

THE NEW TIMES

"Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free " - John 8:31.

VOL. 60, No. 1.

Registered by Australia Post -Publication PP481667 100259

JANUARY 1996.

Australia and New Zealand Edition. Published in Melbourne and Auckland.

CAN GRAEME CAMPBELL, M.P., PROVIDE AUSTRALIA WITH TRUE LEADERSHIP?

by Eric D. Butler

The most significant 1995 political event in Australia was the dramatic expulsion from the Labor Party of Graeme Campbell, West Australian Member for Kalgoorlie, the biggest electorate in the English-speaking world. Campbell finished his term in the Commonwealth Parliament as an Independent. In order to grasp the far-reaching implications of the Campbell affair, it is necessary to see it in the context of a chain of events which led up to the Prime Minister Paul Keating's arrogant demand that the Labor Party sack Campbell.

One of the biggest dangers in the present situation is that large numbers of desperate and frustrated Australians now see Campbell as some type of a national saviour. Electors must understand that they also have a vital role to play. Anyone who has made a close study of the Graeme Campbell story knows that he is no demagogue with messianic visions of grandeur. Of Scottish background, Campbell's career tends to confirm an old saying that the Scots had to leave their native country to fulfill themselves throughout the world. He is widely read and a practical man of commonsense. Before entering politics he was engaged in a variety of developmental projects concerning the West Australian pastoral industry, as well as mining. He belonged to an old-time Labor movement whose representatives were generally those who knew what it was to dirty their hands with physical work. A new breed has emerged, slick lawyers and self-styled academics masquerading as Labor politicians.

Campbell has emerged as a type of catalyst in the deepening Australian crisis. He is widely perceived as a man who reflects the basic values upon which Australia was built. He is an old-fashioned loyalist who has no difficulty in defending the Constitutional Monarchy. As with other subjects, Campbell's approach reflects his practical commonsense approach, although he stresses the importance of heritage and historical continuity.

The First Seat

When Campbell first nominated as a Labor candidate for the Federal electorate of Kalgoorlie, he was greeted with little enthusiasm by the Labor party hierarchy. It is now a matter of history how he won with a handful of recounted votes at the 1980 Federal elections, registering a 10 percent swing to Labor. At all subsequent elections he progressively increased his majorities, making Kalgoorlie one of the safest Labor seats in

Australia. The Aboriginal population supported him along with

OUR POLICY

To promote service to the Christian revelation of God, loyalty to the Australian Constitutional Monarchy, and maximum co-operation between subjects of the Crown Commonwealth of Nations.

To defend the free Society and its institutions - private property, consumer control of production through genuine competitive enterprise, and limited decentralised government.

To promote financial policies, which will reduce taxation, eliminate debt, and make possible material security for all with greater leisure time for cultural activities.

To oppose all forms of monopoly, either described as public or private.

To encourage all electors always to record a responsible vote in all elections.

To support all policies genuinely concerned with conserving and protecting natural resources, including the soil, and an environment reflecting natural (God's) laws, against policies of rape and waste.

To oppose all policies eroding national sovereignty, and to promote a closer relationship between the peoples of the Crown Commonwealth and those of the United States of America, who share a common heritage.

the traditionally conservative pastoralists. Clearly he was perceived as being a good representative.

A close study of Campbell's approach to a number of subjects, including defence, in which he has taken a special interest, reveals that he is a man who thoroughly researches his subject. He is also innovative in his thinking. He passionately believes in free speech, stressing that the Labor Party once also believed in free speech. He objected to the Labor government's banning of British historian David Irving. In spite of his obviously great ability, Campbell the traditionalist found himself increasingly at odds with a Labor Party, which had cut itself off from its nationalist roots and had become internationalist. There was no prospect of Campbell being offered any Ministerial position. But there is no evidence that Campbell has ever suffered from an over-inflated ego, or is consumed with the type of ambition, which produces a Bob Hawke or a Paul Keating. Often to his own detriment, Graeme Campbell has always preached and practised loyalty. In spite of his down-to-earth approach to the human drama, one gets the impression that there is a touch of the romantic. He has a quick wit and an engaging sense of humour. There is no pretence about the man. When he appeared on a television programme in which he was obviously slightly inebriated, with engaging candour he admitted his condition, referring to the problem of "long lunches"! Large numbers who saw this performance could only react: "This man is real."

The struggle for true independence

Graeme Campbell reveals that he is a man of vision. He concluded his New England address by saying; "We will not achieve independence by pretending we are not, or by clutching to the apron strings of Asia. To be truly independent, we have to take the hard decisions, we have to take the risk on our own people, we have to revive a strong national feeling."

As Campbell became increasingly concerned about immigration and the fostering of multiculturalism, he displayed his political courage and independence by directly supporting the group "*Australians Against Further Immigration*", advising electors in by-elections to protest by voting against the Labor Party candidates. But Campbell's greatest act of courage was when he accepted an invitation to address the 1992 League of Rights National Seminar. His theme was "*The Flight from Responsibility*". This resulted in an immediate Zionist-sponsored campaign against Campbell, who not only refused to flinch but went on the offensive, charging that the Zionist Jewish lobby was providing millions for both the Labor Party and the Opposition. There were growing demands by the Zionist-Jewish lobby that the Labor Party discipline Campbell. But Campbell refused to change his ground. A major storm broke out when Campbell again spoke on a League of Rights platform, at the 1995 Queensland State Seminar of the League of Rights. Opposition leaders joined in the chorus. Zionist Jewish demands that the Labor party sack Campbell became increasingly strident. Campbell declined to give any assurances that he would not again speak on a League platform.

