

CHAPTER 1

Failure of the "Old Orders"

(Analysis)

Society consists of individuals and authorities. There is an inherent conflict between man who wants to do "his own thing" and authorities which can not always permit this and often force the individual to do things which he does not want to do.

Social conflicts can be minimal when authorities are strong. This strength may depend on intellectual or spiritual convictions when the views and regulations of leaders are followed more or less willingly by members of society or it may depend on sheer physical strength when authorities enforce their rule and crush criticism by drastic punishment.

Strong police states and dictatorships always appear to have social peace, "consensus of opinion" and an absence of significant social conflicts. This is achieved by cruel oppression of the dissenters. As we have learnt from history and experience, the dissenter in such societies risks torture, cruelty and extermination at the hands of the inquisitor, the concentration camp guard, the commissar and similar defenders of the prevailing order.

In democracies, where the physical strength of authorities is limited, social conflicts cannot be pacified by the summary liquidation of dissenters. There the solution of conflicts depends on whether the community of individuals accepts the justifications offered by the authorities (that is the leaders in politics, economics, moralities, sciences and administration) for the rules which restrict the freedom of action and choice of the Individual.

Authorities in free societies are constantly being criticised and as a result changes, adjustments and improvements occur regularly. There are, however, periods when either the changes do not occur soon enough or the actions of the leaders are not convincingly justified.

Significant changes in knowledge, new discoveries, improve-

ments in communications, transportation and education have vital bearing on the thinking of mankind. Such developments undermine existing traditions and authorities, and they necessitate new attitudes and rules of behaviour in response to the discontent and violently increasing conflicts within society.

The periods of the Reformation and the French Revolution are but a few historic similes relevant to our times in the second half of the twentieth century.

In the last decade the areas and the intensity of conflicts between the Individual and authorities of democratic societies have increased to an alarming degree. At other times conflicts flared up independently in various fields. There were wage differences; there were problems concerning social security or morality, or war, or racial discrimination. In our times all these problems have acquired a sense of urgency; they have become interrelated and new conflicts have erupted in the fields of pollution and conservation and in the snowballing side effects of computerised technology such as rocket developments, atomic contamination and the highly effective guerilla techniques of minorities holding communities to ransom by attacks against vulnerable airplanes, universities, etc.

There is a trend towards polarisation of the antagonists in today's social conflicts. Democratic society is not geared to devote a large proportion of communal funds to the maintenance of order. The number and the intensity of conflicts overtax the capacities of intellectual, moral, scientific and civic authorities to justify their actions and, perhaps in defence, they become inflexible, authoritarian, repressive. They attempt all sorts of means to justify their actions — and in the process they lose their credibility.

On the other hand frustration in achieving their aims to secure improvements and reforms causes the dissenters to fight anything which seems like authority — irrespective of whether they themselves have a better alternative or not. A mood of violence is becoming evident; demonstrations, "change-for-change's-sake" programs are the order of the day without any responsible program for the future.

Social conflicts are so widespread in free democratic societies today that we must consider that society, as such, is in a state of continuous conflict.

If we question the basic reasons for this state of affairs we shall find that the roots of different modern social conflicts go back to the same common causes.

Failure of the "Establishments"

A crisis of trust developed in the mind of the citizen during the twentieth century.

He has learnt, at his own expense, that political authorities cannot be trusted. Official proclamations stating that the currency will not be devalued are just as meaningless as solemn declarations of "non-aggression" pacts.

Religious authorities have given just as much cause for criticism and mistrust. When churches were faced with the choice of opposing political forces in order to uphold their faith or of losing property, status or privileges, they were reluctant to bear witness and suffer the consequences.

Political leaders and ideologists have drugged the masses with promises of paradise on earth while they have squandered the efforts of the people on war hardware and unworkable economic experiments and have sacrificed the best brains in forced labor camps — only to abandon the futile sacrifices and to start with new experiments.

People have been forced to lose faith in their leaders and have come to treat official announcements with even less credence than commercial advertisements. In the case of advertisements one is at least on one's guard, knowing that sellers do not pretend to act only in the interests of buyers. Authorities, however, claim and pretend to represent the interests of the community. So today's citizen feels abandoned by his leaders and betrayed by those in whom he has placed his trust. Belief in faiths, values and morals are shaken or lost and he is left to his own devices to decide whose advice, preaching, promises or tips he shall follow.

People now accept as a matter of fact that authorities and "establishments" are hypocritical.

Since the old-established authorities have betrayed the trust given to them, people have been looking for new philosophies and social orders. Most of those tried in the twentieth century have failed after having extracted a terrible price in cruelty, destruction and persecution.

