



Introduction

Serious Christians are worried about the state of the Church and of the world. Their concern is confirmed and justified by events that occur daily. They seek answers diligently; sometimes finding a clue, though frequently finding little or nothing.

Such Christians would learn a great deal if they were to stroll along to the nearest, amply stocked and orthodox Christian bookshop — unfortunately not as easy as it should be — and look at the books on the shelves. There will be books on the Popes and Papal Encyclicals. There will be books on the Church Fathers, Saints and Prophets. There will be books on both the structure and history of the Church. There will be books on the Religious Orders and the Religious Life. There will be books on Theology, Philosophy and Dogma. In other words, there will be a vast field of materials dedicated, broadly speaking, to the Principles and Personalities of the Church.

Now let these Christians stroll down the road to the local radical/ alternative/left wing bookshop — unfortunately much easier than is desirable — and look at the shelves. There will be books on Lenin, Mao, Castro, Clinton and Blair, so that the broad school of “progressive” thinkers is covered. There will be books on History from every perspective that is fundamentally anti-Christian: Socialist, Liberal, Communist, Anarchist, “Green,” Homosexual, Feminist. There will be books discussing every aspect of Life and Society from an anti-Christian point of view, even down to the absurd “Marxist view of Marmalade in an advanced capitalist society”. In other words, there will be a vast field of materials dedicated, broadly speaking, to the Principles and Personalities of the anti-Christian opposition.

However, our serious Christians, looking for answers, will have noticed, if they have looked around the place with an intelligent and observant eye, that a good number of shelves in the “alternative” bookshop were given over to a subject rarely, if ever, found in the Christian bookshop. They will have found shelf upon shelf of books dealing with the “how”: how to create leaders of men from poor quality material; how to build effective political cell structures in all kinds of environments; how to influence those who are, in theory, enemies but who are easily manipulated because they are not “as wise as the children of the world”; how to create broad alliances, temporary or semi-permanent, in order to achieve specific and defined ends; how to network amongst irate

workers who have had yet another raw deal, amongst middle class youngsters revolted by the bourgeois life of their rather smug parents, amongst technicians who have genuine vision but possess no outlet for that vision, amongst intellectuals who loathe the false façade of modern academia and its illusory doctrine of “academic freedom”, amongst peasants in far-off lands who are victims of some vile global corporation that lives on chewing up communities and then spitting them out. In other words, there is a host of books that instructs enemy cadres on how to operate, to organize, to impact society on all levels. There is no person, no position, no place, no problem that is not dealt with — and amply so.

If our serious Christians reflect deeply, they will see that in the case of the “radical” bookshop, full of books on both “doctrine” and “action”, we are dealing with a superficial grasp of the Thomistic principle that Thought and Action are necessarily linked, and that, as St. Thomas says in the *Summa Theologica*, “the highest form of Contemplation (i.e., Thought) is that which superabounds in Action. While Lies loudly proclaimed and vigorously implemented may produce tangible effects, only the Truth can give rise to genuine Action, to an Action which is an organic and legitimate consequence of “real” Truth. What is wrong with the anti-Christian caricature is that the Thought is wrong, and so the resultant Action can only bring destruction in its wake.

It could, of course, be objected that we are overvaluing these books dedicated to doing. It could be objected that the Church, too, has and is organizing a great deal in all fields and disciplines and has done so from its earliest times. That is true — up to a point; but it is a point that cannot and should not be pushed too far. For if we look around the world, what do we see happening? Are we seeing the advance or retreat of the Christian forces? The truth is our society is living on the rotting remains of that Christendom wrought on the anvil of Catholicism for 1,500 years. The enemy are clearly doing something right, and we are clearly doing something wrong. If a football team is losing, it is because it is not scoring. As Christians, then, we are not scoring.