The Labor Party "proscribed" the League, while Liberal Party leader John Howard made it clear to the Zionist-Jewish leaders that while the Liberal Party would not formally proscribe the League, all Liberal Members would be made to understand that they must under no circumstances be associated with the League. All the parties were now toeing the Zionist-Jewish line. The question of Graeme Campbell came to a head

when Campbell appeared at a Sydney meeting of the *Australians Against Further Immigration*, and then launched a strong attack on Paul Keating and multiculturalism in the Commonwealth Parliament. A number of editorials around Australia welcomed the sacking of Campbell, stressing that one of his greatest sins was his association with the League of Rights.

A dramatic change in the Australian political scene

The anti-Campbell-League of Rights campaign has produced a dramatic change in the Australian political scene, with the possibility of candidates sponsored by Campbell, and broadly subscribing to the type of programme he is evolving, being either elected to the Senate, or recording such a heavy vote that there will be growing tensions inside all the political parties concerning Australia's future. The basic issue is national sovereignty versus internationalism. In a number of newspaper articles and interviews, Graeme Campbell has indicated the major objectives of his programme: politicians must begin to restore the trust of electors by offering them the opportunity both to veto and to initiate legislation. There must be an immediate reduction in immigration and an end to the funding of divisive multicultural programmes. There must be appropriate government policies to rapidly re-establish Australian industries. Financial policies are needed to preserve and strengthen the traditional Australian family. The Commonwealth Development Bank should be re-established and used to finance new and productive enterprises. Campbell wants an immediate increase in Defence programmes and the development of CSIRO and other research programmes, which could absorb talented young unemployed researchers.

Graeme Campbell is insistent that Australia has to start freeing itself from international entanglements, which impinge upon its sovereignty. He wisely appears to be confining himself to a limited number of basic objectives, without inviting controversy concerning detailed methods. He says, "*Where there is a will, there is a way*".

The destruction inflicted on the Australian people by all the major political parties cannot be overcome immediately. But as the wise Confucius said, "*The longest journey must start with the first step.*" Graeme Campbell is inviting his fellow Australians to join with him in taking those first steps.

GRAEME CAMPBELL TO GIVE AUSTRALIA DAY ORATION

Western Australian M.P. Graeme Campbell has announced that he will be outlining his political programme for a new political movement at the Heidelberg, Melbourne, Town Hall on Australia Day, January 26. This address will be known as *The Graeme Campbell Australia Day Oration*. It will be a major event in modern Australian political history. The Heidelberg Town Hall is in Upper Heidelberg Road. The address will be delivered at 3 p.m., but the doors will be open beforehand.

WHAT IS TRUTH?

by Michael Lane

It is not possible to see what our society is today except by looking at it from a distance; and that distance is provided by the past, by history. We must see the present with the eyes of the past. We can learn to see with the eyes of the past by entering into the world of our forebears by reading their writings and regarding their works. In the nature of things, this must usually be done on stolen time; thus, few people manage it. As a result, what was plain common sense for a thousand years and more strikes most people today as reckless innovation. It doesn't occur to them that the conventional wisdom of today is really the reckless innovation. Common sense is the last thing to earn any credence in a world that has got comfortable with the reign of complexities understood only by experts. The first and foremost of these commonsense truths is that Reality is something in particular. This is obvious but controversial; for if Reality is something in particular, then, equally obviously, it is *not* something else. Today, these are fighting words! Reality excludes Unreality; and this exclusivity is felt by some to be intolerable.

The transformation of history by the social sciences may be the most salient fact of our time. Subtly, the social sciences have weaned us from our wills by presenting "the times" as progressive and humanitarian *force*. The social sciences make us out as being at the mercy of impersonal forces that our best chance lies in propitiating. This propitiating goes by the name of Planning. Thus, we see the course of history as deterministic in its broad lines, but manipulable in detail. We recognise no Law of Heaven but a law of probability: we can't defeat the odds, but if we are clever enough, we can ride them!

But the truth is that our free will makes the content of the future a matter that we alone can determine. Our country, in all categories that count is what we have chosen to make it. Nor are our choices irrevocable. We can undo mistakes by the obvious recourse of retracing our steps. That does not mean changing the clocks. Clock time and calendar time, after all, are abstractions. Last year was called 1-9-9-5, this year is called 1-9-9-6. Does that somehow make us more committed? We live in the present, but which present? Is ancient Rome not part of my present? Must we imbibe the rhetoric of a few decades as if it were our mother's milk and disdain the universal wisdom of centuries? No, there is nothing inevitable about history as it happens nor, therefore, about where we are now. Indeed the whole *drama* of history is that it might have been different had people made different choices. Today, too, our choices are fettered by the nature of things - by human nature and by physical nature - not by the fact that we have "invested" something in one road or another. If it is a bad road, by all means let us cut our losses at once. We are nowise obliged to continue down a bad road merely because we have started on it. If we have an appointment in Paradise, shall we keep it in hell merely because we are running late?