We have developed a bitter distrust towards all authority and social reformers. We suspect that all ideals which pretend

to benefit society are in truth confidence tricks which hide the selfish motive serving the interest of the promoters. We search for the hidden benefits, for the pressure group behind every preaching propagandist. We can hardly believe that there is anyone who is not a hypocrite.

Hypocrisy

According to the dictionary, hypocrisy is: pretence, simulation, false profession to be what one is not.

The basic common claim of both worldly authorities (political, economic) and spiritual authorities (moralities, religions) is that their laws, morals and restrictions serve primarily the interests of each individual.

From this basic claim most authorities develop a justification that the interest of the individual is the same as the "public interest" or that satisfying this "public interest" is a pre-condition for the satisfaction of the interest of the individual.

Both worldly and spiritual authorities — and even some scientific authorities — stake their trustworthiness on claims which require them to be unselfish, altruistic servants of the individual members of society. No wonder that such pretence and hypocrisy cannot be maintained under modern critical examination facilitated by widespread education and communication.

The phenomena (which we apprehend under different names such as "credibility gap", "mistrust of the Establishment", "the corrosion of beliefs", "the failure of moralities") stem from this common root. It is the **pretence** of an impossible "unselfish" public attitude which has made all authorities suspect.

The businessman who claims that his **primary** aim is to satisfy the public — and not to make profit — is either a hypocrite or a failure.

The parent who claims to act in his child's interest when he blackmails the child into living a life which the parent chooses is a hypocrite.

The religious man is a hypocrite if he condones the treatment of some people as secondrate citizens when he claims to believe in the God-given equality of men.

Colonialists are hypocrites when they claim that they act primarily for the benefit of backward natives.

Who would believe everything which advertisements say, the promises of politicians, what the propagandists preach?

Before there is a chance to solve social conflicts, before reforms can be considered on their merit, this atmosphere of mis-trust and the resulting confusion and emotional aggressiveness must be eliminated.

How can we hope to re-establish trust and credibility in this prevailing attitude of mutual pretence?

I believe that no philosophy, morality or even foreign aid or community help can expect to be accepted without an investigation to show the interests of the promoters.

People who have been taken in by confidence tricks are wary. Hypocrisy undermines trust much more than confidence tricksters ever can. When a "con-man" is found out people know him for what he is and so his mischief is not associated with the degradation of ideals of justice, morality or scientific integrity.

If a man cheats, embezzles money or commits fraud he does not necessarily cast a shadow on the whole group of people to whom he happens to belong. He will be treated as a criminal — as a person different from the others who happen to follow the same occupation.

The true hypocrite even believes that he really is what he pretends to be. When he is faced with discovery and is confronted with proof that he did not act unselfishly as he claimed, then he says that some ulterior ideal aim, such as the future happiness of a community or life after death, justifies his lies, misuse of justice or power, etc.

Such hypocrisy undermines the general credibility of all authorities. It is difficult to prove the trickery of clever cheats. How much more difficult is it to prove the falseness, the corruption, the hypocrisy of officials.

People fear the unknown and mistrust the man with hidden ulterior motives — the hypocrite.

People know that the motive force of Life is the satisfaction

of the interest of Self. Without this force all life stops; plants die; the ovum cannot survive; animals become extinct and man would certainly not have reached this day and age.

Deny that you are activated by self-interest and you are a hypocrite. You conceal your true motives and intentions behind a pretence and you become feared, mistrusted and suspect — perhaps even more than you deserve.

Can we truthfully deny that foreign aid, charity, parental discipline or strict morality are meant to serve our "enlightened" self-interest?

As long as leaders of society and worldly and spiritual authorities pretend that they are acting primarily in the interests of others, the present state of mistrust will only worsen, the "credibility gap" will widen, the dissenting protest will gather momentum until the outbreak of violence cannot be avoided. Consequently authorities, moralities, organised religions or scientific organisations must reveal their interests in the rules, laws, restrictions, licences which they propose to introduce into the social order before they can be trusted.

When authorities will provide the Individual with effective protection against official abuse and corruption instead of pretending that such things do not exist; when organised religions will admit their interests in mundane matters; when moralities face up to their inner contradictions and scientists admit their limitations, then — and only then — will there be a revival of trust in the so-called "Establishments", in the leaders whom all societies need to maintain order by solving social conflicts.

What are the specific causes which led to this mistrust?

It is essential that we know why the "Old Orders" failed society so that we can attempt to eliminate the causes by specific reforms.

Why are authorities mistrusted?