It is our contention that what is missing in Christian circles is Tactics, Strategy and Grand Strategy. Our organizations range from inadequate to non-existent. Training is limited in terms of frequency, effectiveness and relevance. Analysis, where it exists, is often of poor quality; and it is often so slow moving that by the time a situation, a window of possible opportunity for a Christian gain, has been grasped and understood, it has already passed. The attitude of mind is frequently too little, too late — and too often done without that enthusiasm that breeds success.

Christians, of course, have no excuse in refusing to embrace systematic organization in the quest to rebuild Christendom. There have been any number of converts from enemy ranks to the Church who have contrasted the almost

diabolical energy and initiative of the anti-Christian forces with the lassitude and laxity of the massed ranks of Christianity.

The late Hamish Fraser, for example, wrote in his autobiography, *Fatal Stag* about his days in the Communist Party and his role as a highly effective Political Commissar in the Spanish Civil War. His conversion to the Faith, largely through coming into contact with the Social Teaching of the Church, brought a militant fighter into the ranks of Church, but one suspects from his many articles down the years in his journal, *Approaches*, that he never quite got over how blasé Christians were. We possess the fullness of Truth through our membership of the Mystical Body of Christ, and yet this pearl beyond value barely registers on the scale of life for most Christians.

Or take the revealing work, *I Believed*, by Douglas Hyde, who converted to the Faith in 1948 after 20 highly active years in the British Communist Party, and who for many of those years worked at the top. His book is instructive in many ways, but perhaps most importantly it demonstrates the centrality of Action to Communism; it demonstrates that Communism is not a belief system, but a mode of action. It is, as Antonio Gramsci, the Italian communist ideologue, wrote, “the philosophy of praxis”. It is because Action takes first place that we come to understand why People and Principles are so expendable in the minds of these materialist revolutionaries. One day Joe Stalin is “The Father of the Peoples” — the next he is an ideological deviant who has tarnished the “purity” of the socialist vision. One day “the class struggle” is the defining element of the Party and its principal weapon in the war against Capitalism and Imperialism — the next day it gives way to a broad front of anyone and everyone in order to confront and crush that person or group which is regarded as irredeemably dangerous.

In other words, Communism is not really a body of doctrine at all, but a belief in power at any cost of time, energy, money, reputation, blood. It is perhaps in this sense that Our Lady of Fatima spoke of the “errors of Russia” — not the expansion of overt Communist Party control, but rather of the mentality that deals, double deals and wheels and deals so that war of all against all becomes the norm. Is this not the reality behind all Boardroom upheavals? Is this not the reality behind the innumerable splits in Parliamentary parties? Is this not the reality in so many special interest groups, where the “Cause” is only so much wallpaper used to cover naked ambition?

We can have no common social action until we have common values. But common values are the product of a common mind, and a common mind is the product of a common religion. In other words, there can be no saving action by Christians until they possess the common mind and values that their religion predicates (my emphasis JSP). There can be no divorce between Thought and Action just as there can be no divorce between Husband and Wife, or between Clergy and Laity. In short, Truth demands as of

right that it be applied in all spheres, that it be the source and the *raison d'être* of Action. It is this all-embracing truth that Christianity is a religion, a philosophy, a way of life for all men, in all places, in all times — that satisfies the Hand, the Heart, the Mind and the Soul — and which requires Action to be incarnate in the world.

* * * *

Jean Ousset was a household name in France amongst Catholics in the post-World War II world, and his name is still revered in Catholic circles which maintain a traditional view of Catholicism. But in the English-speaking world, he was and is practically unknown. Indeed, it was only thanks to the foresight of Hamish Fraser that his book, *Action*, was ever published in English.

Ousset was an unusual man — at least unusual amongst the men of the modern world. He was someone who could *think* — and profoundly so — and who could also *act*. His Thought preceded his Action, and the latter was a necessary and automatic consequence of the former. In our day, we tend to have Thinkers *and* Doers, but rarely Thinker-Doers. It is this failure to unite our thinking and our doing into a practical habit that has allowed our enemies to grow and prosper to such an extent that the very existence of our civilization is now in the balance.