"WE NEED TO SETTLE INTO THE LONG TRUTH"

"Time moves faster now. We accomplish more in a decade than our forebears did in a century." Do we? What if we "accomplish" so much by racing at breakneck speed down the wrong path? But the point is not to shorten time by speeding yourself up but to apply yourself to good purpose. To know

what a good purpose might be, we need to settle into the long truth.

The calendar will continue to click, whatever we do, so we should be less concerned with going "forward" than with going right. Our record lately is not so good. Everything seems to be an emergency. We pounce on a problem with a piece of legislation, which creates ten new problems of its own, to which we respond with ten new pieces of legislation. Instead, we should consider solving problems by undoing our bad work and selectively restoring some of the good that we cast aside. We will find that a great deal that was successful in the past we just threw away. Our tradition of Anglo-American and, behind that, Catholic freedom makes us uniquely fortunate. It means we do not have to be Utopian (or not very): we can reclaim the best that is already our heritage. If we look at the past in this way - with empathy and looking for successes - it opens up new options. It empowers us to repeat our successes; it does not leave us stuck with our mistakes. The fact that things are past proves that they are possible.

We suffer from up-to-the-minute-it is and think that the latest of everything is the best. We prize "state-of-the-art" technology. "Recent studies" unveil the "latest discoveries" of "leading experts". "We now know" things of which our poor benighted brethren of the year before last were ignorant. A flattering panorama of endless progress unfolds before our eyes. Not that we never stumble, but we believe probability drives us ever "forward" on average. Ethnocentricity is much maligned; but *chronocentricity* is far more pernicious. That we could be inferior to the ancients or medieval in any department is nothing short of unthinkable. The word "inferior" is scarcely in our vocabulary! After all, we have the advantage of their experience. We have not personally read their writings, of course, but *someone* has. "Our" experts have appropriated everything that was of value in the past and translated it, with improvements, into modern life. All solid knowledge can be found in the encyclopedia. Besides, knowledge is multiplying so fast these days that the expert can barely keep pace with his own field, much less take time to go down the bypath of its (no doubt fascinating) history: so sure are we that it is *just* history - that no *new* knowledge can be found in the past, that any knowledge that remains in the past has been tried and *failed*. We want new knowledge for a new day (sufficient for the day is the evil thereof).

"ON THE SHOULDERS OF GIANTS"

"We stand on the shoulders of giants" (and see further than they) is the compliment we pay our forebears. But the truth is that as far as we can see, we stand on the shoulders of *experts*. That is not necessarily a very comforting thought. However, they assure us that they stand on the shoulders of giants -or at least on the shoulders of a previous generation of experts, who in turn . . . Well, we have their word for it that the bona fide giants are down there somewhere, with their legs in the swamp, holding us all up. If they were not, *we* would be in the swamp -or falling thereto -which is unthinkable.

Among these giants, not the least is the Catholic Church. Being an ancient and venerable institution, it might be thought on that ground alone to have earned a measure of deference. But we have no patience with that, mere age cuts no figure

with us any more. We approach the Church armed with progressive doctrines that seem to have fallen from the sky and, in a trice, find the Church wanting. We go to the Church not for guidance but to make up our mind about it. *Our* beliefs are the court of last appeal, in which a two-thousand-year-old tradition may be summarily judged. The free thinker among us - the Mark Twain or Voltaire - supposes he can dispose of the legends of Creation, the Fall, the Incarnation, and the Resurrection with a few obvious questions that the Church fathers apparently, blinded by faith, never thought of. Whether reading the Bible, Aristotle, or a papal encyclical, we are welcome to "appreciate" their "contribution" to our cumulative civilisation; but unless we wish to be regarded as fools, we must not take them seriously as pertaining to our own time - a test that, we feel certain, *they* could not possibly survive.

To a social scientist, something written by a fellow social scientist as recently as the 1960s is already seriously hampered by its date. You simply can't tell such a person that human beings were writing intelligently about society three thousand years before the colleague ventured his - or her - little contribution. Intelligence, which always had the disadvantage of involving imagination, is now supplanted by the more blind (and therefore reliable) results of the Method. If the writings of the 1960s are already growing mouldy, such authors as Moses, Confucius, Aristotle, and Aquinas are obviously not even in the running. They are *objects* of study, not fellow scientists. We have no reason to want to see ourselves through their eyes. It would only show something about them, not about us, and we are too charitable to put them to such a test.

The social sciences are characterised by materialism (atheism or Deism), abstractionism, and determinism. The Manchester School of economists was an early manifestation of social science, and the three features can be found in both Darwin and Marx. Darwin, inspired by Malthus, believed that new organisms were formed by Chance and sorted out by competition for material needs and that man was the culmination of this process. Marx, also starting from the analysis of the Manchester School, posited a Law of Dialectic governing competition among humans, resulting inevitably in the history of class struggle. Both, in absence of a creating God, posit abstractions as formative agents; and neither gives human free will any sure footing. Materialism and abstractionism might superficially seem conflicting, but they are really perfect complements. With creative Heaven cut out, the only way left to talk about material things is by means of abstract concepts, that is, fictions - while Confucius' dictum was that a well-governed society depends on right thinking and sincerity and that right thinking and sincerity depend on "precise verbal definitions" based on "organic categories" (*The Great Digest*).

