successful social experiment in the history of mankind! Now Mr. David Rockefeller does not project an image of evil as generally understood. Premier Sir Charles Court of Western Australia claims Mr. Rockefeller as a friend, a charming and educated man. The truth is that Mr. Rockefeller, no matter how sincere he may be concerning his ideal of a "One World", is responsible for using credit power, which he should not possess for sustaining criminal regimes in both the Soviet Union and Communist China. Mankind desperately requires deliverance from the evil which the

Rockefellers of this world are furthering,

Creating a Christian Society

Malcolm Muggeridge has expressed the view that "I think there are advantages in living at a time when a civilisation is coming to an end; in such a situation one can better understand the nature of power, just as one can better understand the nature of the body when one is sick. In a dying civilisation one is at least not taken in by power and authority as one might easily be when conditions are flourishing." But it must be admitted that the reality of the situation tends to be blurred by the impressive contributions, which scientists have made to the exercising of power. One British scientist, Dr. Edmond Leach, described as "one of England's most noted anthropologists", has claimed, "We scientists have the right to play God." This is the concept, which the Son of God rejected on the high mountain. Knowledge of itself can end with man destroying civilisation at an accelerating rate. Man now has such knowledge concerning nature, and (temporarily) power over it, that it has eroded his sense of humility and increased his appetite for greater power. By claiming that God is dead and that man alone is now omnipotent, man has succumbed to the ultimate evil.

Only by genuine repentance, rejecting evil, humbly accepting the truth that knowledge must serve the true purpose of man-self-development through responsible judgments in a free society - can we know, love and serve God. And by so doing create a genuine Christian society of freedom and security for all.

GEMS FROM DOUGLAS

With the passing of time, the wisdom and grasp of truth by the founder of Social Credit, C.H. Douglas, become clearer to those who are capable of seeing. Unlike the words of the party politician, often disputed by events as soon as they are uttered, the words of Douglas reflect truths, which are eternal. We feel that the Christmas period is a most appropriate time to ponder on selected "gems" from Douglas, the man who said, "We are engaged in a battle for Christianity."

".... the prevalence of 'the Western heresy' has driven out of Europe that subtle quality which gave poise and resistance to the European. If Europe (and Great Britain) is to be saved, they have to recover their soul. There is no hope in the stampede of the Gadarene swine....We make no pretence of ability to judge the inevitability or otherwise of cultural defeat. But we notice in many quarters a new awareness of what we have been proclaiming to the best of our ability for the past ten years -- that the wars and economic depressions of this century were consciously planned to induce the psychological background for a world revolution which would use the exaggerated and manufactured prestige of 'Labour' to eliminate the prestige of culture, and, 'in war, or under threat of war', to replace the vitality and attraction of the old Europe by the drab uniformity of a Russian workers' ant-heap....."

No honest person hesitates to admit the defects of the nineteenth century while claiming it was the high watermark of modern civilisation. No instructed person has any doubt that it was fundamentally the corruption of the English tradition by the 'vulgar rich' on both sides of the Atlantic and the

North Sea to which practically all these defects can be traced-the same vulgar rich who are using mass democracy to complete the ruin they have conceived. And the bulwark against these vulgar rich was tradition; a national ritual arrived at by centuries of trial and elimination. It is in the failure to present that tradition as a living force of which to be immeasurably proud, instead of as something for which to make apology, that the so-called Conservative Party - a body, as such, without a soul has been guilty of the unforgivable sin, and must suffer for it. And the most deadly error we can make is to look to it, in its present form, for salvation." *The Social Crediter, August 25, 1945.*

* * * * *

"Amongst the less intelligent criticisms of the group of ideas known as Social Credit is that it is disguised anarchy - a kind of go-as-you-please free for all. The argument is equivalent to saying that a claim to choose whether I will play cricket or tennis is a claim to make the rules of cricket or tennis. But the

criticism has an important truth contained in it — a truth which the collectivist monopolists understand clearly. Freedom of choice does *ultimately* mean negative control. Negative control is the only control the man in the street requires. He needs a bridle on the mass expert.

