

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 16.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 1955.

6d. Fortnightly.

VOICE

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

"Freedom consists in the ability to choose or refuse
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.

You Cannot Justify Evil

Quoting twelve texts from the New Testament dealing with Christian teaching on money the leader in the *Church Times* for October 28 concludes: "though men 'cannot serve God and Mammon,' they can surely serve God with Mammon." The word "Mammon" derives from a Greek word designating the false god of cupidity, and is ordinarily conceived of as the "personification of wealth, conceived of as an ignoble object of desire and pursuit."

The *Church Times* is guilty of a grave perversion of the truth, and a truth, the recognition of which is the first essential as a basis for the ordering of a Christian society. And it concerns what in the nature of Reality men may strive for. It has been well said that "Christianity is *inter alia* a technique by which a man, by control of his ideation, may gain such part of the world as in the nature of things appertains to him." Cupidity is not a virtue in the Christian Idea of Reality, it is a vice which serves Mammon. Mammon cannot be served without cupidity; and to say that "God can be served with Mammon" is to say that the end justifies the means. It doesn't. You cannot justify evil. To "serve God with Mammon" a person must first serve Mammon, and you "cannot serve God and Mammon."

It is noticeable, and no doubt significant having regard to the *Church Times'* overture to Mammon, that its leader omits all reference to the incident when Christ drove the money-changers out of the Temple. In our day the money-changers have achieved a power such as has never been known before. In our day the control of money on a global scale has passed into a few hands, and has become an unprecedented world-wide tyranny, rendered the more complete by the elimination of the independent capitalist through penal taxation and inflation, so that he has to depend upon the will of a credit monopoly for the greater part of his capital. And by this means have all the major and all but a few of the minor organs of publicity passed directly or indirectly into the control of the same hands.

Here is Mammon enthroned; and where is there a Church newspaper which attacks this monstrous evil, or even

whispers to its readers that it exists? Is this the price of permitting "God to be served with Mammon"?

During this century the *real* cost, the cost in human effort, of producing anything has fallen steeply, and as a contributor points out on another page, if the money system reflected reality, a £1 should purchase four times what it did in 1914 or more, whereas in fact it buys about one-sixth. The real cost has fallen; the money cost has risen. The money cost is at least twenty-four times the real cost. Are incomes twenty-four times the real cost? They are not on average more than sixteen times. And because 16 cannot 'buy' 24, there is debt, ever mounting debt—and frustration.

It is not necessary to be a financial expert to recognise that there is here being perpetrated on the community a most gigantic fraud; it needs just common sense and a sense of honesty. Throughout the land bishops and clergy will be found chiding from pulpit and Press the British workman for his attitude to work and wages, but we venture to say that the number of bishops or clergy who have publicly denounced the wickedly dishonest system which produces such flagrant injustice does not run into two figures.

Beyond a shadow of a doubt the Church, most especially the Church, should have been, and should be, the protector of the people against this iniquity, which if examined can clearly be seen as the cause, not only of all the industrial troubles and unrest, but also of the materialism of our times. Instead of that they turn against the victims of the fraud.

"The loyal Christian will eschew any excessive expenditure on luxuries" says the *Church Times*, and instances what a wage earner may spend on tobacco. A heavy smoker may spend £100 in a year on tobacco. A £100 sounds a lot of money. But what is the reality behind the money? As it happens the present writer can give the facts first hand. He grows every year a quantity of tobacco as good as any that can be bought for which he would have to pay £100 in the shops. He has done it at a money cost of one shilling on a packet of seeds, a few shillings on fertiliser and the papers to roll the cigarettes in. The total physical cost annually is not more than twelve hours of his spare time. This is the reality for which a fraudulent system charges the smoker £100. But it is not the fraud which the *Church Times*, the bishops and clergy attack; it is the smoker. A fraudulent financial system grossly inflates the price of everything that is sold, and utterly distorts Reality.

"Then let the Holy Spirit audit the accounts" says the *Church Times*, "and if there should be surcharges, as well there may be, they could be rectified." Well, does it not behove the Church, "the Mystical Body of Christ," to turn its attention and focus the light of Truth on our national

(Continued on page 3.)