"FAITH" A WORD NOW IN DISREPUTE

"Faith" is the mind's direct apprehension of a thing, a type of knowledge that science rejects. Empirical science tries to discover the forest by abstracting from the trees. Empirical science tries to construct human nature by abstracting from its myriad manifestations (because human nature is *only* a construction). If it doesn't reject good and evil altogether, empirical science tries to construct them by abstracting from manifestations called "good" and "evil" by convention. In each case, only the material phenomena are presumed to have real

existence, and the goal of the inquiry is to develop a useful fiction. But this is awfully crude. Constructing nature from its manifestations may be like getting your concept of "health" from a survey of a plague-town. It fails to account for human nature as a *telos*. To a Christian of faith, Christ is the human telos; but the lowest common denominator that the social sciences seek would be - the human animal. The Good was a cosmic entity, providing authority; but the good as an abstraction carries no moral weight. Pain avoidance becomes the highest motive for the human animal. Have we turned God into an abstraction in order that we may believe in him safely?

"Faith" is one of those words from the past now in disrepute. To most people, it suggests unreasoning belief in anything, almost synonymous with "superstition". But faith is simply the necessity of our nature and precedes all empirical knowledge. Science, though it pretends to be superior to faith, is completely dependent on it. Mere reason applied to experience cannot come up with a single moral statement. That the universe has a meaning and a worth is a faith. That one seed properly sown, one true act, does affect the balance of Good and Evil in the universe (even if the earth should blow up tomorrow) is a faith. Even those who would deny such faith are nevertheless constrained to live as if they had it, or they could not go on living at all; for if the universe as a whole has no meaning, no fraction of it can attain to meaning, either. Indeed, we can reason backward and say that if faith gives us conviction in the meaning of the littlest thing (or own life, for example), we can be certain that the universe as a whole has a meaning. Faith knows the Fact on which all-lesser facts depend.

Empirical science has a humble but very important role to play. If philosophy is the handmaiden to theology, then empirical science is the handmaiden to the handmaiden. In its right use, it is a technique for examining physical nature. Today, however, it has broken its bonds and is agitating in all fields, presuming to lead the pack, having tossed philosophy and theology out the window or, worse, remade them in its own image. This has led to the wonderful social sciences, which, as they study human beings, should properly rest on an understanding of human nature as on a base. But the Church has known more about human nature and the "social science" for centuries than any social scientist knows today. In all seriousness, I deny that the social sciences possess *any* knowledge, because every piece of knowledge that they lay claim to stands on a rotten base, a false understanding of human nature; and a piece of knowledge in a false context is not knowledge at all. To some extent, this condition poisons the natural sciences, too; for they should be anthropocentric, centered, around man's needs. In our infinite cleverness, we have climbed to the shoulders of giants, then kicked them out from under us.

FAITH SHOULD BE A STRAIGHT LINE TO TRUTH

Christianity has been many things in our civilisation. It has been reserved to our time to make of it a "bias". This curious word "bias" can tell us a lot about our present whereabouts, for it bears an unmistakable resemblance to "faith". Rightly speaking, faith should be a straight line to the truth, and bias should be a deviant line that misses the truth. But to the social scientist, bias is *any* line, that is, any point of view (because there is no particular truth); and faith would be simply naive bias, the belief in a particular truth. Bias includes the idea of

interest or passion, it is a point of view in which we can enlist some passion. The social sciences teach that bias is (1) something inevitable and (2) something to be minimised. All points of view are considered to be subjective, that is, merely personal. Only material facts are objective. The scientific ideal would be to have no point of view, to eliminate the subject, to enlist no passion, to be value-free. But since some bias is considered inevitable, the second-best thing is to "be aware" on one's bias and employ mathematical procedures to offset it, with the idea that a scatter of biases (that is, lies) stands the best chance of hitting the truth: the shotgun approach to truth. In fact, the social scientist's all-great Method amounts to playing the odds, as if the truth were a pot to be won in a poker game.

What is missing here is any sense of purpose; for a purpose would be a preconceived value, and a preconceived value would be a bias. So social science and scientific history glorify the *disinterested* pursuit of knowledge. It is supposed to be possible and desirable to present facts independently of any use to which they will be put. But how does a scientist decide what facts to look for in the first place? How does he decide what questions to ask? As a society, how do we decide what sort of research to promote? The answers to all these questions imply a program. There is no knowledge, even ideally that comes purely from the bottom up, from "raw data". A point of view -which will ultimately be found to be a *moral* point of view - is the foundation of all knowledge. Confucius remarked to a disciple "You think I make a lot of studies and commit things to memory? No. For me, there is one thing that flows through, holds things together, germinates" (Analects 15.2). The question is not whether a research project should have a program - a motive - but whether it should have a hidden program masquerading as "objectivity" or a program frankly espoused.