Modern democratic authorities claim that they serve the interests of the citizen. In fact the citizen is justified in claiming

that all authorities tend to perpetuate the privileges of pressure groups.

In past dictatorships or societies where authorities were openly the representatives of the ruling classes there was no such pretence necessary and they were accepted as the tools of the leaders.

In democratic societies it is essential for peace and order that the community should not feel deceived by authorities. Such deception is sometimes intentional as when governments act not for the benefit of the citizen but for the strengthening of the power of authorities and public servants; when they legislate in favour of the electoral groups which keep them in power. Sometimes authorities act against the interests of the citizen out of confusion and lack of principles, and often they do not act at all when there is need to protect individual interests.

The classic test of individual freedom and the service of authorities comes when a citizen disputes authority. Although the citizen has many "rights" he has little effective opportunity to claim his rights against the might of authorities because of lack of cheaply accessible, independent arbitrators or Ombudsmen.

There is formal "Consumer Protection" but in practice the representatives of consumers are in a minority. There is a pretence of "free enterprise" economy but in fact restrictive practices are perpetrated, with the blessing of authorities, by various pressure groups: supplier, labour and professional organisations.

Inefficiency, waste, misuse of public facilities and even corruption are accepted as part and parcel of public administration which is sheltered by all governments in fear of the powerful public service pressure group.

Authorities pretend to uphold the equal rights of citizens but they perpetrate gerrymanders and voting systems which happen to favour them. The requests of rank-and-file members for law reforms are regularly disregarded by governing parties.

Disregard of the requests of the citizen result in inefficiency and waste. Justice and litigation are too costly and slow and unnecessarily complicated, etc., etc.

Authorities pretend to uphold the rights of the citizen to act freely and claim to restrain his rights only to protect the rights of others BUT they create restrictions in violation of these principles and force the individual to behave in prescribed

ways — even if no harm is done. Censorship restricts what adults may read or see. Laws interfere with the private sexual behaviour of consenting adults.

There is concealment and withholding of information far beyond the necessity to protect national and military interests. Authorities attempt to mislead and deceive their critics in order to cover up their shortcomings, mistakes and abuse of power. Decrees and bylaws which are not subject to public criticism provide insurmountable obstacles to the lone citizen who objects to decisions of authority. Information — collected at the cost of the community — is withheld from the citizen who wishes to use it in argument against authorities.

Public statements, prognoses and promises turn out to be deceitful propaganda or at least gravely misleading mistakes. The citizen learns to mistrust statements on the devaluation of the currency, victories in war and promises made and broken.

Authorities, quick to enforce unnecessary restrictions, fail to provide adequate security and safety which should be their fundamental function. There is notorious absence of vigorous action to deal with the road toll, with pollution, with smoking hazards. There is little attention and effort made to check increasing crime waves and violence. There is significant lack of protection from company, credit and debt frauds or share manipulation.

The contradictions between principles and practice which exist in all kinds of authorities, both in the west and in the east, are not all intentional and sinister in character. Many of the faults lie in the unprincipled craving for power of political parties with the result that authorities are forced to go against their principles in order to buy the support of minority pressure groups. This attitude results in the undertaking of responsibilities which it is beyond the ability of the community to finance.

To gain support authorities undertake obligations to provide unlimited social services, education, public transport, decentralisation, subsidies, etc. Since such extravagant promises cannot be kept the resulting disappointment only increases the mistrust.

Such unprincipled actions, which show the citizen clearly that the primary interest of authority is to hang on to power and not to serve the electors, the individual or, as it claims, the "community" undermine completely the credibility and trustworthiness of the leadership. This kind of deceit erodes the support of the original followers of the party in power because

such an attitude prevents the necessary changes and reforms to adjust to changing conditions.

The resistance of authorities to reforms wanted by their own supporters, and to control over abuses of power and their arrogant disregard of complaints build up frustrations and dissatisfactions in the community to a degree where violence appears to be the only solution.

This "Credibility Gap" must be eliminated before various frustrated segments of the community will believe that violence, strikes, demonstrations, etc., are not the only ways to reform and to control deceitful and abusive authority.

The Corrosion of Beliefs

One of the most significant characteristics of the twentieth century man is the loss of belief in his leaders and a growing scepticism of their pronouncements.

The shocks and upheavals following two world wars, tremendous scientific progress, vastly extending education and communications have disproved the validity of many traditional beliefs. The solemn statements of political leaders have been broken; the promises and prognoses of religious leaders have not come true; and the little people who have gullibly followed the advice of their leaders have lost their savings in devaluations, inflations or wars and have lost their faith when preachers of unselfish moralities have not come to the aid of the persecuted, the exploited, the duped.

