

democracy with voting at elections. Something of the revival of primitive democracy was witnessed during the war in the form of Home Guard activities. The main function of democracy is to "enlist the effective thought of the whole community in the operation of discussion." See pages 17 and 18.

In Russia the citizen may not be a mere spectator. It is impossible to lead a politically neutral existence.

Conclusion.

The critics of modern democracy saw its defects, anomalies and injustices with a clear eye, and played them up in a way calculated to shake our faith in the whole regime.

The Communist challenges us to realism, that thought and action, theory and practice should be one.

We are witnessing new movements which have arisen in reaction to economic evils but which combine

with their struggle for social justice the repudiation of all religious faith. Aware of the reality of sin, the Church knows that no change in the outward ordering of life can of itself eradicate social evil. The Church therefore cannot surrender to the Utopian expectations of these movements, and their godlessness it must unequivocally reject, but in doing so it must recognise that Christians in their blindness to the challenging evils of the economic order have been partly responsible for the anti-religious character of these movements.

Communism has an answer for everything. You and I know it is the wrong answer, but many people believe that it is better than no answer at all.

But all we have offered has been negative. All measures we've taken seem to be "against" rather than "for."

What are we for?

We must fight—ideas with ideas.

The Church's Part.

WHAT IS CHRISTIAN SOCIALISM.

By the Rev. K. BRODIE, Th.L., Rector of Bairnsdale, Victoria.

It is very urgent that the non-Roman branches of the Church should give the people a definite lead on Socialism. An attenuated Marxism bearing little or no relation to essential Christianity will not do.

The questions are: What is Socialism? Is it tenable in a Christian society? How does Christian Socialism differ from ordinary Socialism?

Communism and ordinary Socialism are one in principle. Elementary comparative study of religion shows that they are atavistic, a reversion to the primitive means of organising society by various forms of compulsion, for the good of all, by curbing the ego and acquisitive instinct. They must be strictly totalitarian or a failure. You can't do and say what you like in primitive society. You are not considered morally responsible. Lack of moral responsibility puts back the clock centuries, and unfortunately that is where we find ourselves to-day,—back in the jungle.

Man moved very gradually from primitive forms and thoughts to the great Christian ideal (still practicable) of balancing perfect love with perfect freedom. Controls and compulsory sharing only emphasise the extent of moral decline. Mere materialism always involves loss of freedom.

In the past the "haves" tyrannised the "have nots." The strange new phenomenon which presents itself to-day, is that we have swung from one extreme to another equally undesirable, in which the "have nots" are tyrannising the "haves" per Marxian doctrine and trade-unionism; and it is pretty obvious where it is all going to lead. Freedom is a very precious thing; it has been the very breath of our nostrils for centuries and will not be lightly relinquished.

Hysteria and False Sentiment.

There is a lot of hysteria, and false sentiment about the poor oppressed under-dog has run riot and got right out of control and perspective. Few seem to have ob-

served how successfully the communist class-war doctrine has been and is being promoted. Our working men are not oppressed serfs as we are led to believe. Life is nearer to Utopia in Australia than anywhere else in the world, in spite of governments. We are not debased, ignorant, tyrannised and illiterate. We have freedom of private property and enterprise, normally, but both of these are gradually being filched away or surrendered. Our evils and poverty where they do exist are mainly self-imposed by drinking, gambling and lack of industry and thrift. The average Australian is so carefree, happy, pleasure-loving and guileless, and so surfeited and inebriated with the good things of this life, and his vision is consequently so dim, that he does not seem capable of seeing the red lights ahead. These poor, oppressed, underfed, unhappy Australians!

As already noted the tyrannies of vested interests and trade-unionism are equally undesirable. It does not seem to have occurred to capital and labour that they need one another and that they must find some principle by which they can exist and work together to their mutual advantage and still have freedom, lest they bring the whole social fabric crashing down around us.

Christian Socialism.

To-day, the generally accepted meaning of democracy is rule of the so-called proletariat; but it has a far wider meaning than that. It includes all, the "haves" and "have nots," the majority of in-betweens, the more highly educated and cultured who think a good deal more of being than having, the salt of the earth (to prevent it from going rotten). As an alternative to Communism-Socialism I would suggest that democracy and Christian Socialism are one.

For social order, compulsion there must be: but of what kind? There are several kinds of compulsion—physical, legal, and moral, and the compulsion of fear. How combine precious freedom with compulsion? Can you exist together? The answer is, Yes! Here is where Christian Socialism comes in. The alternative to the tyranny of capitalism and its opposite (call it what you will) is the whole Christian view of life in which the fatherhood of God and brotherhood of man predominate, and in which the principle of stewardship applies. Christianity is concerned with what a man has or has not, i.e., his material needs and surpluses, but more concerned with what he is—his being, not his having. Control men's being and you control their having and giving. The Church must know its own mind and expound it as vigorously as the Marxist does.