SCIENCE SHOULD BE THE HANDMAIDEN OF PHILOSOPHY

Furthermore, a history built up from minute particulars in themselves meaningless can never *make sense*. A history that would make sense would be a moral story. It would lead us a little distance to discern the right way and moral courage to go that way. The past is *not* to be studied for its own sake, out of curiosity. Curiosity alone results in entire careers devoted to elucidating the most obscure trivia. But if we wish to be serious, then unless we need the pasts and know why we need it, we can enlist no passion in its study. The humblest fact can be part of the picture, but it has to be made part of the picture; for if we have to wait on a slow accumulation of minutiae *before* we can hope to see the broad picture, it is all over for us: we shall not have the picture in time to use it. Rather, science should be the handmaiden of philosophy. The essential moral picture and the essential fact of human nature should not be the eventual, hoped-for outcome of research, they should guide research; for otherwise, what would we do in the meantime? Without these moral givens, we could not live; nor could we have any reason to pursue science. Have we not yet realised that the universe is too *big* to be observed and that therefore, only faith can know it?

In fact, the proliferation of knowledge for its own sake quite apart from any use to which it is anticipated putting it has its exact counterpart in the economic world, in capital production for its own sake quite apart from the calls of

consumption. Knowledge *is* a kind of capital and is only legitimated by being put to use. Therefore, we should pursue knowledge in a spirit not of disinterest but of interest -bias, if you like. We should approach the study of the past with faith and empathy. Faith is that which social science says cannot exist -bias in favour of the truth. Empathy is the ability to see people of the past as real people living in real time, our "neighbours" in time, whom the Christian precept bids us love (as, indeed, they showed their love for us in many of the things they made). Without such empathy, no analytical techniques can help us because we cannot enter the door; and whatever facts we find, we will not know what they mean. The continuity of human nature is our sole reason for studying the past in the first place: if they were not like us, their experiences would not serve us.

Social science lauds "objectivity" and "balance"; but real objective history would be history according to objective values, and real balance would mean that everything fell according to its true moral weight. Real history has heroes and villains, though the social scientists will have a good laugh at your simplicity if you ask for such. Real heroes and villains, however, are not simple people. Their souls are fencing grounds where the perilous struggle between good and evil is played out. That is why the Bible is still the history of histories. The Bible takes a point of view without apology. Indeed, it claims that it takes as its point of view the truth. Whatever flaws scientific scholarship may find in it, it establishes the moral arrow fixed for all-time and so is history *for use*. The arguments of textual critics simply are not as interesting to a sane person as the great moral meaning of the Bible. A preoccupation with the former at the expense of the latter betrays a dwarf like mind.

"IT TAKES SOME PASSION TO TELL THE TRUTH"

Beware the seamlessly objective, endlessly qualifying, and professionally non-judgmental and "scientific" histories. These bloodless productions would seduce us to a godless web. It takes some passion to tell the truth! Isn't that obvious? There is a difference between passion its own law and passion in its place, which is the service of truth. There is a difference between the passion of bias and the passion of faith, the passion of ideology and the passion of principle. But "managed" bias in the place of passion -that is a pose. Beware of any history that claims to have no program: it has one. Materialism, abstractionism, and determinism *is* a program.

Human nature is something in particular, not an ever-changing sprite and not a convenient fiction. Similarly, the structure of the universe (which I prefer to call Heaven's Law) is something in particular. The two fit together: man's nature is the role he is given to play in the universe, the portion of Heaven's Law that applies to him, which he is obliged to ascertain and obey. It is not prideful to hope for such knowledge; on the contrary, it is prideful to suppose that we are able to live without it. Animals have no need of it but man, being created with free will, needs to know the *why* of his action before he can act. He needs to know how his action comports with Heaven's Law. To say that man could have been created with a real need for something in itself imaginary would be to make of God a cruel tyrant, of the universe a cruel joke. This ultimate cynicism might be a mathematically rational possibility; but it is nevertheless a perversion of human nature

and, at root, evil. Of those who will dare say the universe is a cruel joke, few are serious enough about it to live accordingly, that is, by chaotic violence. Some say religion is a running away from the Abyss of meaninglessness, as if there were something wonderfully brave in "facing" meaninglessness. But meaninglessness has no face: it is precisely what frees us from having to face anything. I suggest that the glorification of meaninglessness is running away from religion, from *sense* that threatens to vex us.

Human nature is something in particular. Like an acorn, a human being has a built-in direction, a telos. An acorn cannot become, indifferently, an oak tree or a coral reef. The arbor culturist must guess the seed's nature correctly and apply the right conditions: earth, air, water, and sunlight. The Utopian reformer who dumps acorns into the sea will wait a long time. Achieving the human telos does depend on our will, but no more than the acorn can human nature be whatever we want it to. Earth, air, water, and sunlight are *freedom* for an acorn; freedom *from* earth, air, water and sunlight would have no meaning. Similarly, those social conditions that will enable man to fulfill his nature are freedom for a man. Absence of any conditions, insofar as that is imaginable, would not be freedom. Man's nature must be given before the conditions of his freedom can be known.

