

For the INDIVIDUAL.  
For the MINORITY.  
For COUNTRY.  
UNDER GOD.

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 12.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 24, 1955.

6d. Fortnightly.

## VOICE

A JOURNAL OF STRATEGY FOR PERSONAL,  
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

"Freedom consists in the ability to choose one  
thing at a time."

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

*One year 15/-; Six months 7/6; Three months 3/9.*

*Offices—Business: LINCOLN CHAMBERS, 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST. Telephone: Belfast 27810. Editorial: ROCKHOUSE FARM, LOWER FROYLE, ALTON, HANTS. Telephone: Bentley 3182.*

### Direction

Eighteen months ago, when we started publication of this paper, we said that the Church had failed; and we have devoted a great deal of space to pointing out where. Our charge and our strictures met with a great deal of resentment, which came to us in modest expressions of surprise or regret and descended the scales of intelligent and unintelligent reaction down to the silly jibe of "bishop baiting." Well, times are changing: bishops are now reporting publicly what we have said. The *Church Times* repeats the Bishop of Barking as saying at Toronto "the world is in its present position because the Church has failed. . . . We need a penetrating diagnosis of what is wrong with us. We do not need a rest cure: we need an operation." We have pointed before now to Chapter XVII of St. John. The condition there laid down by the Founder of the Church for the world to believe in the Church was that its members should be one in the truth; and to that end they should seek the truth. It is clear that one of the operations needed is in regard to the Freemasonic bishops who are determined to deny Christ by seeking oneness not in truth, but in compromise.

Unity is the fruit of truth, obtained by seeking, not unity, but truth; and it appears to be the case that the last place an abstractionist, unpractical clergy will look for truth concerning oneness is in the correct relation of the individual to the group—in the natural law governing social structure. A true social structure, which is to say a Christian social order, results in freedom for the individual person. And that is just what a Collectivist order, as demonstrated in the Welfare, Socialist or Communist State, does not provide. For that reason a Collectivist order is demonstrably not a Christian order; and yet the great majority of the bishops and clergy still support one or other form of collectivist order.

The basic fact which Christianity premises about man is that he is a creature, meaning 'a created thing'—a creature of God. And we agree with Dietrich von Hilde-

brand\* that "The mark," or at least one of the marks, "of the present crisis is man's attempt to free himself from his condition as a created being, to deny his metaphysical situation, to disengage himself from all bonds with anything greater than himself." This in the past has taken the form of individualistic self-sufficiency, characterised by Liberalism, and is still finding its supporters and publications from Free Trade sources. Its interest in freedom is purely selfish and sectional. We have little doubt that most of the clergy who support the collectivism of the Welfare State and Socialism have done so out of revulsion from Liberalism and have plumped for the false alternative thrust at them because they have not yet recognised the anti-personalism it represents. Their ignorance of natural law makes this understandable; but what is really surprising is that they have failed to recognise that where, to quote von Hildebrand, "The State is to take care of everything: that which is essentially a fruit of charity, generosity, and humility of the individual is to be enforced by the State—*i.e.*, from without," and that this has no relation to Christianity.

The bishops and clergy are not distinguishable from the party politicians and the general public who have fallen for what von Hildebrand calls "the historical reality possessed by ideas 'in the air,'" which have replaced "the authentic metaphysical reality of a thing, as well as the objective validity and truth of these ideas." In this matter he has correctly said: "The intoxication experienced in swimming with the stream of a certain epoch, in being supported by public opinion, in sharing in a new, unheard-of evolution, has replaced the sober and noble interest in truth, the respect for truth as the ultimate judge of every theory, every opinion and thesis."

But, it is in just this: in the metaphysical reality, to which social laws and customs should conform, that it is the business of the Church to be the authoritative guide to government and people. The public is to some extent familiar with the kind of warning given by the Bishop of Bristol to scientists attending the British Association meeting:

"The sin of pride which will not accept the limitation of any supernatural sanction or authority, which seeks to become as God, knowing good and evil, deciding for itself what is good and evil, taking the law into its own hand and making its own morality, that is the peril which besets humanity."

It is one thing to say that there is Authority, having sanctions, transcendent as well as immanent in creation, disobedience to which is immoral; it is quite another matter to define and particularise the nature of that Authority as it affects social objectives in political and economic matters, which is in fact where power is exercised in society. Time after time readers of this paper have approached bishops

\* *The New Tower of Babel* by Dietrich von Hildebrand. (London, Burns and Oates.)

and clergy for specific guidance in these matters; and it is always refused. But it is precisely here, at the point where power is exercised, that the distinction is needed between what on the one hand Authority determines is 'good' and what on the other Power, whether from ignorance or temptation, may, and so frequently does, take the "law into its own hands to make its own morality." It is for this reason that a statement of the Bishop of Oxford in his Diocesan Magazine is so welcome. The Bishop wrote (we quote from a sensible editorial in *The Reading Standard* supporting the Bishop): "Work for work's sake is not a Christian maxim" and therefore "freedom from unnecessary work is something to be welcomed. . . . Perhaps the danger today is that so many people are thinking of life solely in terms of work and amusement." The Bishop's advocacy was for the constructive use of leisure in creative activity.