A 1970 Australian Gallup poll showed that 87% of adults believed in God but only 47% believed in life after death and 35% believed in Hell. Comparisons with other countries reveal a similar disbelief in some of the fundamental articles of faith of organised religions.

Why do sectarian religions fail when in fact the disturbed man of our times is searching for faith? Especially in confused times, man wants to know the reasons why his life is so difficult, how he can solve his problems, what is his purpose in

Life. He wants answers to the questions of where he comes from and what happens to him when he dies and what he is striving, rushing and struggling for.

Any answer to these questions is based on some hypothesis which we call belief. Of course the answers to the questions must be acceptable; they must not be contradictory. The system of answers which is based on the hypothesis that our universe has been created for some definite reason — not by accident — and that there is a purpose towards which life progresses is called religion.

The fact that 87% of Australians believe in God shows their need for religion. The fact that less than half of them accept basic teachings of various formal religious denominations shows how credibility has eroded.

The first obvious reason for the decline in belief is that sectarian religions base their teachings on rigid, inflexible, dogmatic, doctrinaire statements. They claim to possess infallible knowledge gained through revelation. The answers which religions give concerning the facts of nature come into conflict with our scientific knowledge. Religions tend to disregard the need to adapt their doctrines to scientific proof. When man has to solve his immediate problems of navigation, flood control, healing and family planning he finds that fundamentalist religions give no acceptable answers whereas science does. He is bound to lose faith.

Belatedly and slowly, religions are reluctantly changing from primitive superstitions to modern, highly intellectual adaptations. Even those which claim to have originated in divine revelation have submitted to critical scrutiny. Religions which have survived have attempted to adjust themselves to contemporary knowledge through new "interpretation" or "reformation" of those teachings which were unsupportable. This modernising of dogmatic creeds which was essential to retain the belief of educated men has shaken the belief of many others in the basic validity of revelation itself.

Another reason which discredits churches is the bitter sectarian disputes. These disputes, which even in modern times can lead to violence and bloody fights, expose not only the inner contradictions and doctrinal weaknesses but also the hypocritical contrasts between the professed faith in peace, in the brotherhood of men, in the virtues of unselfish sacrifice and the

apparently more important struggles for worldly power and influence.

There are other discrepancies between what sectarian religions and absolute moralities preach and the way they act. Many preach that **the purpose of life is that perfect happiness** which can only be attained after death. At the same time their mundane organisations — their churches — do everything in their power to secure and extend material wealth, worldly power and influence exclusively for their own organisations in **this** life and on this earth. When faced with loss of wealth, power or influence in opposition to dictatorial forces (Nazis, Communists or social problems such as "apartheid") they sacrifice their sacred rules of unselfish behaviour.

Most moralities teach an absolute prohibition of killing, but all religions ask blessing on soldiers. Double standards are created by such moral contradictions which increase confusion and disbelief. To qualify as a true "conscientious objector" to military service one man was recently asked the following question in court: "What would you do if a lunatic were going to shoot a defenceless young woman?" He said that he could do nothing other than pray. "If she was shot I would say it was the will of God," he said.

Our society admires such consistent morality on the one hand but on the other hand the overwhelming majority would go to the woman's defence with the praise, support, encouragement and blessing of the law, the community and religious leaders.

Absolute moralities which propound suicidal commands, which preach the virtues of unselfish brotherly love and accept the practice of the opposite — **not only discredit their particular** brand of teaching; they are responsible for the undermining of man's belief in all morality.

Religions and moralities which contradict our matrix of knowledge, which cannot give practical guidance to behaviour without first changing human nature (by subordinating self-interest to brotherly love), religions which demand uncritical belief in their interpretation of divine revelations — whilst they use reason to discredit other interpretations, moralities which preach one thing but practice and bless the opposite, religions which are more concerned with the interpretation of holy dogma than with the solution of the vital problems of troubled people — have failed in their task.

Alternative Social Systems

The societies of man have undergone great changes. The organisations enabling men to live together altered in response to changes in natural conditions, the development of knowledge and pressures from strong rulers.

However wide the fluctuations between different systems of social orders are, there are basic similarities amongst them all. The activity of all living things is directed to satisfying their needs. Since these needs are many everyone must have a list of priorities. We call these priorities "values". The activity which deals with sorting out, ordering and measuring our values in comparison with some yardstick or standard of values is called "ethics". Ethics is not only an abstract, philosophical science; it is a function practised by all living things when choosing one action instead of another. Choosing the right action may be the means of survival both for the animal and for primitive man. Survival and the avoidance of suffering are the main directive ethical principles of all living things.

