

CHRISTIAN DEMOCRATIC PARTY

www.cdp.org.za

HEADOFFICE: P.O. Box 26186, ARCADIA, PRETORIA 0007 Tel/Fax: +27 012 6510608 Email: headoffice@cdp.org.za

February 2013

Introduction

The CDP has for almost 15 years, warned against the deleterious effects of liberalism on our society. We have consistently shown the close link between liberalism and socialism/communism. In a pamphlet put out prior to the last General Election entitled, "Two sides of the Same Coin", we set out the similarities between policies of the ANC-socialists/communists and the DA – liberals, and the inevitable consequences these policies hold for South Africans.

We can already hear the outcries of protests by liberals as we compare their policies to those of the socialist/communist. In fact, FW de Klerk, answering a question on an email we sent to him said: "I do not agree that the objectives of the ANC and the DA are remotely the same. The DA is a classical liberal party (we don't agree with this assessment as it is obvious that they form part of the modern socialist liberal philosophy) that is committed to constitutionalism, free market principles and genuine democracy. While many in the ANC see it as a liberation movement which is dedicated to its (unconstitutional) National Democratic Revolution".

We have never said that they are identical only that they are similar as they obviously use different means to achieve the implementation of their policies.

The socialist/communists do it through repression and tyranny forcing the populace through threats and intimidation to adhere to their policies (it is into the hands of these people that the liberals and the previous government thought it fit to place the future of this country. The liberals on the other hand subtly use a democratic process based on one man one vote subject to a constitution, which they themselves have constructed and that includes all that is necessary to support and enforce their liberal policies.

The Great Liberal death wish

In an address to the Heritage Foundation in 1989, Russel Kirk, made mention of Malcolm Muggeridge's abhorrence of the political and moral attitude that is called liberalism. The question that must be answered is:

Who was Malcolm Muggeridge, and what qualified him to express such repugnance of liberalism?

Malcolm Muggeridge, grew up in a suburban home in South London and was greatly influenced by his father. In his address entitled "The Great Liberal Death Wish." First published in 1970 he mentions how his "....father and his cronies would assemble there,and plan the downfall of the Capitalist system and the replacement of it by one that was just and humane and egalitarian and peaceable etc." At that early age and convinced that these were good honest and sincere men, he completely accepted their views and that "once they were able to shape the world as they wanted it to be, they would create a perfect state of affairs in which peace would reign, prosperity would expand, men would be brotherly, and considerate, and there would be no exploitation of man by man, nor any ruthless oppression of individuals." Such he says was his "...baptism into the notion of a kingdom of heaven on earth." The liberal and socialist notion of a Utopian state, by man for man, achieved, by their own ingenuity, and which the Bible states, can only be accomplished by God. His father's heroes, which also became his, were leftist intellectuals of the time such as Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, Harold Laski and Sydney and Beatrice Webb. He went to Cambridge University at the age of 17 with his views about how the world was going to be made better "....firmly entrenched" in his mind. From Cambridge he went to India where he taught at a Christian College. He returned to England and taught for a time at an elementary school in Birmingham. At this time he married Kitty, the daughter of Sydney and Beatrice Webb, which he likened to being married "......into a sort of aristocracy of the left." The couple went to Egypt where he taught at the University of Cairo. It was at this time he began to write articles which ended up in the Guardian office in Manchester, regarded at the time as the citadel of liberalism. He was, in due course, asked to join the editorial staff. It was there, he now says tongue in cheek, that, "truth was being expounded, that was where enlightenment reigned." He describes it as the "golden days of liberalism when the Manchester Guardian was widely read and even believed" and was seen as expressing the opinions of enlightened liberalism.

Writing for the Guardian

He recalls how when he first joined the Guardian, he was asked to respond to comments made at some headmaster's conference on Corporal punishment. He stuck his head into the room adjacent to his and asked a gentleman working there what the paper's line was on the subject. "The same as capital punishment, only more so" he replied. In his own words he relates, "So I knew exactly what to tap out, you see. That is how I got into the shocking habit of pontificating about what was going on in the world.....weighty pronouncements tapped out on a typewriter, deriving from nowhere, and for all we know, concerning no one." Because liberalism is supposed to be a hopeful creed, everything that was written had to end on a hopeful note. No matter how terrible a situation that was being described it always had to end with something like; "It is greatly to be hoped that moderate men of all shades of opinion will draw together and that wiser councils may yet prevail." Is this not exactly what we have come to expect of the liberal media in our times, which now comprises more than 90% of all media available in the western world and in our own

country? The brain washing continues unabated and the opinions of liberals are the only accepted ones, all others being denigrated as backward, and as not belonging in the enlightened 21st century.

He says that he soon got weary with, time after time, having to express those ingenious hopes, as it seemed that: "immoderate men were rather strongly in evidence", and he couldn't see that, "wiser councils were prevailing anywhere."

Time in Moscow

After this he was sent to Moscow as the Guardian correspondent, fully prepared to see in the Soviet regime the answers to all the problems of the West. It didn't take him long, however, to discover that though it might be an answer, it was a very unattractive one. "It is difficult to convey to you", he said, "What a shock this was, realising that what I had supposed to be the new brotherly way of life my father and his cronies had imagined long before, was simply, on examination, an appalling tyranny, in which the only thing that mattered, the only reality, was power." What he had experienced in Russia was according to him, found in the lines of The Magnificat, "He hath put down the mighty from their seat and hath exalted the humble and meek" (Luke 1: 52). Whereupon, of course, the humble and meek become mighty in turn and have to be put down. Is this not what we have become used to in the world; people by deception and empty promises achieve power, exercise power, abuse power are kicked out of power and the whole process just keeps on repeating itself.