"If sufficient individuals disapprove of an article, it will go off the market for the simple reason that it will have no market. But only if there is an alternative. If there is no alternative, you become the tool of the gangster. If you have freedom of choice, you needn't. Social Credit is the escape from gansterdom." - *Programme for the Third World War (1943)*

* * * * *

"... thanks to the illusion that a scarcity of money is the same thing as a scarcity of wealth, we are nearly all of us under the spell of what the psychologists call a 'scarcity complex'. We cannot believe that it is possible to have too much wealth. We could, for instance, no doubt enormously increase the industrial capital value of Scotland by developing every waterfall and every Salmon River into waterpower for hydroelectric purposes, but I think myself that would be a sad day for Scotland. We could each and all of us have a powerful loudspeaker in every room but I hope we never shall. "So that we have to be very careful to see that we run our productive system for the purpose of supplying all the tangible wealth that we can, as individuals, use with profit to ourselves, and do not, as at the present time, allow it to be run for a number of ulterior purposes, amongst which we might instance that of a moral discipline, a hidden government, or a system of rewards and punishments." - *Reconstruction (May 1932)*.

* * * * *

"There seems to be little doubt that encyclopaedism - the splitting of knowledge into 'subjects' - has a curious, mesmeric, or magical consequence, the inhibition or destruction of the capacity to relate or compare experiences. The propaganda for 'full employment' is so completely in the teeth of the whole theory of modern industry, and the experience of the past seventy-five years that it would be supposed that it would be met with a howl of derision.

"But it is not so... Anyone retaining a modicum of native intelligence would ponder over the present situation of the world and conclude that since it has developed contemporaneously with an immensely increased capacity for production, it would only be common prudence to make sure that still further insistence on production would not exacerbate it." *The Social Crediter, January 13, 1945.*

* * * * *

"Only a perverse obscurantism would deny the value of Reason properly regarded, just as it would be fatuous to condemn a slide-rule, with which it has an organic connection,

as being in itself reprehensible. ...It is highly significant that the worship of logic is characteristic of immaturity, of youth. At the age of eighteen or so, logic presents an indisputable proof for every problem. And it will be noticed that there has been, and is, a conscious Youth movement' carrying with it the implication that wisdom reaches its apex in the early twenties.

"Yet it must be plain to anyone that not only is evidence lacking that logic has solved any political problems of consequence in the past, but, conversely, that policies now current in world affairs, which pretend to base their appeal on logic, threaten us with destruction.

"There is no saying requiring attention more clemently than 'Unless ye become as little children ye shall in no wise enter the Kingdom.' There is nothing logical about a little child." *The Social Crediter, May 21, 1949.*

Axioms" off Society

It must now be evident generally, as we have been doing our best to proclaim for twenty-five years, that it is absurd to challenge the logic of modern politics and economics, which are irrefragable. It is the so-called "axioms" which demand examination. In what time may remain to us, we propose, at intervals, and as objectively as possible, to examine these "axioms".

Fifty years ago, a Conservative Member of Parliament replying to a criticism made at a private dinner-party, said, "Well, you know, politics is a dirty business, always has been a dirty business, and always will be a dirty business".

We have here, a *fact*, which is stated as an *axiom*.

Fifty years ago, politics were far cleaner than they are today—probably at their cleanest. The explanation of this is simple—they were less professional. The average Member of Parliament was a man of private means and diverse interests. It was not a matter of life and death to him to retain his seat, and there were limits beyond which he was not prepared to go to retain it. The Member just quoted was of this type, yet he did retain his seat, and he admitted that he was employed in a dirty business. If he had troubled to justify himself, he would no doubt have said, "Politics

THE BOOK OF THE MOMENT

Originally entitled "It's Time They Knew", by the late C. Barclay-Smith, "The Money Trick" might well be described as the book for the moment. It has a special value at present as the finance-economic crisis deepens and all constructive suggestions are met with the bleating cry, "But where win the money come from?" "The Money Trick" is the answer. It is a proven bestseller and eye-opener. Campaigners are urged to always have a small supply on hand, to hand to the Local Councillor, the hard-pressed businessman, and those desperate farmers *so* misled by their "leaders".

Let us saturate Australia. So that "The Money Trick" can go out in thousands we are offering a special discount rate: 4 copies for \$3, posted to anywhere in Australia.

is the art of the possible".