Ordinary Socialism, as already stated, means governmental or tribal control and loss of personal freedom. This only means that the government becomes the capi-

talist. Party governments are no more morally responsible than big business. History shows that the little finger of the one can be as thick as the loins of the other.

Money has come to stay, whoever holds it and controls it. The alternative is primitive barter, still with its "haves" and "have nots." If a man owns £10 he is a capitalist. That £10 constitutes a moral responsibility. It will be a bad thing when the day comes in Australia when you cannot call your money your own, and guided by moral principles do with it what you please.

Our present social system is as good as any other. It presupposes Christian principles for its success. The whole trouble lies in the human heart. We do not need a change of system, but changed human lives, those of many politicians, union bosses, business men and workers included. And above all we need to return to the Christian sense of values which will replace money as a god and make it a means to an end and not an end in itself. This, only religion can do. A country gives up its religion officially or otherwise, and away goes freedom, good will, and everything with it. Materialism is our real problem.

The Right Use of Money.

The only alternative to socialisation of money, much in the news at present, is an individual Christian view and manipulation of it. The Christian view is that all we have, we hold in trust from God, and that we must use it not only for our own benefit, but for the benefit of all, within reason, on the principle that we are members one of another, and greatly affect one another for weal or woe.

"As free yet not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness." To-day we are free. But if we abuse

our liberty we deserve to lose it with all the consequent chaos, loss and confusion.

No doubt there are a few anomalies in our social system. There always have been, and always will be. They are not incapable of being remedied somewhat, by exercise of Christian principles, but not completely. We must take care not to throw out the baby with the bathwater.

There must be scope among free and intelligent people for clean competition and healthy striving, which are the essence of individual and social stability and progress.

Our present discontents are the result of Marxism and the fallacious psychology of extreme Behaviourism, both of which seek to adapt the environment wholly to the individual; whereas, nature teaches us that the individual can and must adapt himself to his environment and improve it—that is, his lot in life generally. On the whole our present social system allows for this more than any country in the world, and more especially when its inherent Christian principles are applied.

It is not the Church's business to be left or right, pink, red or white, but to see things whole, keep the balance, and change human lives, give men and women a right perspective in order to bring them together in the common unity of the Faith. The Church has done it before and by the grace of God must do it again.

Only in Christ, that is, in His Spirit, can there be "neither bond nor free"—rich or poor. In Him all are free and rich toward God.

Anybody in sympathy with Marxian Socialism obviously does not understand the Christian Faith or appreciate the latent power of the whole Christian evangel.

Will There be a Revolution?

By F. OSWALD BARNETT, M. Com.

(From a Talk in Wesley Church, Melbourne, 2/3/1947.)

You will start by asking me what I mean by that many-sided word—"Revolution." Webster gives one definition as "a total or radical change."

Such a total change took place when certain goods, instead of being made in the home by hand, were made in the factory by machines. This very radical alteration in the system of manufacture changed the whole course of English history, and was known as the Industrial Revolution.

Such revolutions are taking place almost daily in this scientific age. The splitting of the atom has entirely revolutionised the method of making war, and is already leading to another revolution in industrial development.

But I fancy that, radical though these changes may be, that is not the kind of revolution on which I am expected to speak. We cannot blink the fact that we are living in a state of constant industrial strife. Every day we open our newspapers with the hope that there will be an announcement that industrial peace has come. But we are always disappointed. If one strike is settled, another quickly follows in its wake, until we are getting confused and irritable.

No right-thinking person would seek to prevent strikes by the use of force. The worker has the inalienable right to refuse to sell his labour

if he so wish. We do hope, however, that when he does strike it will be for a worth-while cause, and that he will tell us what it is all about.

But Australia is not peculiar in this respect. Strikes are occurring practically all over the civilised world. Since the war there has been a universal outbreak of industrial unrest that has raced around the world like a great tidal wave.

Huge strikes are occurring in America that have paralysed the tremendous post-war programme that was, almost in the twinkling of an eye, going to put American products on the world market in a big way.

There are strikes even in war-shattered little England, despite her colossal problems and a Labour Government.

Strikes are everywhere, and we here in Australia are also being rocked by strikes and rumours of strikes, until some people feel that we are getting perilously close to a violent revolution.

Causes.

What is the cause of this constant industrial turmoil all over the world?

It is a world-wide struggle between the haves and have-nots, between the employers and the employees, between capital and labour.

If we liken the total production of a country, or of the world, if you like, to a huge cake, the employers and the workers are quarrelling as to how it will be

divided. In the early beginnings of Capitalism the worker got little more than the crumbs that fell from the rich employer's table, the employer holding on to the bulk of the cake.

