

Sermon: What then is to be done? Trinity XV, 24th September 2006

A curious thing: recently what was for a long time unsayable is now being said – and by people you would think most unlikely to say these things. The Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality for instance has greatly angered Ken Livingstone and other fellow travellers by saying that multiculturalism is a recipe for disaster. Of course if you say this you will be deliberately misunderstood – *deliberately* misunderstood – by those who have a vested interest in promoting disaster. So one always has to begin with a disclaimer: one is obliged to say for the umpteenth time what multiculturalism *is not*.

Multiculturalism does not mean welcoming people of all races and creeds to live together in beautiful harmony. We'd all like that, it goes without saying. No, unfortunately, multiculturalism means giving hospitality to alien groups who have no intention of adopting and living according to the traditional mores of the nation. This is to take hostages to fortune. Especially if the authorities then enact laws which seem to prefer and privilege the dissident minorities.

Especially when the authorities allow and even encourage all manner of calumnies to be uttered against the traditional faith of this country – Christianity – but to prosecute anyone who dares to make even the gentlest criticism of the aliens. Sometimes this has hugely comical results: as when Muslim fanatics warn us: *Don't you dare say Islam is a violent and murderous religion – because if you do, we'll kill you!*

And another unsayable that is at last being said is that marriage is a good thing, for the couples concerned, for their children and for society in general. The government said this first. Followed by the Archbishop of Canterbury, one discreet pace behind.

We have been at war culturally for a long time. I'll tell you about it. Before the Second World War, Georg Lukacs and members of the German Communist Party set up at Frankfurt university The Institute for Marxism, based on the Marx-Engels Institute in Moscow. This title was eventually euphemised into The Institute for Social research and later The Frankfurt School.

The aims of the Frankfurt School were the overthrow of western culture – Christianity – and the imposition of revolutionary Communism. They understood that this could only come about after Christian beliefs had died in the soul of western man. So they began to undermine western life and culture from within, to transform western institutions from within those institutions themselves. Their manifesto said:

Morals, values, truth, standards and human nature itself are products of different historical epochs. There are no absolute moral standards that are universally true for all human beings. Morality is socially constructed.

So bang go the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount. And did you notice, Gramsci included *truth* as something that is not absolute either? That was very convenient for the Frankfurt School – because they were liars.

Unfortunately, we see that the aims of these subversives – corrupting western institutions from within – have been very largely achieved. Achieved beyond the

wildest dreams of Gramsci, Adorno, Foucault and Herbert Marcuse themselves. Because western civilisation, western culture, has rolled over, committed suicide, given every assistance and encouragement to its enemies.

The latest manifestation of this destruction is political correctness. And here too the totalitarian atheists have won as well: for they have got us to laugh at political correctness as if it were merely absurd – like the urban myth that the Mayor of London banned black bin bags because they were racist. But political correctness is not a laugh, not a bit of fun. It is the linguistic means by which a subversive elite imposes its diktats.

I have a book coming out this week about political correctness. And I fear people will only snigger and say, *O look – Peter's being ever so naughty again!* Just as they snigger when one attacks the liturgical and theological vandalism of the last forty years. I hope people *will* laugh at the jokes in my book – but I hope they will also realise that these things are matters of life and death

How do you subvert an institution? You do it by what Trotskyism called *transitional demands*. For instance, you invent the slogan *Social Housing for All* as a means to creating unstable ghettos. And, as George Orwell pointed out, you do it by Newspeak – Newspeak, the language of political correctness. You invent descriptions for social policy which sound benign but which are really destructive of the society in which they are planted.

So, for instance, you set up something called *sex education* – only you take care that this should in no wise include sexual morality. It's animal biology for the encouragement of promiscuity. You give the morning after pill to twelve year olds. Promiscuity undermines the family and that is what the subversives want. Or you institutionalise abortion and call it something nice like *Choice* – an operation in which everyone has choice, except the foetus. *Multiculturalism* and *diversity* are further examples of poisonous newspeak. *Social inclusion*, *accessibility* and so on. You could write a whole glossary of these lying words. Words coined for the purposes of social engineering.

And you seize also on good and useful words like *satire*. Say *satire* and people think of Jonathan Swift and Aldous Huxley, George Orwell. But today so called satire is used not to mock the Establishment but to further the subversives. Let me give you an example. *The News Quiz* on Radio Four at 6.30 every Friday is billed as satire. And it *would* be satire if politicians still wore three-piece suits with stiff collars and watch chains; and if BBC announcers still talked like the Queen. That bunch of vapid third-raters who are the stars of the show would like us to think they are cutting edge anti-Establishment – when in fact they *are* the Establishment: the progressive, politically-correct Establishment.

I return then to the question I asked at the start. *What then is to be done?* People are starting to do what needs to be done: they are beginning to say the unsayable. But the words have remained unsaid for so long that they are difficult to say. And some of those who are beginning to say the unsayable are doing so hesitantly and, as it were, with a stammer. It is the terrorist attacks and the resulting public anxiety which is provoking people to say what needs to be done. But they aren't quite saying it.

The admirable Melanie Phillips says in her book *Londonistan* that *The West must stop sleepwalking into cultural oblivion*. But she doesn't tell us quite how. Michael Gove in his book *Celsius 7/7* is scarcely more explicit. He says:

We need to rediscover and reproclaim our common values. We need an ideological effort to move away from moral relativism and towards moral clarity.

Why does he say only *moral clarity* and not *moral truth*? Why does he say we need to *rediscover* our values? We know what our values are: they are the historic Christian faith. And the last thing we want is *an ideological effort*. We had quite enough *ideology* from the Frankfurt School.

God has raised up one man who is quite explicit about what needs to be done. Marcello Pera, President of the Italian Senate. He says:

Christianity is so consubstantial to the West that any surrender on its part would have devastating consequences. Will the Church and the clergy and the faithful be able to be purified of the relativism that has almost erased their identity and weakened their message and witness?

So that is what we must do. No mistake. No more relativism. No euphemisms. No hiding behind discretion and a polite diffidence that seeks to offend no one. No more moral cowardice. No more lukewarm faith – faith as cancerous respectability and keeping our heads down. What must be done? The recovery of the full Christian faith in mind and heart, in thought and practice, in prayer and devotion. Stand up for true belief. Pray with me will you? Pray, will you as if your life depended on it. For it does.