What however more than anything convinced him of the liberal lie was, "the extraordinary performance of the liberal intelligentsia, who, in those days, flocked to Moscow like pilgrims to Mecca. And they were one and all utterly delighted and excited by what they saw there. Clergyman walked serenely and happily through the anti-god museums, politicians claimed that no system of society could possibly be more equitable and just, lawyers admired Soviet justice, and economists praised the Soviet economy."

He asked himself how this could be. Was it possible, "that this credulity could exist in the minds of people who were adulated by one and all as maestros of discernment and judgement?" It was this that brought him face to face with the fact that the liberal view of life, was not what it was made out to be - a creative movement to shape the future – but rather that it was a destructive philosophy based on tolerance towards all that followed the prescription laid down by them and being intolerant and defamatory towards all that don't.

Foreign journalists in Moscow would apparently compete with one another as to what outrageous story they could make up with which to test these intelligentsia visitors to the USSR. One such story was, for instance, that the milk shortage in Moscow was due to it having been given to nursing mothers. A fallacy put out by Malcolm Muggeridge and for which he received considerable acclaim was that the huge queues outside food shops came

about because the Soviet workers were so zealous in building socialism that they wouldn't rest, and the only way the government could compel them to rest for even two or three hours was to organize a queue for them to stand in.

"I laugh at it all now," he said, "But at the time you can imagine what a shock it was to someone like myself, who had been brought up to regard liberal intellectuals as the Samurai, the absolute elite, of the human race, to find that they could be taken in by deceptions which a half-witted boy would see through in an instant."

Communism's useful idiots

"I could never henceforth regard the intelligentsia as other than credulous fools who nonetheless became the media's prophetic voice, their heirs and successors remaining so still" It is likely that it is this sort of gullibility by the liberals that motivated Stalin to call them "Communism's useful idiots". It is a gullibility that has persisted and is as evident in the liberal's psyche today as it ever was in those days.

Man the master of his own destiny

On the basis of liberal-humanism, there is no creature in the universe greater than man, and the future of the human race rests only with human beings themselves. This, in spite of claims to the contrary some of them may make. They have convinced themselves that it is only the efforts made by man that will bring about their own happiness and ease of life. The truth is, however, that man's efforts will only produce the direct opposite. Jeremiah 17:9 says, "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked: who can know it?" It is impossible for anything good and beneficial to mankind, to be birthed from such an impure and degenerate seed.

"This philosophy is summed up in the poem "Invictus." By William Ernest Henley

Out of the night that covers me, Black as the pit from pole to pole, I thank **whatever gods** may be For my unconquerable soul.

In the fell clutch of circumstance I have not winced nor cried aloud. Under the bludgeonings of chance My head is bloody, but unbowed.

Beyond this place of wrath and tears Looms but the horror of the shade, And yet the menace of the years Finds and shall find me unafraid. It matters not how strait the gate, How charged with punishments the scroll.

> I am the master of my fate: I am the captain of my soul.

This poem has been quoted by a communist, such as Nelson Mandela, who according to him was empowered by its message of **self-mastery**. Arch liberals such as Franklin D Roosevelt, and anarchists such as, the American heavy metal band 'Virgin Steele', as well as many others, claim to have been inspired by it, being blissfully unaware (or are they) of the damnable heresy and open challenge to God embraced in it. The film "Invictus" made in 2009, and which was a biographical 'sports drama film' directed by Clint Eastwood starring many well -known actors, was named after this same poem. This was highlighted when Nelson Mandela gave the captain of the national South African rugby team a copy of "Invictus" to inspire him to lead his team to a Rugby World Cup win.

How readily worldly concepts are accepted and take over the thinking of men. Concepts that stand in direct contrast to the Word of God.

Attacking liberalism

What is this liberalism that Muggeridge so unflinchingly attacked?

Russel Kirk says, that Muggeridge would have fundamentally agreed with a passage from John Henry Newman's Apologia. After Newman first heard the word 'liberalism' in connection with Lord Byron and his followers he stated: "Afterwards liberalism was the badge of a theological school of a dry and repulsive character, not very dangerous in itself, though dangerous as opening the door to evils, which it did not itself either anticipate or comprehend. At present it is nothing else thanthe development of human reason as practically exercised by the natural man." This passage confirms what the CDP has consistently been saying about liberalism and that is, that whether in the guise of religion or politics liberalism is a value system supported by its proponents with real religious zeal and fervor.

Muggeridge in The Green Sticks says: "far more than any mob of revolutionaries, the bourgeois liberals' innovating notions have gnawed at the footing of personal and social order....(and have) undermined the whole basis of Western European civilization as no avowedly insurrectionary movement ever has or could.... by promoting the 'notion' of determinism, in the one case in morals, in the other in history, thereby relieving individual men and women of all responsibility for their personal and collective behavior."

"The fundamental error of liberalism is its false gospel of automatic and ineluctable progress," Muggeridge declared. "The enthronement of the gospel of progress necessarily required the final discrediting of the gospel of Christ and then destruction of the whole edifice of ethics, law, culture, human relations and human behavior...."

This subject is so vast and at the same time so compellingly fascinating that we will have to continue with and conclude it in future discussion documents.