"*The truth shall make you free,*" says the Gospel. But so far as truth threatens to be something in particular, we want no part of it. We want to be free *from* the truth, as if that had a meaning; but the name for freedom from truth is -Folly. The truth might put us in the wrong, and we are very jealous today of our rights to have our opinions unmolested. The truth might sting our consciences and compel us to change our lives, whereas we want the privilege of inventing our own truth and living as we please. We pretend this is a grave responsibility. We think ourselves rather brave to live with questions, instead of "taking refuge" in answers - as if answers were not imperatives but just explanations, having heard which we might go back to sleep. But can a person who eschews answers be said to be asking questions *sincerely*?

"RELIGION CAN FREE MAN'S SOUL FROM EVIL"

Knowledge - truth - multiplies our options. Just as technology can free man's body from toil by discovering and applying Heaven's Law. Freedom for an acorn is specifically freedom to become an oak tree, and freedom for a man is freedom to become a Man. Which is freedom, the mission, with its road and school and books, or the jungle? Does the jungle free you from having to live in the mission, or does the mission free you from having to live in the jungle? Do you want to be free as an animal is free or free as a man is free? In its crusade to abolish the subject with its free will, social science from Darwin on has declared that man *is* an animal.

Like the mission in the jungle, the Church has cleared a little ground for us to think in. As a matter of fact, it has cleared quite a large ground for us to think in. Without a framework, no thinking is possible; without limits, no freedom; without language, no talk. The mission has a perimeter, because it is a particular thing. That does not mean that it cannot both improve its precincts and expand into new territory, but it does mean that it will not willingly *retreat*. There is no compulsion: you are still free to hack brush in the virgin forest if you want to. But the Church offers a picture of

the world that is large, varied, and consistent; full of adventure; rich in good things (including the ancient liberal arts, which the Church brought to us out of the past); and also with its quota of evil. Indeed, it is much like the real world. It is a world of free human wills but a world *precisely defined*. Freedom *from* definition would have no meaning: fog is not freedom. The church's supple Latin language is a framework in which to think. So, for that matter, is our Norman English. Shall we now say that it would be better to speak without limits - without a language - if that were possible? Shall we free ourselves from the bonds of language and revive our true animal "free speech" of grunts, clicks and whirs? Okay, so life is not black and white! Let's at least have precise shades of grey! Everything is precisely *something*. Give us "precise verbal definitions" based on "organic categories". "Mystery," beautifully said Jean Cocteau. "only exists in precise things."

Isn't it interesting that applying a framework results in variety, while kicking the framework away results in sameness? Perhaps this is because this particular framework reinforces free will, which enhances our ability to choose and so to be human and individual; whereas seeking freedom by kicking the framework away leaves us at the mercy of our animal selves, which are more predictable.

"THE EXISTENCE OF EXTERNAL TRUTH"

The right to one's opinion, of which we are so extremely sensitive, means the right to search for truth and inevitably make mistakes. It doesn't mean that mistakes are not mistakes. It presupposes the existence of external truth; otherwise, the whole business would be meaningless. An opinion, as such, has no particular status and deserves no particular treatment. Freedom of speech is a precious *political* freedom: it protects not your opinion but you. Freedom of speech means that you may not be imprisoned or fined for your opinion or hindered from speaking it. The Church will be in the forefront of those defending your right to free speech (and hence thought) without yielding an inch of its confidence in its unique possession of the truth. Free speech is your political right to make mistakes, not your intellectual "right" to be stupid. An opinion asks to be measured by the truth, and a wrong opinion should be intellectually punished. If there is no truth except private truth, what am I reaching for when I form an opinion, or why should I spend any time on it?

Imagine a teacher giving an astronomy lesson. In this setting, students making mistakes is simply part of the process. Their "right" to make them is not an issue. Wouldn't it be strange for a student to declare, "I have a right to believe what I please about it," or, worse: "I'm glad this is true for you, but this other is true for me"? We easily recognise the existence of particular truth in the study of the heavens, but not when it comes to the study of Heaven. Yet "make up your own religion" is just as much a piece of lunacy as "make up your own astronomy". Again, imagine you lived in the sixteenth century and were undertaking a voyage to America. Other explorers have spent years traversing the land, learning local languages, penetrating westward. A map of America skilfully drawn by such a one would be a precious document. Would it make sense to complain of such a map that the rivers and other features were drawn *in particular places*? Would you rather take such a map reminding you of limitations or a blank parchment to draw on as you please? Which would make you freer?

Christianity claims to be the warp and woof of the universe, not just an interesting set of opinions. Therefore, it has a right to expect us to accept or reject it on those terms. The Church, for better or worse, chooses to define itself in an exclusive way. On those terms, it is either true or false: the one thing it is not is one of any number of equally valid personal worldviews. If Christianity is a view *of the world*, you cannot at the same time call it a "personal belief". Nor can you say that a view *of the world* is true "for you". Is the God you believe in the creator of the world or the creator of just you? You can't say that the Christian view of the world is true for Christians and the Jewish view of the world (say) is true for Jews and both are equally true (the world having nothing to say about it). If the Jewish view of the world is true *of the world*, then I want someone to persuade me of it, and I will become a Jew. Or if what you mean is that *no* religion is true, then let's renounce our religion; for there is nothing compelling us to profess some belief or other if, in fact, all are false.

