

Draft 2

- 2 -

I think the answers are along these lines. The rules by which society governs itself are in dispute. When I was a girl the number of people who went to church wasn't very different from the number who go today. But the great majority of people, church-goes or not, believed in the basic teachings of the Bible - the Ten Commandments in the Old Testament and the Sermon on the Mount in the New Testament. Then, it seems to me, George Orwell's Newspeak took over, and the old moral certainties vanished. The certainty that there were such things as good and evil vanished.

T.S. Eliot says:

They constantly try to escape
From the darkness outside and within
By dreaming of systems so perfect that no one will need
to be good.

There was a failure of intellectual leadership in reasserting the fundamental truths, by those who knew the rules existed, and that ~~the rights existed~~ and were right. It is our duty to reassert those rules, to recover the intellectual leadership in demonstrating that they are right. People need to be reassured that there are moral truths. What is wrong with modern society is not material deprivation but disorientation. The compass has been lost and people are giddy.

/You may

You may well ask what all this has to do with a politicians job. I will give you the answer. Everything. No system, economic, social or political, will work unless the overwhelming majority of people want to act morally, to try to do what is morally right. We are told we live in a mass society, where the individual can do little or nothing. One of the infuriating catch-phrases - the phrase of the Pharisee - is "I don't want to get involved". Life is replete with examples of individuals who have achieved much (examples - Whitehouse,)

That is why the present sources of discontent are not only economic, social or political. They run deeper. They are spiritual and moral.

I will tell you what I mean. When I was at Oxford many of the brightest and the best were socialists or even communists. They dreamed "of systems so perfect that no one will need to be good". Collectivism will make the choice of good and evil redundant.

The collectivist wants all people to be good and all people to be happy - in his way - he chooses what is good and what makes people happy. But, in practice, dragooning people to goodness and happiness makes them bad and unhappy. And the reason for that is simple. Human beings have one God-given right. The right to choose. Not a right to happiness, or to be good. But a right to choose, for themselves, to be good or to be bad.

A collectivist society is a dragooned state. Twenty years ago the Communist authorities in East Berlin built a wall - a wall with minefields, barbed wire, automatic firing devices - not to keep us out but to keep their enslaved people in. They built this wall to save them from the temptations of capitalism - the temptations of freedom, of opportunity and of abundance. The people of East Germany are still tempted by the forbidden fruit. Twenty years later the wall is stronger than ever. The wall proves a profound truth. The promises of socialism are less attractive than the practice of capitalism.

In the last forty years or so we have seen a great wave of collectivism rise, advance, reach its crest and break. We are at the turn of the tide. We are living with the sound of "its melancholy, long, withdrawing roar, retreating." In place of the collectivist wave a new wave is gathering - here in Australia, in the United States, in Britain. It is the wave of what I call the social market economy. The wave of freedom.

The spiritual malaise that we have to overcome is the something for nothing philosophy.

/What our

Part 2

What our collectivists offer is not the reality of the barbed wire, of the secret police, of ~~the one party state~~. They offer instead the dream of a society without struggle, without effort, without choice, a society "where there is no joy but calm" and "where slumber is more sweet than toil".** It is the eternal dream of a lotus-land of abundance through idleness. The dream is an attractive one to those who find no joy in effort, no satisfaction in self-reliance,

Re. Smoothing in journal of ...

R) There is no freedom without personal responsibility, no success without failure. Democracy does not consist of putting all your personal responsibility into some collectivist nirvana. As the Bishop of London says "There is no plan, no form of administration, no legislation, no social reform which can save us in spite of ourselves, for every plan, all administration, all legislation and all reform has to be implemented by fallible and sinful human beings in whom evil can find a response".

Say something about it

Let me apply this point of view to the great contemporary misery of unemployment. Is it something that Western Governments can cure quickly or easily? I can assure you that if we could we would. To put it mildly, there is no mileage electorally in widespread unemployment.

/We are

** Tennyson: Song of the Lotus-Eaters.

We are told that all we have to do is reflate. But we know full well that jobs are not created that way. Printing money causes price rises. Keynes knew that - Keynes was no Keynesian! - ~~the famous 1944 White Paper on Full Employment actually said it. [quote]~~

Now, everybody knows that reflation is not the simple answer. It will create inflation which enriches the rich and destroys the poor. ~~(The man with land, antiques, assets, benefits from inflation. Ordinary people don't even survive it.)~~

So slowly, painfully, we have to drag inflation down and create the conditions in which real jobs are created.

Governments cannot successfully spend their way out of reality. When they print money, they promote inflation. When they try to create jobs, ~~more~~ ^{some} jobs are lost in the private sector. As the public sector expands, its quality falls. ~~And there, all the time, is the insidious growth of state power and the erosion of liberty. It is a diminution of humanity. Personal responsibility is lost.~~

~~Here in the West we are living with the failures of social democracy. We have yet to see the benefits of revived capitalism.~~

/In the

direction of labor

In the United Kingdom we have ^{2.6} unemployed. In the OECD countries there are ^{perhaps} unemployed. The hope for their future does not lie ^{direction of labor on in} in the saltmines of Siberia. That is the way that work is created in a collectivist society. It lies in what we see around us; individual effort in creating new businesses. They will be largely in the service sector (Examples) But no politician, nobody, indeed, can predict where the new business will come from. It is a fundamental tenet that the future is largely unpredictable, that the unexpected always happens. If we knew what the future would bring we could have neither choice, nor hope - both choice and hope are fundamental Christian truths.