Letter to a Bishop

My Lord Bishop,

I am very grateful for your reply to my letter. With all due respect, may I ask this question: Would your Lordship agree that it is the end for which work is done which sanctifies the work? The point in the Bishop of Oxford's statement which above all struck my colleagues and myself with such force was this relating of work to its end; that work in itself is not an end, but a means—that, as he said, work for work's sake is not a Christian maxim. The saying of one of the Fathers of the Church that the essence of sin is the elevation of means into ends seems to us to be pregnant with a truth which has a vital bearing on the grave problems which beset Society to-day, and, indeed, to be at the centre of a true orientation of every—even the simplest—endeavour upon which any of us embark.

It is because this is so obviously and essentially a religious question, though Society clearly does not comprehend it as a religious matter (and for that reason is heading for disaster in a chaos of expediencies), that we are so anxious that the Church should speak clearly and with one voice on this matter so that the public can recognise the voice of Authority. At present, whilst hearing only a babel of voices, it feels itself increasingly at the mercy of Lawless Power multiplying 'laws' for its own purposes.

These questions of a true conception of work and leisure seem to us to be among the most vital questions confronting Society. It is not simply a question of the right attitude to work, important as that is wherever work is necessary to sustain life. The question which, to us, seems so vital, and on which we are hoping the Bishops will speak, is not narrowly limited to work in the sense of gainful economic activity. My associates have for many years past been foremost in pointing out—what is undeniable—that the *material* requirements for a life more abundant could have been provided for decades past in sufficiency for everyone in this country with an ever decreasing proportion of the adult population employed in productive undertakings, and with the work of an ever increasing proportion of the population not being required in productive undertakings.

It is a plain fact that if we as a nation had not been bound to a policy of Full Employment as an end in itself—if there had not been the colossal waste of effort on arms, armies and war, the overriding fear of unemployment which has produced the Trades Unions' restrictive practices, the strikes, the slacking on the job, the bloated bureaucracy, the legislative and taxation maze (which has created so much work for clerks, lawyers and accountants), the fierce competition to sell what has always been in potential abundance (with its concomitant army of salesmen and advertisers)—we should not have had this concentration on materialism. Education could have served quite different purposes—purposes concerned with a full life in the Christian sense.

If we had not had all this work for ends which cannot be justified as *true* ends, and therefore ends sanctified by God, the millions of men and women employed in this way could have produced a plethora of material goods and services—in which case the materialism and pleasure seeking would have been far in excess of what it is to-day—OR—

Or what?

That is the question—and it is the question which we

suggest is the vital one on which Society needs the guidance of the Church. And it is one which grows in urgency every day as fresh scientific discoveries and technological advances load it with dynamite!

Are we to become slaves of a technological Frankenstein monster, for ever making work for its own sake, serving the monster's end? Or are we going to recognise that there is a vast potential of leisure, that technological advance can release men and women for this leisure if proper financial provision is made for them to be leisured? Science has already posed this question. It can be faced, or it can be shirked. It raises two further questions: one of 'work' or leisure as a social objective, with subordination of financial policy to serve the objective; and the other involving preparation and education for leisured activities.

The world awaits the Christian answer to this vital question, and we do not believe it will heed it unless the Church speaks out loudly, clearly and with one voice.

What They Say

"The scientist would like nothing better than to see the material improvements, which he now so clearly anticipates, being used to raise the conditions of a more or less fixed world population; indeed to provide ample leisure to withdraw from the mechanical aspects of a modern civilisation. This Sir George makes abundantly clear."—From a review in the *Daily Telegraph* of "The Foreseeable Future" by Sir George Thomson.

The Welfare State has "tended to impair the individual independent effort and use of the power of choice. It is not surprising therefore, that initiative, self-reliance, and independence are often lacking . . ."—From *Citizens of Tomorrow*, a document published by King George's Jubilee Trust, Odhams Press.

"The current climate of thought and opinion hampers the healthy growth of a sense of personal responsibility.—*Ibid.*

"The authorities are disturbed by an ominous and perplexing rise in the suicide rate. . . .

"The concensus of informed opinion is that one of the main causes of suicide among the socially secure is boredom. . . .

"But the habits and influences that make the day's work increasingly monotonous and uninteresting for the great majority of people also persuade them to depend on artificial entertainments during their leisure hours. The more of these stimulants they have, the more they need—and the less they satisfy."—From an article in *Everybody's*.