It is not necessary to look very far for an explanation of the *fact*. It is stated with admirable clarity in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, and is of course, the basis of Machiavellianism. The real reason that the *Protocols* have roused such furious denunciation is precisely this—that they explain the divergence between public and private honesty. Protocol 1, XI reads: "The political has nothing in common with the moral. The ruler who is governed by the moral is not a skilled politician, and is therefore unstable on his throne. He who wishes to rule must have recourse both to cunning and to make-believe.' Great national [sic] qualities, like frankness and honesty, are vices in politics . . ." Compare "Full employment"; "Public Ownership", "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat", "*Liberte', Egalite', Fraternity*", etc.

At this point, we are clearly confronted with a difficulty. Have moral qualities any real existence and justification, or as the Socialists contend, are they merely a trick to make the mob easier to control? Socialist politics, while only a few steps further on the road, are obviously not hampered by any doubts on this point—they are completely a-moral. Their objective is the supremacy of the bureaucrat so long as he obeys orders. Nothing else.

Fortunately, we are not thrown back upon authoritarianism for an answer to this vital question—it can be obtained from one of the most thoroughgoing exponents of the empirical technique—Gustave le Bon. *A mob has no morality; an individual depends for his individuality on his morality.* Lying and corruption disintegrate a man. No society can survive a-moral leadership.

In consequence, Collectivist Government is inevitably the most corrupt form and must lead to a tyranny unredeemed by any virtues.

—C. H. DOUGLAS in *The Social Creditor*, Sept. 15, 1945.

THE MISSING MILLIONS

The following letter, originally dated July 7, appeared in *The Canberra Times*, July 28, 1976:

Sir, - In a public address in defence of the existing economic system delivered in Melbourne in 1932 Professor Copland, then Dean of the Faculty of Commerce in the University of Melbourne, quoted J. M. Keynes' logical fallacy: "Let X be equal to the cost of production of all producers. Then X will also be equal to the incomes of the public." This *petitio principii* seems to have come unscathed, at least publicly, through all these years, and appears to be at the root of the current Australian Government's 'attack' on Public Enemy No. 1 - Inflation.

However, reports covering the 24-hour industrial stoppage in Victoria on June 30 stated that the strike cost \$10 million in lost wages, and \$50

million in lost production. Now it is quite evident that \$10 million "incomes of the public" will not purchase \$50 million value of production. It would be an exceptionally brash economist who would claim that the missing \$50 million represented profit. The question is, what does it represent?

All modern industrial economies are deficit finances. In a fairly rapidly expanding economy (as in Australia and elsewhere in the post-war years) the deficit-finance is provided by an expansion of the money supply through the continuing granting of loans in excess of repayments by the banking system. But there is a limit to industrial expansion, which is indicated by a virtual saturation of consumer-demand for particular categories of production. This condition is now fondly called "stagflation".

This, of course, is where Keynes came to the rescue of other economists. He advocated, and made respectable, *government* deficit financing (previously Balanced Budgets were a *sine qua non* of Sound Government). The new doctrine was called "pump-priming". And these days economies almost everywhere are dependent on government deficit finance, on an expanding scale.

The purpose of this letter is certainly not to raise an academic point. It is to look at the practical consequences of the situation disclosed. As is becoming obvious to mere inspection, the Australian Government's measures to "fight" inflation are merely intensifying the current economic-difficulties, steadily moving towards disaster. In my opinion, certain theoreticians in and behind the Socialist Movement understand this situation thoroughly, and are relying on it to destroy so-called Liberalism and the private Capitalist system - this time forever. Mr. Fraser's claim that the Whitlam Government was "mismanaging" the economy was a prescription for his own destruction, probably before the next elections are due, because he is clearly not "managing" any better than Whitlam & Co.

The core of the problem lies in the discrepancy between the incomes of the public and the value of production. The rectification of the problem lies in financing this discrepancy out of existence by accountancy procedures. These are a little subtle to grasp; but I should be happy to explain them to anyone who, recognising the economic breakdown, mathematically certain, towards which we are accelerating, is in a position to put them into effect.