In order to grasp the significance of Ousset’s work, we need to confront the question: “What is Action?”

Action, in the sense in which it is used here, is an attribute or quality which pertains only to human beings. Paul Glenn, in his excellent *A Tour of The Summa*, says that whilst it is true that animals act, they do so in a way which cannot be compared to the acts undertaken by men. Why? Because “a human act is a free will act. It is any thought, word, deed, desire, or omission which comes from a man by his free, knowing, and deliberate choice. The Latin noun *voluntas* means the will, and the adjective which means pertaining to the will is voluntariness. A voluntary act is an act which proceeds from free will acting in the light of knowledge.” He continues: “Since every human act is a free will act, every human act is voluntary.”

To every Christian and non-Christian who can still think logically in these days of confusion, this will stand to reason, but the point is made because too many are now incapable of grasping straightforward distinctions. An animal can have no rights. Why? Because it lacks both intellect and free will. Its acts can never have a free and responsible voluntariness. And because this is so, it has no duties either. We conclude that what ought to be done, what needs to be done in the world, can be done only by men, acting according to their nature.

Now, insofar as all human actions are free, they are also necessarily moral or immoral. All Action is thus divided into two distinct categories: the Good and the Bad. Any number of

refinements, extenuations and widening of definitions can be added, but the basic fact of an absolute *division* of Good and Bad remains forever. It is a standard that cannot be superseded by a higher criticism, nor diluted by sophistry. This is an important matter to grasp, for it means that what we choose to do, or choose not to do, will always resolve itself into these two categories.

Perhaps more pertinently, understanding this fact brings us into immediate and necessary conflict with the power élites of modern society, who negate this principle both in theory and in practice. For the “modern man”, Action is a neutral idea — a conception that relates more to the circumstances rather than to anything intrinsically moralistic. The validity - or usefulness of an action is judged by its “success”; that is to say, if any given action produces what the agent of action desires, then it is successful, it is “good”. If it does not, it is “bad”. In other words, it is the basis of the false philosophy that currently dominates our world that “the end justifies the means”; it is the idea that even a bad means can be used to achieve a good end, because what determines the whole matter is the “success” achieved, not the morality of the means used. It doesn't take much imagination to see where this fluid mentality can and does lead — to the worst depravities that can be committed by man against man. We saw it in the destruction of millions of souls in Gulags during the Soviet period, and it was justified, held “successful”, because it advanced Communism which was “good”. We see it in our day in the ravaging advance of Globalization, where communities and nations are sacrificed to business, because profit and economic power are “good”. Whilst this mentality continues to exist, continues to go unchallenged, the permutations for resultant corruption and degeneration are simply endless.

But is it true that action is neutral, a tool or weapon to be wielded according to circumstance, and which justifies itself or otherwise by the fruits obtained? The answer is, of course, no, because what is being really argued is that the effectiveness of an action determines its morality.

The Christian position is this: a good action may be effective or not, but a bad action can never be effective except apparently. An evil action can never be absolutely or ultimately effective — except on the surface of life — because its very “nature” prevents it from being fruitful. St Thomas writes: “Evil is not a thing or essence or nature in itself; it is the hurtful absence of a thing; it is the lack of what should be present. Being is necessarily good, for being and the good are really the same. Evil is, in itself, non-being”.

Let us look at this idea in more depth. It would be argued by most Christians that distributing pro-life literature outside abortion clinics, hospitals and shopping centres is a good action. In and of itself, it is a good action — but that doesn't mean that it is necessarily effective. It may or may not produce the consciousness that would demand that abortion be outlawed, but that the action is good is beyond question.