"... WHO HAS THE RIGHT TO SAY WHAT THE NATURE OF THE UNIVERSE SHOULD BE?"

Religion is not subjective! Heaven is not whatever we choose to make it! Here the freethinking egalitarian retorts, "But who has the right to say what the nature of the universe is?" In itself, this is a *very important* question. Our egalitarian, however, if not asking it seriously. For him, it is a rhetorical question and means that if everyone doesn't have the right, then no one has the right, and if no one has the right, then the universe *has no nature*. I wish people would clearly separate two issues: whether the universe has a nature is one question, and who might know this nature is another. I suggest that, answering the first question by faith in the affirmative, we should ask the second in all sincerity, really wanting to know; and then we may be favored with an answer. However, anyone who would conceive of being Heaven's lieutenant as a "right" to be jealously fought over, rather than an awesome responsibility conferred on the humblest, by that alone condemns himself.

Heaven is; and we are saved or ruined (in this life) as we follow Heaven or not. Say otherwise, and you make of good one human custom and of evil an alternate human custom. Without the moral compass, we can live only as animals. In fact, under the influence of the social sciences, we have turned the old wisdom of good and evil, without actually repudiating it, into simply an unobvious cost-benefit analysis. T.S. Eliot, in *The Rock*, echoes the old wisdom:

*Take no thought of the harvest
But only of proper sowing.*

This does not mean do not act according to the best lights of science (agricultural or moral). It means, having acted according to the best lights of science, you have done your part. The harvest of corn is not the most important thing, and the moral harvest cannot fail.

Consider the old story, "The Seven Blind Men and the Elephant". Each man touches a different part of the elephant and takes the elephant to be like the part he touches: a wall, a tree, a fan, a rope, and so on. What does the story mean? Just as the universe is too big to be observed and so must be grasped by faith, the elephant is too big to be held and so must be grasped by sight. Yet in this story all are blind. If sight is like faith, blindness is like bias. Without sight, how do the men know that they have an "elephant," instead of seven different things? How do they know there is such a thing as an "elephant"? If they are social scientists and proceed to

"compensate for their biases" and "construct" an elephant out of the various pieces, would that be a true picture? Finally, what will happen when a sighted person walks up and tells what he sees? The answer is that when fools are in charge, the ubiquity of folly becomes a dogma.

"HIERARCHY . . . IS TO BE SEEN EVERYWHERE"

"Linear, either/or thinking!" someone cries. I don't deny it, but I just call it "thinking". Thinking discriminates between things and so brings them into relationship. The structure of the universe is a heavenly structure, or hierarchy. Thinking aids in mapping it. Hierarchy - the relation between root and branch - is to be seen everywhere. We see it in the sun and planets, in the white-light spectrum, in harmonics, in the periodic table of elements, in a spider's web and the spider itself, in the human body, in an internal combustion engine, in chess, in language, in architecture, and in all human social relations and institutions. Thus, if I know by faith that the universe has a purpose and therefore that I have a purpose in it, I also know that my life has a place in a hierarchy. Hierarchy, again, implies particularity, rather than the blurring of boundaries.

There is a reason why the character of truth as something in particular is disturbing to some people: it seems to bear the mark of a personality. Rather than an impersonal and timeless model of reality such as a mathematician might generate with a minimum of postulates, Christianity makes of the universe a world and a story. It has an organic quality that reflects the delight in creation and makes each law and each detail unique, like snowflakes or the turnings of a vine tendril. It has the characteristic of a story that you can't be sure what will happen next. The modern scientist is apt to identify "laws" of specified degrees of probability and the "explain" variation by pointing to the corresponding degree of improbability; in other words, he attributes variation to chance. Try to define "chance," and I think you will see that this approach can never stand. This is not a *likely* universe, nor is it all possible universes. Rather, an Artist has exercised his arbitrary taste and pleasure to make a single, unlikely universe. That is what is so disturbing. A likely universe would more resemble the one described in the words, "The earth was void and vacant, and darkness was upon the face of the depth." Planned probability is the totalitarian concept of order.

Surprisingly enough, this gives us an opening onto another feature of Christianity that is a stumbling block for many, revelation. We want a logically perfect universe such as we might confirm by spinning it out of our own minds, independently of knowing it. Instead, we are given a particular universe too capacious to be observed, whose structure we cannot grasp - whose story we cannot know - unless they are told to us. Thus, the particularity of the truth means that we depend on revelation to know it. And we need to know it. The reason for your being here (beyond any private reason) and the higher laws of our existence (beyond just bodily laws) are knowledge that we need if we are to have any basis for consciously living and acting in accordance with our free will (free will being the most unlikely thing in this unlikely universe of ours). Yet because human reason cannot grasp the universe in toto but only examine fractions of it, it is impossible for us to discover this knowledge.