I do not consider that this matter is any longer open to argument. I will merely make the prediction, which interested readers can verify in due course by observation, that unless there is a considerable expansion of the money-supply (the expansion from 1964 to 1974 was 161.72% - average 14.77% p.a.), unemployment will rise, and inflation progress. Borrowing from overseas, and/or increasing the export "surplus" are both forms of deficit financing. (And it ought to be obvious to anyone that importing money to buy *our own* production implies an internal shortage of purchasing power.)

Merely expanding the money supply will not *cure* our troubles, though it would temporarily ameliorate them, while compounding them for the future. But decreasing the money supply, which is the consequence of cuts in government expenditure, will certainly bring the Socialists back to power. And then God save us all, for the Socialists know where they are going. They were, until dismissed from government (though not from advisory positions), propelling this country into an international socialist New Order.

BRYAN W. MONAHAN,
Red Hill.

— The Social Creditor, September-October, 1976

PERFECT FREEDOM

By Chas Pinwill

Freedom. What a concept, what a symbolic word, yet of what reality? Agreed by all to be wondrous indeed. Freedom — the guiding light of millions, millions marching as much in one direction as another. To be free, "free" as the wind, yet the destructive hurricane, or the gentle breeze by the sea? Those invoking freedom, pursuing it, proclaiming it, find so often upon arrival that they have surrendered it, and that tyranny reigns supreme.

Yet freedom is not just an ideal; it is real. It does mean something; it does reflect a reality. It is not just a catch-cry at the service of the power brokers of the market place. It does partake of substance, for how else could it play such a substantial, though be it intangible, part in our lives? Not, of course, unless we are all mad, a conclusion which, quite apart

from its terrifying implications, is denied by all good order indeed all that is good. Rejoice freedom is certainly real.

But something in me rebels at the questioning, circumspect approach to freedom. Questions we have aplenty. They tumble out at every moment; pile up in heaps of disarray, like

work undone, or "good" intentions unattended. Answers we must have.

QUALIFYING FREEDOM

Christianity has brought to man a concept of Perfect Freedom. Freedom, unqualified, perfect and confined by nothing. Yet a freedom real, and being definite, surely must be capable of definition. Freedom must be defined to assert its reality, yet never qualified and thus negated.

The qualifiers come in many guises. The humanists would qualify our freedom by humanity, other humans. Thus the "everyone is a slave of everybody else" type freedom. The individual is subservient to "the others".

Then come the Marxists with their "freedom" neatly tied in a bag, like the pig that lived in a poke. Their tremendously emotive freedom is to walk along the path of historical determinism. Not only to accept the inevitable, but to assist it, to be the very midwives at its birth into the world. So important is the notion of freedom in the affairs of men, that Marxists have in the guise of defining it, qualified it, and have unashamedly pronounced that freedom "is the right to work for the State".

Then when that mighty day arrives, and some Mark Antony ascends the Forum, and all the people cry, "What's in the bag, What's in the bag," then comes forth its exultant contents. Freedom, freedom is proclaimed, it's in the bag, it's in the bag at last, and all step safely in.

Socialists qualify our freedom with the rights of less fortunate others to loot it from us, and the privilege of Government to loot in their name: Freedom is qualified by every endeavour of whatever nature to take power over us, by every corruption of the obligation to serve.

Freedom is often done a disservice by those who are most mindful of its abuses, by suggesting responsibility as a limitation. It is not. Such people often fall for the line that Society has a life of its own, has an interest above the individual and outside of service to him. Responsibility is so much a part of the very nature, the definition of freedom, that they are one.

Let me explain. Freedom has to do with the right to choose. Yet not to choose between one group of alternatives, both

STRANGER THAN JAMES BOND!

"State Secrets" (1975) the last major work of the famous French scholar and historian. Count Leon de Poncins makes James Bond seem tame. This work is in essence a collection of a unique selection of secret documents, which unravel the mainspring governing the revolutionary Movement, which has this century, destroyed Empires and advanced International Communism. Here is the stuff of real history, the suppressed documents that students are not supposed to see. The role of Zionist Israel emerges clearly.

Price \$3.40 posted

good and bad, and another group similarly composed. Not even between one thing and one other, since both might be best rejected, or of course adopted. Freedom resides in being able to choose or reject one thing at a time.