Equally, we might conceive of the most stunning exposition of Christian doctrine ever penned, which by its careful compilation, its precision of phrase and its ease of access would convert anyone to Christianity. The action would undoubtedly be good, but would it be necessarily effective? No, because if it were printed but not distributed how could it bear fruit? Thus, whilst Goodness and Effectiveness in Action are closely related, they are not synonymous.

We all know that politicians lie and that they do so almost from force of habit. Indeed, one might say that it is largely taken for granted that they lie, that somehow lying “goes with the job”. Why do the politicians do so, since most ordinary folk regard lying with abhorrence? Plainly because they believe that it works, that it is “successful” in obtaining the ends that they seek.

“Success” in our society is generally defined in terms of Power, Wealth and Influence. If you possess these attributes, you are, *ipso facto*, “successful”; if you don't, you are a miserable failure. And the concomitant conclusion is that the more Power, Wealth and Influence that you have, the more “successful” you are; and it is obvious that there is a symbiotic relationship between these three attributes, for Power tends to lead to Wealth, and Wealth tends to lead to Influence. In its turn increased Influence leads to more Power, and more Power to yet further Wealth. And so it goes on, with the result that a Ted Turner, or a Bill Gates are held, by the mass of people, to be phenomenally “successful”.

So, politicians lie, and industrialists steamroller opposition because they believe such actions are successful, are “good”, for it stands to reason that few men consciously undertake to do evil knowing that such action is evil. Evil is always carried out under the auspices of the “good”, with the result that the road to Hell is paved with good intentions.

Yet the fact remains that action which leads to such “success” is not good, that the success itself is an illusion, and that this can be demonstrated on two planes — the theological and the practical.

On the theological level, all Christians know that “the wages of sin is death”. We know that whatever the “successes” of a great mover and shaker in this life, he will be judged severely by God upon his death and that — all things being equal — his “success” will bring him the eternity of Hell. All the lying, thieving, killing and downright immorality which provided “success” in this life — all consequences of a man's actions — will be recompensed with damnation. Where, then, is the “success” in a life of action that is founded upon the bad? Is it not the case that the “success” is illusory, and the idea of action as a neutral concept wholly absurd?

Of course, those who are rather less “otherworldly” might say that this line of reasoning is typical of medieval Catholicism, the “pie in the sky” that kept men ignorant for a millennium

and prevented the great figures of History from being free to mould the world in a new and more inspirational way. The problem, however, is that the illusion that “the End justifies the Means” fails not merely in terms of theology, but also in the terms of those who adhere to the notion that the morality of an Action is determined by its “success”. In other words, even on their own terms their “success” is a failure. That is not a play on words, even less is it a paradox. Rather it is a demonstrable fact.

Let’s take our favourites — the politicians — once again as an example. Who actually *trusts* a politician? Who actually believes that he means what he says, and that he intends to do what he says? Who actually believes that going into Politics is an honourable vocation, worthy only of the best since Politics is concerned with the life and well-being of an entire community? If public cynicism about Politics, Parliaments, Parties and Politicians is anything to go by, very few. And one certainty is this: no politician believes the word of another politician! They both know the realities, the rules of the game. The world out there is “a dog eat dog” world, and expediency is not merely a Method, but the most sublime Principle. It is because this is so true in such an unreal world that neither Person nor Principle has much value beyond the defining and all-compelling moment. If an alliance with a man, a party or a corporation of the most base kind will bring “success” for a day, for a moment, then it will be entered into without a second thought. It is the philosophy behind the much quoted statement that “a week is a long time in politics”.

Thus, when a politician tells you that he will “never lie to you”, one suspects that that was the first lie; that when a politician tells you that he is “a patriot”, it is probable that he is just about to betray; that when a politician bewails the fact that he has “no alternative to choose from”, one feels instinctively that money has changed hands.