But the Bishop of Oxford's statement falls short of that action which is so urgently needed from the bishops and clergy: the denouncing from pulpit, platform and press of the vicious policy of 'Full Employment,' and the propagation in its place of a policy of well-paid leisure for all those whose work in the production of goods and services is no longer required.

*The Reading Standard* says: "One of the leading philosophers estimates that if the world could compose its political differences and concentrate on organisation for peaceful living it would not be necessary for anyone to work more than two or three hours a day. That must remain a dream of the future." Apart from the fact that this 'dream' has physically been possible of attainment for more than a quarter of a century the writer of this passage has reversed the correct order of ideas, which is: that if 'the world organised for peaceful living' it would for the first time have a sound basis on which to 'compose its political differences.' The world's economy, the economy of each individual country as at present organised, is only prevented from collapse by the multiplication of unnecessary tasks, by huge expenditure on bureaucracies, armies, armaments, capital expansion and export markets; and by a vast complexity of quite unnecessary and vicious legal and taxation enactments, which alone justify the otherwise superfluous existence of veritable armies of accountants, lawyers and clerks. Remove these preposterous excrescences, and the economy, as at present organised, collapses for lack of purchasing power in consumers' hands.

Remove these excrescences and it will be found immediately that the material requirements of industrialised countries, that is to say, the material requirements of the individual members of the populations of these countries can be met by a small fraction of the adult population working short hours in productive enterprise.

This being so it is now that it is necessary to demonstrate an economy organised for peaceful living, for life not dominated by materialist motives. And it is above all the Church's responsibility to give directional guidance to the electorate in this matter. The practical requirement is inescapable: it is that income must be distributed additional to, but extra to, wages and salaries, and not out of taxation—income which is additional to and quite outside the present price-accountancy system.

This is the direction for a Christian society—for Christian living. And it is vitally necessary that a *start* in this direction should be *demonstrated*. Once demonstrated, society will move in that direction. It is for the Church to direct the nation on this Christian path. Talk of "work for work's sake not being a Christian maxim" is idle if it is not incarnated in practical policy.

An Anglican bishop has recently written to us to say that *Voice* "or something of this sort is badly needed" and to enquire "what sort of plans we may have for wider publicity." The answer is that the bishops can open up a wide road for greater publicity by recommending this paper to the clergy in their dioceses. The vicar (unknown to us) whom a correspondent reports expressed his thanks from the pulpit to a person unknown to him who sent him *Voice* regularly, and proceeded to expound its message on freedom, exemplified what could be done from one end of the country to the other.

---

### Personality and the Capacity to Wonder

"Another fundamental attitude darkening the understanding is the incapacity, rooted in *pride*, to listen, to let things themselves speak, to allow them to instruct us. What I mean here is that pedagogic pedantry in face of the world which destroys all 'wondering.'"

—Dietrich von Hildebrand, in *The New Tower of Babel*.

• • •

" . . . But because the world is not a network of neutral ends, but a cosmos of resplendent values, because it reflects and heralds in a multitude of ways the Sun of goodness and beauty which is God, the attitude of the new functionalism as a basic attitude of mankind is unobjective."

—*Ibid.*

• • •

" . . . The hyperactivity of our epoch—the terrible rhythm of work which enslaves the person and prevents him from fulfilling the life for which he is truly called . . . the primary vocation of man does not consist in the production of impersonal goods . . ."—*Ibid.*

• • •

" . . . the opposite to metaphysical indolence, a certain winged alertness of the mind, peculiar to the humbly loving, reverent personality. . . . I mean, rather, that quite consciously directed alertness of a man which enables him to be affected by all genuine values, to surrender himself in a value response of love and will to all real goods, 'to keep step' and to 'conspire' with the object of his understanding. I mean the general resonance of the mind which makes man free, which produces a response to value in the moral sphere instead of eternally seeking for pleasure. . . ."—*Ibid.*

## Inflation

Lately the statement that inflation is "too much money chasing too few goods" has appeared with remarkable frequency in all sorts of places. By itself, and in the context, it is presented as a definition of inflation, which suggests that at the moment it is the fashionable misrepresentation. The phrase is of course not a definition at all, though it may explain one possible cause of inflation. It has evidently been coined not merely as a red herring to lead people's minds away from the real cause, but also to implant two ideas. "Too few goods," if true, would support the exhortation that we all work harder. "Too much money" is intended to justify the present penal taxation. No wonder the advocates of the slave state relish rolling this phrase round their tongues. Many such slogans and phrases are obviously given much publicity, even if not specifically coined, for the purpose of misleading the public or trying to supply a 'cover' for the real criminals. To mention only two such instances let us remember the word "anti-Semitism" and the suggestion that travel encourages international goodwill.