ACTION AND REACTION

Much is made by the Libertarians of the freedom to act. Yet action is not an end, a desirable result, it is but a means, a mechanism, an administrative demand. Are we to demand the right to choose the means, one at a time, and proclaim this freedom above that of the freedom to choose the result, the end? Are we looking for results or methods? Freedom of action is nonsense if we neglect to choose the end, the result, the consequence.

Even the revolutionaries know that the real action is in the reaction. That action has no purpose, whether striking a cricket ball or talking to another, outside of the reaction that it sets in motion. One may only truly and freely choose an action on the basis of the resulting response.

Perfect freedom only has meaning if it confers the possibility of a perfect resulting response. So perfect freedom resides in being able to choose or reject one thing at a time, on the basis of that things response ability. Responsibility does not detract from the fullness of freedom, but creates it, by taking choice out of bondage in the realm of means, and bringing choice to the question of ends.

Children understand this: "Mummy, can I have a drink of water please ... please, can I have a drink of water." Any appeal on the basis of broken pumps, striking plumbers, footage head or corrosive pipes; any appeal in the realm of means is treated with deserving contempt, with unnerving persistence concerning the matter of ends. "I want a drink of water". Adults have to enter into the area of means, but should they forget the primacy of ends, there is no place for freedom.

Is there any way that man can be freed from the tyranny of unwanted ends? Is there a law or laws, a set of principles, an identity or a force, which we may if we choose, obey, and thus come with a certainty to perfected ends? Can we so orientate our actions as to escape the tyranny of unwanted, though no less dire, consequences?

ENDS AND MEANS

Actions have no true purpose outside of serving ends. Action is a servant to the end.

Free will may be exercised to serve the cause of slavery, and thus the self-destruction of free will. Or it may be exercised to choose the other pole of possibilities, freedom. Free will is to freedom but a means.

The laws, which govern the growth of freedom, are absolutes, and freedom demands the exercise of free will in favour of obedience to them.

"In Whose service is perfect freedom" was not intended as a question. It has that incomparably and infinitely greater status, that of an answer.

LEFTISTS PREFER INFERIOR QUALITY

By D. Watts

When Mr. Jimmy Carter made his world-famous revelation that he had looked on a lot of women with lust and had committed adultery in his heart many times, it might have been thought that, like an exhibitionist on the penitents' seat at a Revivalist meeting, he was confessing his sins. He was doing nothing of the kind. He was proclaiming his virtue.

Mr. Carter had been making an appeal to America's Bible Belt and the Baptists of the South by giving them a probably true picture of himself as a faithful husband and loving father of a loving daughter who is not a delinquent. That middle-class morality, to a fairly large and influential section, the members of which hold sleazy immorality to be virtue, would be greatly to his discredit. Since these Permissives are almost invariably leftists and therefore would, in the ordinary course, vote for the American Democratic Party, it was advisable to assure them that he was, by nature and in his heart, even as they. Apparently, in America, the Permissives or trendies or whatever be their dreary, newest name, have such a large say in setting standards that all political Parties must tread tactfully in the country of sexual immorality for, in an interview, Mrs. Ford, the wife of the President, evidently from fear of hurting the susceptibilities of the immoral, said that she would not be surprised to discover that her young daughter was having an affair. It has come past joking-point when a mother has to come close to taking away her daughter's character in order to avoid the risk of losing political support for her husband. Sex is considerably more than a physical exercise. If it were not, there would be no rejection of either puritanical aversion from, or pornographic attraction to it. There is no difference that matters between the sexual outlook of the puritan and that of the pornographer. To both, sex is purely physical and to both it is dirty. The shrinking of the one and the sniggering of the other come from minds that are grossly materialistic. To jeer at the puritan and be tolerant of the pornographer is not broadmindedness; it is inconsistent and ridiculous.

It hardly needs to be said that among superior people sexual behaviour of an intimate nature is private. The public exhibition of it in physical detail would, of course, excite most watchers; but in character that is not much different from the religious orgies in which the devout participants in degradation have indulged. It is a stripping from sex of all but pure animalism. To that, under leftist influence, sexual behaviour is reduced by novelists, entertainers and certain educationists; for leftists prefer inferior quality in sexual behaviour as in all other kinds of human behaviour.