Man, living in a community, must adjust his actions to those of his fellows. The conflicting interests of the individuals within communities are adjusted by measuring the values of individual choices against a "standard of values" accepted by that society as the guide to achieving the aims for which the community exists.

The aims or purposes for which men band into communities fluctuate between two extremes: to enable the Individual to satisfy the maximum of his desires OR to seek protection by absorption within the multitude of the community.

According to these two extreme purposes of societies the priorities of values of actions are measured by two opposite yardsticks: The greatest good is either the total satisfaction of the desires of the Individual OR The benefit of the community, i.e. the public interest (which may be quite different from the aim of its members). The basic variations of social systems derive from their different ethical positions between the two extreme value standards.

Social systems are the practical interpretation in various fields of activity of the basic ethical principles. The basic characteristics of social systems may be grouped thus:

ETHICS: Standard of value may be the benefit of:	(A) The Individual	(B) The Community
POLITICAL projection of Ethics:	FREEDOM ensured by RIGHTS to acquire benefits.	EQUALITY ensured by RESPONSIBILITY for harm caused to others:
ECONOMIC projection of Ethics:	PRIVATE PROPERTY as a result of the right to benefit from one's actions.	PUBLIC PROPERTY to ensure the right of all to exist on this earth.
MORALITY: Guidelines to behaviour likely to achieve the aims of Ethics:	Advice only to achieve happiness.	Strictly controlled directives.

Consistent Liberalism

Social systems fluctuate between the two extreme alternatives in reaction to the unsatisfactory order enacted by previous social orders. Analysing the differences between their basic ethical principles and their politico/economic projections, one can pinpoint advantages and disadvantages and also inner deviations and contradictions between principles and practice.

It is my contention that the professed ethical principles of the major contemporary social systems are very close. They fail to realise their professed aims because of contradictions in the interpretation of their principles into political rights and responsibilities with the resulting mixup of unjust income distribution and complete moral confusion.

It is my belief that the consistent application of the universally accepted ethical standards, the clearcut definition and limitation of political freedom (rights) and equality (responsibilities) will result in a social system which satisfies contemporary social aims by integrating the best elements of the extreme social orders.

Integration and synthesis: middle-of-the-road solutions are very much needed in today's polarised societies. The great difficulty with such solutions is that they are, in many cases, not clearly defined because they are not based on extreme absolutes. It seems easy to demonstrate what is black and what is white. It is much harder to give a clearcut definition of the grey. However there are no true absolutes in existence. What we perceive as "black" is a mixture of grey with a degree of absence of "white". There is no absolute knowledge and consequently values of good and bad are subject to change. Nothing in life is static. Life is change.

Values change and consequently behaviour patterns change in all societies. The content of what gives happiness may change but the ethical principle that the Individual has the right to pursue his happiness remains clearly defined. Changes in activities and conditions bring new views on what is safe and what is harmful to people but the principle that the Individual is responsible for harm caused to his fellows also remains clearly defined. The consistent application of such clear definition of rights and responsibilities creates, I believe, a strong practical basis for a proposed middle-of-the-road social system which I describe as "Consistent Liberalism".

**THE RELATION OF SOME SIGNIFICANT
SOCIAL SYSTEMS**

According to Differences in their Ethical Principles

SCHEMATIC ILLUSTRATION — SOCIAL SYSTEMS

THE RELATION OF SOME SIGNIFICANT SOCIAL SYSTEMS
according to differences in their ethical principles.

SCHEMATIC ILLUSTRATION — SOCIAL SYSTEMS

	ETHICS Standard of values	POLITICS The projection of Ethics into the distribution of Rights & Responsibilities	ECONOMICS Income & Property	MORALITY Guidelines of behaviour to achieve values
ABSOLUTE ANARCHY (Can only exist as an idea)	The limitless satisfaction of the desires of the Individual	RIGHTS: DOM None RESPONSIBILITY: None EQUALITY: No	PRIVATE PROPERTY: Unlimited PUBLIC PROPERTY: None EXPLOITATION: Of the weak	Dictated by the whims of the strong (Hedonism). No rules. METHOD: Personally enforced terror
PATRIARCHY MATRIARCHY TRIBALISM MONARCHY OLYGARCHY THEOCRACY ARISTOCRACY FEUDALISM	The benefit of the ruling few: Father Mother Strongmen (chiefs) Divine rulers, Hereditary rulers (mundane & spiritual) AND their appointees (vassals, nobility) (Suits static societies with few changes)	RIGHTS: "Divine" or acquired by brute force. Inherited. Almost total freedom for the rulers. Some limited EQUALITY within the ruling class. RESPONSIBILITY: of the rulers almost nil. Very little limitation of their rights. Almost complete oppression of the ruled (slavery, serfs).	PRIVATE PROPERTY: vested in the ruler and his appointees PUBLIC PROPERTY: also vested in the ruler — who may allow limited conditional public use. EXPLOITATION: through strength and inheritance.	Behaviour is directed to the service of the rulers: Strongmen, Divinities etc. Additional personal benefits are promised in life-after-death. METHOD: Severe punishment, mystic guilt and damnation to enforce conformity.