Readers of this journal should know by now that the breaking down of our economic and financial systems is in fact due to an insufficiency of purchasing power—money—facing a potential abundance of consumable goods. This insufficiency is at present made up by wasteful exertion such as government employment that does not help, and may hinder, production, production of armaments, of unnecessary capital production, of manufacture for export, and by crazy outlay on such things as groundnuts and space travel. The phrase we are examining carefully does not differentiate between wanted and unwanted goods. It would in any case be better to call the latter "bads" and not "goods."

The sequence of events during inflation is roughly as follows:

Wages increase on account of rising prices, these wages go into costs; therefore prices rise still more, causing agitation to increase wages and so on *ad infinitum*—or collapse of the economic system. That wages go into costs is inevitable, so it is wages that must be looked at more closely. We here come to the full employment policy and the resultant work state. No purchasing power is issued except such as will be charged to costs and so included in prices. Owing to the constantly reducing percentage of wages, *etc.*, to total costs, more and more wasteful production has to be created to keep the majority of people at work. As all these wages must go into costs, costs, and therefore prices, keep increasing. The wages now being paid out are mainly for wasteful work and not for producing consumable goods. To maintain the work state more and more wages have to be issued to cover the increasing gap between total cost of consumable goods and the purchasing power issued in their production. It is all due to the determination of the enemy to maintain a work state. Before the final collapse here—it came in Russia in 1918 and in Germany in 1921—the enemy hope to have put the chains of slavery on us.

One dictionary defines inflation as a state of being puffed up, a definition which clearly ignores the financial

phenomenon known as inflation. Another dictionary defines it much better as an artificial increase or rise. A suitable definition of what we are experiencing and what we are here considering is a continuous rise in the general level of prices without a corresponding addition or improvement to the goods coming on to the market. This is under present conditions due to the progressive increase in wages, salaries and profits (these to only a small degree) being paid out on wasteful exertion. The outlay on this type of production is controlled by bankers, government officials and politicians—*e.g.*, Mr. Butler's squeeze—according to a concerted and prearranged plan. Readers should ask themselves and others such pertinent questions as: whose plan? on what authority? for what purpose? for whose benefit? and many more. Old fashioned economists call it "controlled inflation," a procedure that is now being applied practically the world over. The control varies. For instance the U.S.A. are being permitted a prosperity which is denied Great Britain. All the time the wasteful expenditure, being financed by borrowed money, is causing the national and industrial debt to the banking system to grow.

Popular mis-education suggests that the alternative to inflation is deflation. This too must be described as artificial, though it occurs immediately incomes in the form of wages, *etc.*, cease to be pumped out for wasteful production. It is then that the true position, insufficient money to buy the goods produced, becomes obvious. What happens then is that goods pile up, have to be sold at unprofitable prices and often below cost, at a loss. Men are 'stood off' as their services are no longer required and so conditions go from bad to worse. Those who remember the early 'thirties need no reminder of the conditions under deflation. Which is worse, inflation or deflation, is something which must be left to the taste and financial position of the individual at the time.

It has already been stressed that both conditions are artificial, *i.e.*, man made. That there is a third possibility, *i.e.*, a condition corresponding to the realities of production, is carefully kept from the knowledge of the people. The natural system is one in which improved methods, new inventions, discoveries, *etc.*, are reflected in constantly reducing prices. Any system that does not square with natural law will not work and we are suffering on account of this fact. Enacted law (in latin *lex*) must be based on natural law (*justitia*) or it is evil.

Why then is it that there is this continuous tinkering with our industry, money system, and our means of livelihood? It is a tinkering that appears superficially to be amateurish, probably because politicians are the normal mouthpieces; but when looked at broadly is shown clearly as a well defined satanic policy. There can be only one answer to the riddle. Inflation and deflation serve definite purposes, namely to enslave men and women and to put at the apex of world government a small cabal of what must be megalomaniacs, ruthless, unscrupulous, regardless of human happiness or life, and very powerful. The power they wield is in direct proportion to the ignorance of the people they are trying to enslave.

H. R. PURCHASE.

### "Vernon Lee" on Leisure

From an Essay contained in the collection, "Ariadne in Mantua" (*The Week End Library—John Lane, The Bodley Head Ltd., 1930*) by Vernon Lee (pseudonym of novelist and essayist, Violet Paget, 1856-1935).

(Concluded.)