What, then, is the impact on a society which is governed by men who equate the “goodness” of an action with its “effectiveness”? It means that Honour, Respect, Truth, Commitment and Conviction have no meaning whatever. It means that there can be no social cohesion, no social action — for if you have no trust or respect in someone, how can you possibly work with them? A politician may be able to “survive” — for a greater or lesser time — in a Parliament using such methods, but **a Community or Nation cannot. It is Truth, Objective Goodness, which must inform the life and spirit of a society if it is to survive and prosper, Its customs, its traditions, its sense of community, its vision and destiny, its planning for the future, its belief in right living, and so much more are predicated on the notion that only Action which is objectively good can vivify its life principle.**

Look around you, then, and see what the spirit of lying, of “good” — in terms of success — action has achieved in

countless modern societies. It has achieved doubt, cynicism, mistrust, apathy — purely destructive qualities which renders impotent individuals, families and communities by slow, ineluctable degrees. And the politician builds his “success” on this! He builds his edifice of Power, Wealth and Influence on a foundation that he is honeycombing with the seeds of collapse! History is replete with such men, and history is replete, too, with societies that collapsed as a result — many never to rise again.

So, the idea that “a good action is one that is effective” simply does not stand up to scrutiny. Good actions are objectively good, irrespective of whether they are effective or not.

The cynical might argue, of course, that there is more to life than politicians. Fine. Let’s look at two more institutions, Industry and the Church, to see that what was said about politicians is just as true of industrialists and modern churchmen.

In commerce, in business, the Captains of Industry, the technocratic whizz-kids, the venture capitalists, the Stock Exchange dealers and so on have done sterling work. They have made of work an endless drudgery; they have made loyalty a nonsense; they have made hard work and initiative pointless; they have killed all those human qualities in the workforce — in factories, in offices, in shops — which not only made work more enjoyable but more *efficient* and profitable in every way.

They have achieved this consummate “success” through belief in the idea that the possession of money is the “highest good”, and that any action that leads to such “good” is necessarily good in itself.

But loyalty, for example, has no price. The person who turns up 10 minutes early in the morning, and leaves half an hour late at night without being paid; the person who does an extra job which is not in their job description but which would go undone otherwise; the person who does more work, or serves more people, beyond the strict necessity - these people, once put off from demonstrating their loyalty, cost the “successful” businessman in the very coin by which he measures his “success” — money! This is so because he has to replace these “free attributes”, generated by generosity and gentility, through stricter regimentation, a greater bureaucracy, more intense working practices and the progressive implementation of the slogan “All for the Company, None against the Company”. In other words, he haggles over nickels and dimes and loses a wad of dollar bills! Is his “success” real or illusory?

Or take Church this past generation or so. Why is it in such a mess? For this reason. Modern churchmen have convinced themselves in too many cases that they can have their cake and eat it as well. In practical terms, they believe that they can obey the Laws of God and be on good terms with the

world when the whole history and teaching of the Church have said precisely the opposite. This grave error manifests itself in the belief that “success” — by which one assumes more members, more influence, more money; more popularity — can be had through the “good” action which calls itself compromise; by ‘going easy’ on the Ten Commandments; by being more ‘tolerant’ on questions of Dogma; by insisting exclusively on the ‘medicine of Mercy’ to the exclusion of the lashing whip of Divine Justice; by smiling blandly and sweetly when the countenance of Holy Anger is far more appropriate.

The “success” of such means — actions — was at first heralded by the pronouncement that the Church would witness the fruits of a Second Pentecost, a blossoming and flourishing not seen since the times of the Apostles. Thirty years on these objective fruits have failed to materialize, and the worried churchmen of our day are pushed back to talking, “not about numbers, but the quality of people’s spiritual lives”.

But the disaster was wholly predictable for the actions undertaken were not objectively good, and thus could bring nothing but evil in their wake. If “all religions are the same at heart” — whether said explicitly by the faithless pastor or implied by the cowardly pastor — why bother being a Christian? If God is going to “forgive us all and take us to Heaven come what may” — why practise the Christian virtues? If the priest is “just like any other man” — why bother trying a vocation to the priesthood? If renunciation, sacrifice and penitence are “throwbacks of medieval theology” — why get up early on Sunday morning to go to Church? Why go on pilgrimages, build schools, read devotional books, and financially support your parish priest? Hundreds of millions of Christians have asked themselves these kinds of questions over the last 40 years and have voted with their feet.