ENLIGHTENED MONARCHY

CAPITALIST DEMOCRACY

HISTORIC LIBERALISM

"MERITOCRACY"

The Protestant Ethic.

The satisfaction of ambitions of "God-fearing individuals through personal endeavour, application, merit, ability.

Accelerating changes in knowledge bring changes in aims and values. Complexity brings confusion by making old standards invalid.

RIGHTS & RESPONSIBILITIES:

conferred by legal conditions BELIEVED to ensure practical FREEDOM & EQUALITY to all.

The principles ruling legal equality confused.

As a result the less "able" had no protection from harm caused by the successful.

PRIVATE PROPERTY ensured as a result of production & exchange.

PUBLIC PROPERTY as a result of confusion and error in the application of the principle of "Equality" (1) not defined and (2) often sold into private property (natural resources, monopolies). As a result the less able were EXPLOITED by "Wage Slavery".

The useful behaviour is best (Utilitarianism).

With the decline of religions the evolutionary theory supported similar guidelines: "the survival of the fittest".

METHOD: A combination of legal punishment and strong moral disapproval, "shame" and economic sanctions to promote conformity.

Vast acceleration of technology changes values daily. The "good" turns out to have "awful" side effects.

As a result the claimed standard of value: the benefit of the citizen is pretended to be the same as that of the community.

The aims and functions of society become confused, chaotic.

The exercise of political RIGHTS is reduced to choice between unsatisfactory alternatives.

Authorities enforce ill-considered limitations on individual FREEDOMS in an attempt to ensure RESPONSIBILITY to maintain order.

They become hypocritical, mistrusted. In response to taking away rights the citizen expects the community to accept responsibility of ensuring a (good) living.

Vastly increasing economic progress emphasizes only the false hope that "free trade" exists between capital and labour.

Pressure groups of suppliers fight for a larger share of the "national income".

As a result, just PRIVATE PROPERTY (private expenditure incomes) is taken into PUBLIC PROPERTY (through taxation) and PUBLIC PROPERTY (such as natural resources, monopolies) is permitted to be sold to individuals.

The confusion in values leads to confused moral guidelines. In reaction to earlier strong disciplinary morality (frustrated "Victorian")

AND in response to the lack of convictions — permissive (instinctive, aimless, directionless, uncontrolled) moral attitudes prevail.

The trend is to disregard the rights of others but expect the community to provide a (good) living.

CONFUSED

"MIXED DEMOCRACY"

CONTEMPORARY

ETHICS
Standard of values

"CONSISTENT LIBERALISM"
"THE GOLDEN MEAN"

The IDEAL system of synthesis: **EQUALITY without oppression AND FREEDOM without exploitation.**

↳ **"ANTI-MONOPOLISM"**
"THE THIRD ROAD"

POLITICS
The projection of Ethics into the distribution of Rights & Responsibilities

1) The selfish interest of the Individual to happiness
(INDIVIDUAL ETHICS) LIMITED ONLY by the need to

2) Protect the Individual from others (**SOCIAL or PUBLIC ETHICS**)

Result: Clearly defined rules of both standards. Values interchanged to achieve the common goal: happiness. The discredited, hypocritical, "unselfish" motivation is replaced by the selfish motivation to help one's fellow out of self-interest (not because of the pretence of "brotherly love.")

ECONOMICS
Income & Property

1) Clearly defined inviolate **PRIVATE PROPERTY** earned by personal exertion or free exchange.

2) Clearly defined **PUBLIC PROPERTY** (natural resources, monopolies). The public income from these ensures a basic livelihood (social benefits) to all.

Result: Market exchange freed from restrictive practices of private monopolies.

EXPLOITATION, "Wage slavery" eliminated. Sym-biosis of free individual achievement with clearly limited social security.

MORALITY
Guidelines of behaviour to achieve values.

1) Individual Morality gives advisory guidelines to balanced happiness according to changing conditions.

2) Public Morality advises behaviour to protect public security and safety.