"FAITH IS A PREREQUISITE FOR LIVING"

Then comes the Church, testifying as a witness, confirming what we can know -that reality is something in particular, that

we possess free will and responsibility, that some kind of faith is a prerequisite for living -and then revealing other things that we could not know, about Christ the human telos, good and evil, faith, and freedom. Each must assess for himself the credibility of this witness. In confirming what we can know, does she not merit our faith as to what we cannot know? Is this not a proof beyond a reasonable doubt "and to a moral certainty" (i.e., to a certainty, as long as it is true that we live in a moral universe)?

We can perceive the progress of the rot invading our social fabric because, through the eyes of the past (which is still part of our present), we have also seen sound cloth. The sight may sadden us, but at least it will make sense. Freedom may be gained through the ability to discern, and the moral courage to take, the necessary step. And the necessary step may be, in itself simple.

PREPARING FOR THE BIG EVENT OF 1996.

This year marks the fiftieth anniversary of The Australian League of Rights -a major milestone in Australian history. No movement has been more vilified than the League. Rooted in the Truths of the Social Credit revelation as presented by C.H. Douglas, The Australian League of Rights has grown into what even its critics admit is the most influential non-party movement in Australia. The importance of the League will become much clearer after the coming Federal Elections.

Appropriate steps are being planned to ensure that this fiftieth anniversary is commemorated in a fit and proper manner, with the annual *New Times* Dinner, being held in Melbourne on the first Friday in October, being one of the major highlights. It is anticipated that there will be a number of overseas visitors. Veteran Canadian Social Creditor and National Director of the Canadian League of Rights, Ron Gostick, will be attending with his wife. And a number of supporters from all around Australia have already indicated that they intend to participate in this historic event. The League's National Weekend will include both the National Seminar on the Saturday and the National Action Conference on the Sunday.

We will as soon as possible be publicising some of the events planned for the National Weekend. But the first and most urgent requirement is that those League supporters who anticipate attending *The New Times* let the organisers know as soon as possible. A suitable and most appropriate Melbourne venue has already been booked, but it is conceivable that it will not be big enough. If this happens, alternative arrangements will have to be made. Please assist the organisers by indicating as early as possible if it is your firm intention to attend. All correspondence to Box 1052J., G.P.O., Melbourne 3001.

BASIC FUND PASSES \$50,000

Magnificent and inspiring responses to the League of Rights' Basic Fund appeal has carried the total past \$50,000. Under present conditions, this effort is striking proof of the dynamic spirit of the League of Rights.

Words fail us in attempting to respond adequately to a truly great achievement. But the "target" of \$60,000 still remains to be achieved. Another \$8,000 is required to reach the objective. All donations to Box 1052J. G.P.O. Melbourne.

MULTICULTURALISM AND THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE

The American scene continues to provide striking evidence of the failure of multiculturalism. Writing in *The December* issue of her *Phyllis Schlafly Report* (P.O. Box 618, Alton, Illinois, 62002, U.S.A.) Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly, one of America's most outstanding conservative writers, warns that multiculturalism is leading towards the abolition of English as the nation's basic language. One result is that a movement has developed to make English the official language. Twenty-two States have already made English their official language. In Florida, the official English proposition passed by 84 per cent, in California by 75 per cent, and in Colorado by 61 per cent.

Phyllis Schlafly comments, "The movement to legislate English as our official language has nothing to do with what language you speak in your home, church, or club, or what foreign languages you may care to learn. It has to do only with what language is promoted and paid for by the government. Few Americans realise that current federal law requires ballots to be printed in non-English language if only five per cent of the population in a voting jurisdiction, or ten thousand people, speak a language other than English. 375 voting districts in 21 States are now required by the federal government to provide voting ballots and election material in foreign languages. In San Francisco, voting materials are printed in three languages. In Los Angeles, ballots printed in Spanish, Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Tagalong and Korean cost the taxpayers \$900,000 (US) in last year's mayoral election."

Australia is moving in the same direction as the USA. As the multicultural lobby extends its influence through the bureaucracy, the demand grows for the introduction of bi-lingualism. Mrs. Schlafly says there is a hidden agenda behind the bi-lingual education programme. The destructive programme of attempted forced bi-lingualism in Canada was the brainchild of Fabian socialist Trudeau and his fellow centralists.

Mrs. Schlafly comments, "The bilingual dedication lobby now asserts that evidence of effectiveness is not important because the decision of how to teach immigrant children is a 'cultural' not a pedagogical issue. Some admit openly that the purpose of bilingual education is not assimilation at all, but to make foreign language and culture an integral part of American society. Some advocates see bilingual education as the first step in a radical transformation of the United States into a nation without one common language or fixed borders . . . The historian Theodore White points out, 'It is distasteful that a nation whose seal bears the inscription *E Pluribus Anum* (From the Many, One) should be asked to divide itself from one nation into many tribes.' A voice from another era, President Theodore Roosevelt, bluntly expressed the same, consistent American doctrine. The one absolute certain way of bringing this nation to ruin would be to permit it to become a tangle of squabbling nationalities. We must also have but one language and that language is English'."

Australia's best-known historian, Geoffrey Blainey, has warned of the multicultural threat to true Australian unity. The coming Federal elections should be used by responsible Australians to cast their votes in protest against any more multicultural madness.