By means of trade-unions and collective bargaining the worker has, through the years, been getting a bigger slice of the cake, but is always struggling to get an even bigger portion, while the employer is fighting a constant rear-guard action to retain as much as he can.

So we have strikes and lock-outs, turmoil and strife and unrest. Where will it stop? What does the worker really want?

Let us be frank. Eventually the worker wants the whole of the cake, the means of production to belong to and be under control of the community.

We would be foolish if we denied that the worker has much justice on his side, for it is obvious that there is an unjust division of the National Dividend.

In the last report of the Commissioner of Taxation it is disclosed that there were in Australia about a million and a third people who paid income or war-time tax on income received for the year ended 30th June, 1941. An Australian family of father and mother and two children was supposed to live then in frugal comfort on less than five pounds per week. As no figures are available for that amount I have been compelled to take the figure nearest to it, approximately £5 15s. per week. Out of the million and a third taxpayers only one in every seven received a taxable income of more than £5 15s. per week. You will remember that the year 1941 was a war year, and that unemployment was practically unknown. Yet six-sevenths of the taxpayers got less than £5 15s. per week.

If we go back to depression days, when the last census was taken (30th June, 1933) 51.4% of the married men in Australia got less than £3 per week. As the basic wage was then £3 4s. 2d. one half of the married men were receiving a very slender slice of the cake.

So the worker has much justice on his side when he says he is getting far too little of what is produced.

Now he is beginning to ask for all the cake.

That, it seems to me, is the background for any possible revolution—the worker claiming the whole of production (that is, of course, socialism), and the employer (including the investor) most strenuously resisting that claim, and clinging with all his might to the status-quo (that is, capitalism).

It is here that the stage is set. The workers demand all the cake, the employers refuse to part with it.

Numbers are on the side of the worker. The employer relies on the fact that, economically, he is still in the saddle, though he is having a somewhat bumpy ride, and that, as the champion of the status-quo, he relies on the force of the State to back him up if the worker flagrantly breaks the law.

Strikes and lock-outs are just the visible symptoms of this tremendous clash of ideas. And it is the same everywhere—all the world is divided into two camps, each glowering at the other, with numerous more or less small skirmishes taking place here and there along the lines.

How Will It End?

Will the issue be joined in a tremendous battle—a violent revolution? Those who take a long-range view believe that the whole world is on the way to socialism. They believe that socialism is as unpreventable as the incoming tide.

The question is not, Will we have socialism? but, How will Socialism come, by Evolution or Revolution? And what sort of Socialism will it be, Godless or Godly?

This is the only realistic approach to the problem.

The danger is upon us now—just in the turmoil of the changing tides, as the Old Order is being replaced by the New.

Now, in the surging of the tides of reaction-aryism and socialism that are meeting with turmoil at the present time, can the Church simply look on as a spectator, and allow the conflicting forces to fight it out without seeking to know what is God's plan, what is His purpose for the Church? If Socialism is inevitable, and I believe it is because it is the nearest approach yet to a practical brotherhood, then must not the Church seek to guide and control it, and put its spiritual impress upon it? The Church cannot evade its responsibility, for the final solution of the present social problem is in the hands of the Church, and it must plunge into the maelstrom if it would save the world.

It is unfortunate that the Church in times past split the world into two parts, sacred and secular. It has said that its mission is spiritual, and it has almost entirely vacated the secular field.

It is anxious that the worker should not have too much intoxicating liquor, that he should not gamble, that he should not live an immoral life, with all of which we heartily agree. I know the various Social Service Departments of the Church have a wider vision even than this; but tell me, has the Church ever stood up in its righteous indignation and said that the system that produced slums, and war, and recurring depression with its crushing poverty, was contrary to the plan of God, and therefore must be abolished?

Every Christian will at once admit that the present order is based on selfishness and is therefore not in accordance with God's plan — that God did not will for one section of His children to exist in abject poverty, and the other to live in purple and fine linen and fare sumptuously every day.

Challenge to Christians.

Just here I would challenge the employers. Many of you are Christian and sincerely trying to do the right thing. But when it comes to industrial conferences you tend to treat the matter as a secular issue and do not ask "Are we sincerely seeking to discover God's will in this thing?" You know that the employing class is determined to oppose change and cling as hard as it can to the status-quo. And yet you also know that if Socialism is the unfolding of God's plan then you can no more prevent it than King Canute could stop the incoming tide. Why not be constructive? Why should you acquiesce only at the point of a pistol? Why not examine the disabilities under which the worker labours, and get in ahead of him with a constructive suggestion? If you are suspicious, and selfish, and unyielding, if you inevitably blame the workers all the time, you will increase the turmoil you want to prevent. You must be a Christian not only at home or in the Church, but when you meet in an employers' group. The one test you must apply to every solution that is proposed should be: "Do I sincerely think that this is according to God's plan?" If it isn't you must say, "Out!" Your greatest job is to Christianise your group.