All acts are permitted among consenting adults but responsibility for compensation for harm is enforced.

METHOD: Tolerance: no "guilt" and "shame" neurosis — but one must pay the price of harm caused in deviating from moral advice.

The standard of value is the "Benefit of the Community".

It is pretended that THIS is the prime interest of the Individual also. Consequently the aims of the Individual must be "unselfish".

Hypocritical and inconsis-

The pretence of **FREE-DOM** is maintained through

a) "mock" **RIGHTS** (gerrymanders, controlled press etc.)

b) some pressure groups achieve extra rights, protection (subsidies etc.)

The existence of relative Poverty amidst growing affluence and Progress is resented. To correct this incomes are redistributed according to "needs".

PRIVATE PROPERTY permitted but part of it is confiscated into **PUBLIC PROPERTY** through taxation. Tax is variable, does not define limits of rights to own results of one's action.

Behaviour patterns are in confusion.

They fluctuate according to age groups, social strata, fashions, commercial promotions etc. The main trend is experimental permissiveness, bringing strict reactions to prevent harmful

CONFUSED
"MIXED SOCIALISM"

"NEW DEAL"

WELFARE STATE

tent attempts to sacrifice "self-interest" to the "unselfish" service of the community.

The value:

"Community Benefit" becomes the justification and cloak which cover up the blunders and self-seeking of the preachers of altruism.

(a) FASCISM

(Welfare state for the benefit of a genetic community)

and its complementary

(b)

COMMUNISM
(Welfare state for the benefit of a class community)

Absolute

COMMUNALISM
(Can only exist as an Idea)

and privileges. Pressure groups (public monopolies, trade unions etc., monopolists) expose the pretence of EQUALITY by threats and force (strikes, demonstrations etc.)

EXPLOITATION: Exclusive group privileges allow unjust incomes. "Needs" supported by strong pressure groups are accepted as "rights" to take away the income of the able. The only principle of income distribution is the strength of various pressure groups. This makes fights inevitable.

Supposedly strict morality

(a) to maintain the genetic purity of the ruling race (interacial sex is discouraged with various severity).
(b) to maintain solidarity of the ruling class all "class enemies" (i.e. dissenters) must be reported for punishment. "Class solidarity" is above all (family, love, convictions, loyalties).
METHOD: All-pervasive, dictatorial control of all activity which may weaken the strength of the rulers.

PRIVATE PROPERTY allowed for the ruling groups but subject to dictatorial, capricious interference.

Economy is directed but when it fails, the private property of (a) oppressed races, (b) persecuted classes is expropriated and subjected to penalties.

PUBLIC PROPERTY is all that the State confiscates.

EXPLOITATION of the oppressed groups.

The ruling groups are entitled to special RIGHTS and Privileges.

a) Hereditary "birth-rights"

b) Class privileges to party members, workers.

EQUALITY of the citizen is further reduced by capricious limitation of the rights and imposition of penalties on "scape-goat" communities — to suit the leaders.

The benefit of the favoured group:

(a) Hereditary, (racial etc.)

(b) Occupational (workers)

The benefit of the "Commune".

It presumes that there is no conflict of interest amongst members.

PRIVATE PROPERTY in "what the Commune does not need" only.

PUBLIC PROPERTY includes all valuables. Distribution: from each according to his ability — to each according to his needs.

EXPLOITATION of the able.

Dictated by the whims (the limitless "needs") of the "Commune".

METHOD: Communally enforced terror.

Reformation or Revolution?

The causes of the conflicts.

The conflicts of contemporary democratic society are caused by inconsistencies in the application of liberal ethics. We believe that man ought to be free to follow his ideals of happiness — provided that he does not harm his fellows. In contrast to this authorities, governments, absolute moralities, dogmatic religions, economic planners and tax officials, etc. force their views of happiness on the citizen. We experience what Professor Marcuse calls "surplus repressions".

The conflicts are sharpened by the resistance to reforms for the correction of the inconsistencies between the practices and professed principles of "Establishments". Where these inconsistencies are shown up, the hypocritical resistance to correct them brings the "Establishments" into disrepute. It can often be shown that the resistance to reforms is made in defence of privileges — political and economic advantages — obtained by those pressure groups which keep the "Establishments" in power.

The dissatisfaction of most citizens is directed against specific laws, regulations, prohibitions or abuses and not against the basic inconsistencies of the prevailing social system. Changing the myriads of unsatisfactory aspects of existing societies appears as a never-ending frustrating task which turns many dissatisfied reformers towards irresponsible or total opposition to the social order.