It has been disputed that there is any connection between sexual permissiveness and other forms of lax behaviour. Certainly, stealing, bad manners, mayhem, cruelty and the rest do not result from fornication or adultery, but all kinds of individual and community behaviour of an inferior quality are likely to have a common root cause. Whether that be denied or not, it cannot be disputed that sexual laxity, an increased crime rate, lazy forms of aesthetic creation, a heightened love of violence and grey conceptions of what are normal personal relations have all come together.

The historical origin of a virtual monopoly of freedom of speech by leftists has often been described before. It lay in the opportunist use of a pre-war leftist trend to inflame war-

enthusiasm. When, during World War II, leftism was arbitrarily identified with democracy and the war was represented as being fought for democracy, it seemed to follow that any political thought, which was not leftist, was unpatriotic, perhaps potentially treasonable. Consequently, by the time that the war ended, only convinced leftists were in a position to give public expression to their beliefs and ideas. The tendency, inherent in leftist thought, of compassion for those in inferior economic and social states to degenerate into a valuing of inferiority for itself was thus not strongly enough held in check by an insistence on the necessity to individuals and the State of superior quality mental and moral behaviour. The moderate attitude of "live and let live" degenerated into the narrow-minded one of believing that the saying applied only to inferior individual behaviour and inferior cultural and moral standards. Sexual looseness is only one of the conventions of inferiority that arose from an identification of pure leftism with democracy and an identification of democracy with rule by inferiors and the circle-closing identification of leftist government with a protection of political and social inferiority. From that comes a development even more noxious than is the leftist preference for inferior quality. It is an identifying of democracy with government by inferiors.

The Quality of Society Everyone's Business

In *The Bulletin* of July 17th, 1976, Mr. Ron Saw commented on a proposed research into the drinking habits of Australians. His conclusion, in effect, that it would be only a repeat performance of a futile show is, judging from similar inquiries, right enough. What I relished, however, was the heading to his article: "Why can't those wowsers leave us in peace?" Considering that for decades those in Mr. Saw's camp have never left the wowsers in peace, but in novels, plays, cartoons, jokes and articles have made them the butt of jeers, figures-of-fun, the scorn of broad-minded delinquents and the substitute for a now discredited kill-joy Devil, his plaint does sound a little peevish. Of course, though, giving it to others is different from being given it.

Mr. Saw's intimation that while he does not indulge in vice, he would if he wanted to do so and feels no impulse to preach to those who do and that his attitude is "live and let live", would have been tolerant and sensible in the beginning of this century. Conditions since then have changed. There were then, as always, drunkards and people who gambled to excess and adulterers; but sixty or seventy years ago they were the mavericks. Today, their moral standards are far too close to being the accepted social standards for anyone with a concern for people to rest smug in his own personal virtue.

Though no one with any feelings of compassion can, from a desire to avoid wowsers, remain with inverted toleration indifferent to the misery and sometimes actual physical hurt that a drunkard or inveterate gambler can cause others, or to the acute unhappiness that may be the consequence of marital

failure yet, in a general way, a person's private behaviour is his own business. The quality of society, on the other hand, is everyone's business.

At the end of the last century and the beginning of this, a prevailing Puritanism did make "live and let live" a tolerant maxim. Most people, then, did not think that Sunday should be a day of boring inaction relieved only by often boring religious observances; but many able to influence general social behaviour did. I remember an instance of that. A stretch of road between Fremantle and Perth had become a stretch of loose, deep, dragging sand. The municipal Council said that it could not afford to mend it. The cruel straining horses pulling heavy lorry loads through the drift moved a number of men to give up their Sundays to repairing the road. The howling protests against breaking the Sabbath that resounded from certain pulpits and were printed in newspapers put an end to that "ungodly" labour of love.

Not all people in those days believed that all parts of the human body except the hands and face were indecent and should be covered up but, fashion being influenced by that opinion, covered up they were by all people, even in the broiling Western Australian summer days of fuel stoves and no refrigerators. Even the garments worn next to the indecent body became contaminated with impurity. There once lived next door to us a woman who was obliged to bring her washing in before her husband arrived home from work because he thought it improper for him to see his wife's underclothes displayed on the line.