Some people are shouting that the Communist is just biding his time to precipitate a violent revolution. That may be true of a few irresponsible, thoughtless hot-heads who are thinking backwards to the French Revolution, picturing the barricades, and guns, and pikes, and sickles and scythes.

But the intelligent Communist knows that to run a successful violent revolution the revolutionaries would have to be in supreme control of the armed forces, army, navy, and air-force, and more than all, in charge of the supply of atomic bombs. The whole idea in these modern days in such a country as ours is simply fantastic.

The true Communist has much to teach us. If he were more alert and read both the Old and the New Testaments he would find that all his principles of social justice were outlined there. He would find that Karl Marx coined the name of Communist from the Acts of the Apostles, and actually got his slogan, "from each according to his ability, to each according to his necessity," from the second chapter of Acts.

Instead of thinking the Christian belief is irrelevant, he should study it, and then he would make the greatest discovery of his life—that Jesus laid down the basic principles of Socialism nearly two thousand years ago. After studying the teachings of Jesus he would be able to hoist us with our own petard, and say to us, "Why don't you put into practice the social principles enunciated by Christ?"

I am a Socialist, not because of Karl Marx, but because of Jesus Christ. At the same time, I appreciate the sincere Communist. The unselfish home-life of some of them, and their passion for their cause, make me feel ashamed.

Challenge to Socialists.

To the Trade Unionist, whether he be Labour or Communist, I would say that the plan of God for this world is far more beautiful than anything he has ever conceived, and that it has behind it the only dynamic that will ever make any plan work happily for the benefit of mankind—the dynamic of sacrificial love. To the Trade Unionist I would say, you don't go far enough. To aim at material security, to abolish unmerited poverty, is splendid, but it's not enough. If absence of poverty was all that was necessary to make people happy and good, then the residents of Toorak should be the happiest saints in the land. Material prosperity does not necessarily mean character, or even happiness. Change this selfish system by all means, but change the selfish individuals in it as well, or the new system will work no better than the old. And it's only the love of God that can change the human heart.

The Christian can and must prevent any thought of a violent revolution by carrying the dynamic of Christ into politics, by seeking God's plan both for himself and for the nation.

The Church must abandon its timidity, and apply God's plan to the whole of life, the secular as well as the so-called spiritual. It must unhesitatingly expose every

I.W.W. SONGS

TO FAN THE FLAMES OF
DISCONTENT

THE PREACHER AND THE SLAVE

By Joe Hill

(Tune: "Sweet Bye and Bye")

Long-haired preachers come out every night,
Try to tell you what's wrong and what's right;
But when asked how 'bout something to eat
They will answer with voices so sweet:

CHORUS

You will eat, bye and bye,
In that glorious land above the sky;
Work and pray, live on hay,
You'll get pie in the sky when you die.

social injustice, and not sheath the sword until it has slain it. It must never be satisfied until every man, woman, and child has the fullest opportunity to develop to his utmost capacity. It must fulfil the purpose of Christ, "I have come that you might have life, and have it in abundance," and that means all life, spiritual, mental, and physical.

Will we have a violent revolution? Despite the gravity of the times, we unhesitatingly say "No." It is unnecessary, un-Christian, and would not build the brotherhood we seek to establish. We know a better way—the plan of God for you, for me, for the Church, for the Employers' Federations, for the Trade Unions, for the whole nation.

I challenge you all to surrender your life to His indwelling Spirit that will guide you into the truth, so that you may have the joy of discovering and putting into effect that most majestic and magnificent plan that God the Father has eternally planned for us, His children.

Communism in Practice in the Western Democracies.

[From "Christian Frontier" (New Zealand) Memoranda.]

At the Congress of the Australasian Council of Trade Unions held recently the moderates retained control of the machine, but the extremists won every vital decision. The moderates were successful only in votes taken at the congress by secret ballot. This limited their successes to the election of the officials who control the machine.

All decisions taken by a show of hands went to the extremists.

How do you explain the power of the tiny communist minority to get their way, despite the very different views and interests of the union rank and file?

Why They Succeed.

Their first strength is that they work with unremitting vigour, and they will work for perfectly honest trade-union objectives as long as those objectives do not conflict with the interests of the Soviet Union. While another trade union leader will naturally expect to have a night at home with his family from time to time, a communist will devote every minute of his waking hours and every ounce of his energy to a mission given him by the party, and if the party tells him to work in a trade union, his whole time and whole strength are devoted to working for the union.