The "Interregnum"

There are many attempts at finding new, better social systems, ideologies, religions and philosophies to lead humanity to a better future.

I believe that the way out of the present period of conflicts is by a return to the original precepts of liberal philosophy and through the consistent application of the standards of liberal ethics in political and economic activities.

It is certain, however, that as yet no new or reformed philosophy, religion or morality has been acclaimed by mankind to take the place of the orders which have failed. Many govern-

ments remain in power for the lack of an acceptable alternative government; many religions keep their followers because there are no better faiths offered and man craves some system of belief. We prefer order to disorder and we put up with known imperfections for fear of the unknown. We live in the "Age of Longing" of Koestler until a new social order becomes established either through a "New Reformation" or through revolutions and violence.

In the 1970s we are at dangerous crossroads. We live in a period of "Interregnum" with all the great dangers of such historic times. There are many impatient people who are anxious to replace all that we know to be bad with something completely different. There is a growing number of hotheads who believe that their justified discontent with injustice is sufficient reason to use any means, including violence, to dislodge the present authorities from power.

Dissatisfaction finds expression in several forms. "The angry young men" of the 50's said that there were no more "causes" to fight for. This frustration was later expressed in the escapist syndrome of the "dropouts", the "Hippies", the "Flower people", the drug addicts — taking a "trip" from reality and aimlessness, with the recurring desire to be "invisible" (that is: not responsible) as preached in "Hair". The generalised dissatisfaction is often verbalised by mystical or messianic philosophies which offer justifications to support authoritarian methods followed by violent minority groups.

Activist groups claim that the "elites" of party members, of radical students or other fanatical believers are the only ones who are inspired to know what is right and they claim to be "entitled" to enforce their views and their rule on society.

These violent "idealists" disregard the principle of "equal rights" in the same way as theocracy does or when the rulers take into public ownership **man-power** as one of the means of production. The result is the same in all instances: the enslavement and sacrifice of the individual for some "holy" cause.

Frustration breeds violence. The younger generation, which has not experienced real economic hardship, and people who forget or do not know of the oppression and cruelty which exist under the extremist political systems of dictatorships and anarchies are tempted in their frustration to resort to violence with the sole aim of "getting rid of the old system". The signs of such growing rebellion and irresponsibility are everywhere.

Reformation: the way out

The only way to avoid the growing violence of dissatisfied and frustrated groups and the correspondingly increasing violence of the law-enforcing agencies of the disreputed authorities is through the introduction of progressive reforms through a vital movement of reformation. The reforms must deal firstly with the causes which have brought authorities into disrepute. Secondly, the reforms must aim to control the irresponsibility, the upsurge of violence and threats against peace and order.

1. THE FAULT OF "THE ESTABLISHMENTS" IS HYPOCRISY

The first step of the new reformation is to re-establish trust. We must demonstrate clearly the reasons for mistrust of authorities. The abuses of power must be clearly shown. Authorities all over the world maintain such conditions — hidden benefits and gerrymanders which ensure exclusive advantages to some groups whilst they hypocritically pretend to represent the interests of the people.

Reforms must ensure the protection of the individual human rights to freedom. (Details — see chapter on "Civil Rights" p.165.) Restrictive practices, both social and economic, must be eliminated or their benefits returned to the community. (Details — see chapter on "Economic Conflicts" p.106, "Monopoly and the Individual" — G. Hardy, Reform Publishing Co. 1964.)

Religion must be revitalised as a tolerant, ecumenical source of inspiration instead of infighting, sectarian, missionary movements. Failed moralities must be replaced to provide guidance to behaviour. PUBLIC MORALITY will only deal with the protection of the Individual from others and will not attempt to enforce conformity with some ideal. INDIVIDUAL MORALITY will direct each individual, to the achievement of happiness — as he sees it. (Details:— see chapter on "Conflict of Moralities" p.82.)

2. THE FAULT OF REVOLUTIONARIES IS — IRRESPONSIBILITY.

The second step of the new reformation is to maintain the personal safety, security and peace of the Individual by controlling the growth of violence, crime and other elements which damage our health and property (such as road and industrial accidents, pollution, etc.).

To achieve this it is essential to define, identify and enforce

responsibility for the consequences of human actions. Anyone who causes damage to others (through criminal action, negligence, street demonstrations etc.) must be called upon to make restitution for the damage. (Details — see chapter on "Civil Responsibilities" p.165; "To kill or not kill?" p.30.)

If there be no such Reformation, if "Establishments" will not renounce their hypocrisy and restrain their abuses of power and if responsibilities are not clarified and enforced, the result must inevitably be — violence.