Now I suspect that *Charm* is closely related to *Leisure*. Charm is a living harmony in the individual soul. It is organised internally, the expression of mere inborn needs, the offspring of free choice; and as it is the great giver of pleasure to others, sprung probably from pleasure within ourselves; making life seem easier, more flexible, even as life feels in so far easier and more flexible to those who have it. Now even the best work means struggle, if not with the world and oneself, at least with difficulties inanimate and animate, pressure and resistance which make the individual soul stronger, but also harder and less flower-like, and often a trifle warped by inevitable routine. Hence Charm is not the nursling of our hours of work, but the delicate and capricious foster-child of Leisure. For, as observed, Leisure suspends the pull and push, the rough-and-ready reciprocity of man and circumstance. 'Tis in Leisure that the soul is free to grow by its own laws, grow inwardly organised and harmonious; its fine individual hierarchism to form feelings and thoughts, each taking rank and motion under a conscious headship. 'Tis, I would show, in leisure, while talking with the persons who are dear, while musing on the themes that are dearer even than they, that voices learn their harmonious modes, intonation, accent, pronunciation of single words; all somehow falling into characteristic pattern, and the features of the face learn to move with that centred meaning which oftentimes makes homeliness itself more radiant than beauty. Nay more, may it not be in Leisure, during life's pauses, that we learn to live, what for and how?

*Life's Pauses.* We think of Leisure in those terms, comparing it with the scramble, at best the bustle, of work. But this might be a delusion, like that of the moving shore and the motionless boat. St. Jerome, our dear patron of Leisure, is looking dreamily over the top of his desk, listening to the larks outside the wide window, watching the white sailing clouds. Is he less alive than if his eyes were glued to the page, his thoughts focussed on one topic, his pen going scratch-scratch, his soul oblivious of itself? He might be writing fine words, thinking fine thoughts; but would he have had fine thoughts to think, fine words to write, if he had always been busy thinking and writing, and had kept company not with the larks and the clouds and the dear lion on the mat, but only with the scratching pen?

For, when all is said and done, 'tis during work we spend, during leisure we amass those qualities which we barter for ever with other folk, and the act of barter is *life*. Anyhow, metaphysics apart, and to return to St. Jerome. This much is clear, that if Leisure were not a very good thing, this dear old saint would never have been made its heavenly patron.

But your discourse, declares the stern reader or he of sicklier conscience, might be a masked apology for idleness;

and pray how many people would work in this world if every one insisted on having Leisure? The question, moralising friend, contains its own answer: if every one insisted on a share of Leisure, every one also would do his share of work. For as things stand, 'tis the superfluity of one man which makes the poverty of the other. And who knows? The realisation that Leisure is a good thing, a thing which every one must have, may, before very long, set many an idle man digging his garden and grooming his horses, many an idle woman cooking her dinner and rubbing her furniture. Not merely because one half of the world (the larger) will have recognised that work from morning to night is not in any sense living; but also because the other half may have learned (perhaps through grumbling experience) that doing nothing all day long, incidentally consuming or spoiling the work of others, is not *living* either. The recognition of the necessity of Leisure, believe me, will imply the recognition of the necessity of work, as its moral—I might say its *hygienic*, as much as its economic, co-relative.

For Leisure (and the ignorance of this truth is at the bottom of much *ennui*)—Leisure implies a superabundance not only of time but of the energy needed to spend time pleasantly. And it takes the finest activity to be truly at Leisure. Since Being at Leisure is but a name for being active from an inner impulse instead of a necessity; moving like a dancer or skater instead of moving, like a ploughman or an errand boy, for the sake of the wages you get for it. Indeed, for this reason, the type of all Leisure is *art*. But this is an intricate question, and time, alas! presses. We must break off this leisurely talk, and betake ourselves each to his business—let us hope not to his treadmill! And, as we do so, the more to enjoy our work of luckily useful, the less to detest it, alas; as so often in our days, useless; let us invoke the good old greybeard, painted enjoying himself between his lion and his quail in the wide-windowed study; and, wishing for leisure, invoke its patron. Give us spare time, Holy Jerome, and joyful energy to use it. *Sancte Hieronymus, ora pro nobis!*

### Sir David Kelly

Sir David Kelly concludes his book *The Hungry Sheep*:—"My own contribution to an answer is very small, for I have had to choose between a book which would put off the general reader by its length, and a book which is too short to contain more than a fraction of the evidence and illustration needed to defend myself against hostile specialists. ('He doesn't seem to have heard of so and so!') I accept the risks. . . . People want guidance and are deprived of it by 'the treason of the clerks,' the orthodox academic intellectuals who can pick holes, analyse, quote each other, snigger at the now unorthodox traditional values, but too often are happy in a purely negative rôle and boast that they can give no coherent inspiring message. Though Milton meant the words in a very different sense to mine, they are not inappropriate today:

*The hungry sheep look up and are not fed,  
But swoln with wind, and the rank mist they draw,  
Rot inwardly, and foul contagion spread."*

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.  
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.