GOALS

Once we grasp that all Action is either good or bad, we can judge aright what means may, or may not, be employed in establishing a truly Christian society. But a further understanding is necessary. We must understand first what our Christian goals ought to be. Of the licit and acceptable means, we must then distinguish which means will really advance the Christian cause from those that won’t. We must finally understand which Actions to take — political, educational, social, economic, financial, commercial, agricultural, cultural and so on — and how to make them not merely good, but also effective at the same time. What these actions are, and how to ensure that they are effective, is the subject of this book.

- These actions will involve whom? Young and old, rich and poor, man and woman, worker and intellectual.

- These actions will cover what? Everything from the least to the most challenging.

- These actions will occur when? At all times and consistently so.

- These actions will take place where? In the home, the church, the school, the factory, the farm, the business, the club, the association, the movement, the office.

- These actions will take place how? With whatever resources — material, human and intellectual — are available.

In other words, wherever the orthodox Christian structure and spirit does not currently reign, appropriate action, good action, moral action, effective action will have to take place. It will have to continue taking place until a truly Christian society comes into being once again; and it will need to continue thereafter to ensure that society stays that way.

If Life is Action, then we must *think* and to *do*. Not just here and there, but everywhere and always, for anything less than a complete action will prove a terrible failure. If you greatly ameliorate the economic structure of a society through the diffusion of wealth but you leave the same corrupt mentality to fester in the schools and universities — you lose! If you return people to the land but leave so-called “business ethics” untouched — you lose! If you create a usury-free society, but you leave the money-grubbing philosophy untouched — you lose!

The second lesson is that not all the Questions, let alone all the Answers, are in Ousset’s work. It is not a painting-by-numbers work that, if patiently followed, will lead automatically to a Christian society. It is for this reason that the Directors of IHS Press have added the subtitle: A Manual for the Reconstruction of Christendom to the original title. A Manual of whatever kind does not pretend to give you all the answers to every specific question — whether it be a Computer Manual, a Manual of Moral Theology or Tool Manual that explains how a tool works and may be used. A Manual is something that gives the outline of how things work; what principles are at work; how to determine how to solve a problem. It is something to be read, re-read, pondered and dipped into as often as is necessary. It is not a Patent for Success, but a Resource to be used in proportion that the user becomes more acquainted, more proficient in its use.

Therefore, Ousset talks about Individual Action; about Group Action; about National Action; about International Action. He discusses Tactics, Techniques, Strategy and Structures. He highlights the importance of Ideas and of People. He draws out the relationship that should exist between Leaders and Led, between Laity and Clergy, between Workers and Intellectuals. He discusses how Morals and Prudence must influence the choice of Action. He explains how one should set reasonable objectives before an action,

and how to evaluate the results after the action. He invites one to ponder the fact that just because a given action has been

used successfully in the past, it doesn't mean that it will always be so; that whilst novelty in action should be regarded circumspectly, it doesn't follow that novelty is bad, for creativity and initiative are at the core of all authentically Christian life. In short, he breaks down the immense question, "What is to be done?" into many component parts, analyses those parts sufficiently without being verbose, and then commends the reader to apply the lessons he has learned to the situation in which he finds himself. You learn, in effect, to use a hammer and chisel, but it is down to you to decide what to make, how to make it and in what time frame.

Thus, Prayer Groups and Confraternities will have their place; as will Study Circles and Cultural/Artistic/Musical Bodies. There is room for Scientific entities, Publishing houses, Political Associations, Clubs, Guilds, Educational Structures, Co-operatives, Rural Initiatives, Training Institutes, Journals and Bulletins, Demonstrations and the Distribution of Propaganda Materials, Lectures and Seminars and Speeches. In a word, the world is your oyster so long as you link your Thought and Action in a profoundly Christian manner!