I do not know whether or not the majority of people believed that the begetting and bearing of a baby was a shameful, immodest affair, but those who did were able to make all mention of such a vital, sexual matter to be covered, except in whispering privacy, with a silence that news-slanters would envy. It was not that the moralists of other days went in the wrong direction, but that they went too far. It is not that the reaction against their extremism has gone in the wrong direction, but that it has gone too far. Mr. Saw's position would have been the moderate one when I was a young rebel critical of extremism. It could have been the tolerant one now were it not for the great weight of opinion that has accumulated at the leftist extreme — weight, not of numbers, but of influence. He, and most of his generation, by adding moderate leftism to extreme leftism, are not bringing a moderating influence to bear on popular opinion, but are only adding more weight to the already over-weighted side. The saying "live and let live" has not much balancing power when it means, "Let these on the extreme of my side live, but kill my opposites."

Spiritual Refreshment Required

Any revelation or inspiration is at first strongly resisted by the conventional. When it begins to be accepted, it stimulates thought but on being generally held to be respectable, gradually it loses the radiance of enlightenment and becomes stultified in a conventional creed and usually vulgarised. In the end, embodied in dogmas and codes, it comes to exhibit the

same characteristics of stupidity and intolerance as did the older beliefs and conventions which it had supplanted. Nevertheless, something of the understanding of reality, which was revealed in the first flush of enhanced perception usually remains, adding its permanent little to evolving civilisation. At least, it does that so long as rigidity of thought does not degenerate into ossification.

A society needs to be mentally and spiritually refreshed from generation to generation. To do that it is not enough for a new interpretation of reality to be different from the older ones; it must be better. Leftism brought gifts of compassion for a sense of duty towards the downtrodden and oppressed. Those civilised traits remain beneath the political dogmatism and intolerance, which has distorted the original revelation. Political bigotry, unimaginative political conventions and the old, old persecution of the uncomfortable with all their hypocrisy and cruelty are now upon us. We need a new generation of rebels — not the old fashioned youth who are conventionally rebelling against conventions that were beginning to break down fifty or sixty years ago, but young rebels with the courage and intelligence to stand up against the hidebound, intolerant and often hypocritical leftist conventions of thought and beliefs that are, for love of inferior quality, destroying superior human quality.

Consider some of the putrid hypocrisies of generations that we're so condemnatory of Victorian hypocrisy: while professing perturbation about increased rape and divorce and violent crime, stimulating exhibitions of the wallowing in sub-animal lasciviousness and brutality are staged in theatres and on television and described in popular novels and defended in the name of freedom of thought and expression by the unthinking or the stupid or cynical exploiters. Rebellion against oppression has, under leftist influence, become rebellion against the rights of superiors and is proclaimed as fighting for freedom or justice. Rebellion by well-treated children against parents, by students against proper authority, by terrorists against lawful order and harmless people and by criminals against society and those appointed to restrain them are defended by leftists who pretend to deplore tyranny and suffering. Yet all those kinds of actions are primitively tyrannous and cause much unnecessary physical or emotional suffering. Through leftist propaganda, racial tolerance, which can come from only a superior tolerance of natural differences, has degenerated into a preference for coloured people, especially the uncivilised among them, and a prejudice against the white race. This racial discrimination, hypocritically described as promotion of racial equality, has enabled the ruling persons of cliques of nations, never in any age noted for honest words or honest dealings, to flaunt openly their callous betrayal of the civilised and of civilisation, brazenly declaring that they do as they do from love of democracy or peace or racial justice or anything else that sounds sweet in the ears of the gullible.

A revulsion against the cult of inferiority is overdue. The leftists would be foolish to insist that a reaction against ruling inferior values is inseparable from a reaction against leftism though, indeed, they may have gone so far as to make it almost impossible to disentangle the one from the other. It would be

best if the revulsion came from both the left and the right. One might have expected that leadership against anti-superiority would have come from the Churches. There are, to be sure, members of small religious organisations making the needed protests, but their fundamentalism, though comforting and inspiring to their members, prevents them from reaching the very agnostics and atheists whom they long to convert. The Festival of Light is a rather more powerful source of opposition, but in its efforts to contend against the extremist immoral Establishment it is handicapped by being given the image of the puritanical extremists of the last century and the beginning of this one.