My own view of the way the unemployed will be brought into work is clear. It will be done throughout the West by hundreds of thousands of people backing their own ideas and putting their hearts and souls into new enterprise. Society does ~~too~~ much to tie down such people, and we must constantly seek to encourage them, to free them from unnecessary controls, to liberate them to do their best, to give them incentives.

This is what I call the social market philosophy. It rests upon the belief that there are things that are the proper province of Government, and things - many more things - that properly are the concern of the individual citizen and his family. This distinction is a fundamental one. Upon it the whole of our free civilisation rests. Of course there is

room for argument as to where the line should be drawn. But that there is a line between these two provinces no thinking person can doubt. | Government must secure the conditions for freedom. That is its job. People must live their own lives. That is their job.

Our need is to create secure conditions in which people can work out their own destinies for themselves. When government keeps the peace people can live their own lives.

And has,

The fundamental error of collectivism is that it chooses people's destinies for them. And look at the result. The state has been so busy leading people's lives for them that it has neglected its prime role. The state has been feeding people, housing them, employing them, keeping them in sickness and in health. But it has not succeeded in keeping peace in the streets. And our enemies abroad are stronger than ever. The collectivists have neglected the main job of the state - which is protection of the citizens against internal and external attack - because they have so extravagantly expanded the sphere of collective action. More has meant worse. ?

The collectivists wanted to provide for people from the cradle to the grave. But in our big cities people are frightened to walk in the streets at night. What kind of social security is it that cannot guarantee the freedom not to be mugged? The more the state has tried to do the less it has succeeded. It has neglected its fundamental duty to keep

/the rule

the rule of law. The rule of law is fundamental to freedom, if only because it protects the weak from the strong.

Once that truth is grasped, then we can do something. The boundaries of state action must be redrawn.

First, the job of the state is to defend its citizens against attacks from within and without. The enemies of freedom must be repelled abroad and repressed at home. Without the freedom to live peacefully there is no freedom. I begrudge no expenditure on defence and on the police. And to call that expenditure 'repressive' is to stand logic on its head.

All else is primarily the sphere of private action. I am not saying that the state has no role to play. That would be absurd. What I am saying is that we have to justify the state's action in this sphere.

One job the state can do. It can ensure sound money. Without sound money the economy cannot function. And unless the economy functions, then nobody can earn enough to be compassionate.

The failure of collectivism - the failure of social democracy - is precisely that. Unsound money has led to inflation and so inevitably to unemployment. We are trying to pick up the pieces from social democracy's failure. Inevitably that has meant unemployment, disruption and economic failure.

Restoring sound money creates the conditions for success. That success will come from the efforts, imagination and drive of individuals. I am often asked when ^{and how} that success will come. My answer is clear. Nobody can possibly say in advance. The competitive process is inherently unpredictable. We can say one thing with certainty. Despite every obstacle individual enterprise has succeeded for two hundred years. It will not fail us now.

The state has a third duty. It is to buttress and support the social market economy. I see several ways in which it can do this. It can help to provide education and training. A skilled workforce will be a successful workforce. That is our duty to the young, and to those who wish to improve themselves.

The state can provide a basic structure of social services to cushion the shocks of change, and to ease the transition to a new economy.

A compassionate society must compensate the weak. But to compensate failure is to penalise the strong.

So while I sympathise with the arguments for compassion we must surely realise that a phony compassion is no compassion at all. Only a successful society can afford compassion on a scale compatible with human dignity.

/The welfare

The welfare state must help those in need and help them generously. That is the way of discharging our social responsibilities. *TC - 1/1/1968*

But I am opposed utterly to the change of the welfare state into a mechanism for the manipulation of the claimant society. We do not have claims on society. We have obligations. The erosion of obligation is a diminution of humanity.

There is one more thing I want to say. I have noticed a steady, even an accelerating growth in the demand for immediate solutions. "Take the waiting out of wanting" is an advertising jingle that hits it off immediately. "I want it now". The desire for instant comment afflicts everybody in public life and the desire for instant action is the scourge of governments. The Bishop of London expresses it thus:

"everyone has a right to what they want, to expect to get it without delay, and to demand it by force if it is not forthcoming."

But personal responsibility requires striving towards a goal, waiting for the results. If anybody has a grievance, it takes time to remedy it. The instant strike, the immediate riot - they are not the way to achieve results. They are bound to lead to strife and to repression.

/So the

So the choice between good and evil, the choice between what is best and what is worst, has been powerfully weighted towards the bad. The don't care society, the do your own thing society, have diminished freedom and led to evil. They have not in fact allowed people the dignity of choice in a firm framework of ethical standards.

I believe in capitalism. But I only believe in capitalism because I believe in something more profound.

I believe that fundamentally, people have the right to choose. It is the freedom to choose that is the freedom worth having. I do not mean just the freedom to choose one thing rather than another in a shop - important though that is. I do not just mean the freedom to choose where to live, - important though that is. I do not mean just the freedom to choose what to work at - important though that is. I mean the freedom to choose between a good life and a bad choice. I am talking about moral values. Because ultimately, it is the choice between good and evil that you can only make for yourself.

All the great religions teach us that life is a struggle between good and evil. Life without struggle is no life at all. Each human being carries the potentiality of choice between good and bad. That choice must be examined alone, and in the small family unit. A collectivity cannot choose to be good. Society, political arrangements, the laws that Parliaments pass - they can help people make their choice. But politics is not an end in itself. It is a means to an end.