It might be objected that Ousset seems preoccupied with the Left, with the spread of Communism. In its way, it is a kind of valid objection; but it should be remembered that Ousset wrote this work in 1960's France. This was a time when the country was being ravaged by the forces of the Left, and when the whole Western world believed that Communism might overrun them at any time. The war in Vietnam, the eruption of Student Power movements throughout the West, the Cuban Missile Crisis, the Berlin Airlift, the crushing of the Czech Uprising, the spread of Marxist tyranny in Africa, the oscillation between Left- and Right-Wing governments in Hispanic America, the rise of Communist China all these things must be borne in mind. They are the colour and texture of the background against which Ousset wrote. He didn't choose the circumstances, they were simply a given. Thus, it should be no real surprise that he focussed on the immediate, on what was at hand since this is what we all do

Yet, despite pressure, Ousset does not fall into the trap that many did and do; just because Communism seemed the most urgent threat, it did not blind him to the evils of Capitalism in society. He maintained that being anti-Communist does not make one an apologist of Capitalism even by default.

We should not be over-critical of Ousset's concentration upon Communism, for after all Communism is only one side of the coin, the counterpoint to Capitalism, which jointly prepares what Hilaire Belloc called the Servile State. Belloc puts it this way in *An Essay on the Restoration of Property*. "To establish the Servile State, one has but to follow certain lines which lead rapidly to an ideal conclusion, a society where all men, the few Capitalists and the mass of the proletariat are all securely nourished the latter on a wage, or, lacking this, a subsidy of idleness. The same is true with the Communist state: a society where *all* men are securely nourished as slaves

of the government. A simple formula and its exact application will, in each case, produce the ideal society envisaged." And if the Servile State means anything, it means the absence of any meaningful human action. It is the repetition of monotony to the benefit of the Few, and at the tremendous expense of the Many. We are well down that road, and it may be seen in how we have become spectators — for the characteristic of spectatorship is not action, but inaction.

We watch more and more sport, but we play it less and less. We listen to music more and more, but we play it less and less. Work is not something that we *do*, but something that we suffer. Politics we leave to others. Education is for teachers alone. Religion is for old women and priests. Milk comes not from the cow, but from the supermarket. Clothes come off the rack, not off the home loom. Books are viewed on screen rather than handled and read. Concern for the old, the young and infirm gives way to concern for the bank account, the credit card and the compassion-less charity telethon. News gives way to gossip. History gives way to Lies. Law gives way to tyranny. Government gives way to social control. And Christianity is giving way to anodyne humanism.

In sum, Life is ceasing to be action in any meaningful sense. It is becoming a virtual reality — the sickest joke yet of Satan who counterfeits all the gifts of God. We are becoming the spectators of our own lives. Our lack of Action means lack of life — and the lack of life is death. Capitalism is death through Consumerism. Socialism is death through Bureaucracy. Parliamentary Democracy is death through Boredom. Freemasonry is death through Secrecy. Modernism is death through Disbelief. Our lack of Action is truly Abortion right across the board.

Ousset writes as a Catholic. He writes with precision. He writes with distinction. He writes with honesty and perspicacity. He writes *brutally* — for in a society of illusions, such as ours, the Truth appears brutal. He writes to wake us up, to stir us to action, to do something before the ship of Christian culture and civilization sinks below the waves. He writes with passion and conviction. But above all, he writes with the knowledge that the Truth will set us free. All we must do is act upon it.

The Directors
IHS Press
July 2002

[Editor Note: Ousset was writing to Catholics in his time. I have changed 'Catholic' to 'Christian' in the text, to embrace all believers in this time when the One New Man is beginning to manifest – John Potter]