The Reality of Equality

The Festival of Light's most subtle enemy, however, are the clergymen worshipping a Calf, not even golden, but made of base metal, the metal of moral and spiritual inferiority. A short while back, on the radio, a clergyman was defending the leftist demand for political equality between the South African races. He declared that they should have that because all men are equal before God. Is political equality really equality before God? That he should think so is a sad comment on the materialistic influence of leftism on religious thinking. The leftist political code first took the place of a moral code and next took the place of a code of spiritual values.

Equality before God is absolute. Neither before God nor man is equality concrete. Human equality is of the absolute reality of every man to himself and of his own experience to himself. No other person has for a man the absolute reality that he has to himself. No other man's experience is as absolutely real to a man as is his own. We can know *of* the reality of another and of his experience; but we cannot know it. One's knowledge of one's own reality is subjective. Knowledge of another's is objective. To the savage and the insensitive other creatures have only an objective reality. On the other hand, religious teachers and other humanitarians too often take a purely subjective view of human beings of inferior quality, imagining that, in certain social or political or economic situations the savage or criminal feels the same as they themselves, would do. By doing that they are transferring the absolute equality of immortals to unequal mortals. It is necessary that, with all our feelings of sympathy or empathy with others, there must be a complementary objective observation of their different reactions to same experiences, of the mental and moral inequalities of mortals. Both subjectivity and objectivity are real. Both the absoluteness and the concrete relativeness of men are real. Both equality and -inequality are real. All men are both equal and unequal before God.

One reason for the decline of the organised Christian Churches is that a large number of clergymen, including too many in high positions, has been concentrating upon the good of the perishable aspects of society and the mortal being, going to the impious length of giving absolute values to earthly social forms and political institutions. In that way, they may sometimes do a little good; but they are in grave danger of doing much more evil, for under their guidance their Churches and their religious teachings are subordinated to social and political

ideologies and so cease to have much spiritual value.

Since, in these days, the Churches have failed men in the matter of helping to preserve and increase human quality of a superior value, where can we turn for spiritual salvation? Does it come from lay mental and moral leaders? The vast majority of them, too, have a leftist preference for inferiority. The essential character of civilisation is a replacing of trial by combat with peaceful methods of resolving differences. Until that is done there can be no cultural progress. One looks somewhat tolerantly on university students who use physical methods of disorderly demonstrations and shouting down those with whom they disagree, for they do this because it is expected of them. It is less easy to be tolerant of those who taught them that physical force of some description is a better argument than are analysis and reasoned expositions.

The Leftist Sacrifice of Civilisation

The intellectual leftists have extolled violent revolution. That is the final stage in the dissolution of a political system, the death that comes at the end and not the first step in the creation of a new and better order. It is followed inevitably by a beginning of organisation again at the elementary beginning. Leftists write books and stage plays that usually stimulate the morally retarded and the savage who sleeps with one eye open in many an apparently civilised breast. They side with terrorists and rioters and thus are primarily responsible for the prolongation of civil war in Northern Ireland and the Middle East by those savages who love violence better than they love peace or the ideals for which they cantingly profess to fight.

Leftists who believe that inferiors are served by a preference for inferiority are in the same category as the ancient people who expected to derive benefits from offering up children as sacrifices to Moloch. If, indeed, there were a god who could be bribed in such a way, immoral though the sacrifices were, it would at least have been realistic to offer them. Adding pathos to horror is the fact that there never was such a god and nothing to be gained by making the atrocious oblations. Similarly, leftists who have sacrificed human beings and human civilisation to inferiority have been worshipping a non-existent god, a graven image before which the slain tens of thousands rot unheeded and the ruined cultures of advanced nations lie like withered flowers.

BASIC FUND

With the Fraser Government and its "advisers" determined to hold Australia on the present disaster course, it is as certain as the sunrise what is going to happen early next year. The League has been hammering down the foundations on which to build next year. But it must have adequate finance.

Northern N.S.W. and Queensland supporters should send their contributions to Mr. Jeremy Lee, Kingstown, via Armidale, N.S.W. 2350. All other contributions to The Australian League of Rights, Box 1052J, G.P.O., Melbourne, 3001.