"I believe that the whole trouble with this country is not that we don't work hard enough, but that we have been working far too hard for far too long.

"We may also find—as I believe we are finding now—that adjurations to harder work simply produce more slacking."—Lord Hailsham in the *Sunday Graphic*.

Lower Prices

The Budget shows up, as usual, the glaring contrast between the Policy to which Government after Government is wedded and that which this paper presents as the only sane policy. The Chancellor rides roughshod over the just demands of the British people and puts forward inflationary measures that, by raising prices, will lower the standard of living for all. Exports are apparently given all consideration, the British people are given none.

The aim of a Government representing the British people should obviously be lower prices. Every rise in price injures the British people, it is a mean pilfering of their inadequate incomes; inadequate when compared with the enormous productive capacity of this country and the countries closely associated with it.

Quite apart from the unpardonable increase arbitrarily brought about by Purchase Tax the general rise in the price level over the past 100 years is in itself evidence that there is something seriously wrong with the financial system. The application of power (wind, water, coal, oil, atomic power) to production reduces the human labour element per unit of production; and therefore in terms of man hours and wages cheapens production. The same effect is brought about by improved methods, discoveries, inventions, and so on. If the financial system, which is the medium of distributing production, were sound, *i.e.*, reflected the facts, there would have been a steady, progressive, and marked reduction in the general price level. We all know to our cost that there has been a steady overall inflation; a 1914 £1 is now worth 3/4 or less, when to reflect facts it should be worth £3 or £4. This means that an article that cost £1 in 1914 should now cost 5/- or 7/-; whereas in fact it costs £6. It is surprising that because of the deliberate policy which has been pursued over these years, nibbling away at our purchasing power, so few people can visualize that it is a wrong policy for the vast majority of Britons, or that another policy—Lower Prices—could and should have been pursued. Most people are apt to accept as inevitable what has happened. Few people can see what should have happened.

The causes of the cheapening of production in terms of human labour enumerated above are not the only reason why prices should have dropped. The cause for the wicked inflation is in the first instance an insufficiency of purchasing power in the pockets of potential customers, anxious to buy but unable to buy. This was amply demonstrated during the slump of the early 1930's. This insufficiency was made good by armament production and downright wasteful effort. But as the insufficiency was made good entirely by wages and salaries that had to go into future prices, the waste was automatically reflected in rising prices. Now if the insufficiency had been bridged by payments to individuals that did not go into future costs there would have been no inflation and the natural results of falling prices would have ensued unhindered. One way of helping bridge the gap is by giving producers or retailers a national price discount to allow them to sell below cost plus profit, without anyone incurring a loss. C. H. Douglas in *The Use of Money* mentions a concern which makes a loss. Goods are sold below cost and paid for out of two sources: the public pay the price; the producer pays the difference out

of his own credit. "Now if you can pay for an article from two sources, one of which is the private reserves of the individual, you can certainly pay for an article from two sources when the public credit is there to second it, without raising prices." ". . . that constitutes a bridge between the lack of purchasing power and the goods which are demonstrably there to be purchased. . . ."

Such an issue of credit to help reduce the prices would be neither inflation nor deflation but a blessing to all individuals living in this country. How different from the Budget!

A word of warning. There is no problem of production. The difficulty encountered by industry is a selling problem, how to find purchasers with sufficient money in their pockets. The economic crisis, now about 100 years old, and getting steadily worse with inflation is a financial crisis, due to a faulty financial system and its peaks are engineered by the very people who benefit from inflation.

H. R. PURCHASE.

YOU CANNOT JUSTIFY EVIL—

(continued from page 1).

accountancy system—our financial system? "The Christian must not, however, get into debt. No excuse justifies that," says the *Church Times*. If we take the National Debt only, it can be shown that every family in this country, including episcopal and clerical families, are in debt on this account to the tune of about £2,000 each. To whom? To the money-changers, the Credit Monopoly which receives from the British taxpayer every year £500,000,000 in interest on the National Debt. In our issue for October 8 we quoted from *The Bank Officer*, "Under the Companies' Act banks are allowed to state their profit figures after the allocation of unstated amounts to contingencies and other internal reserves." And we referred to The Income Tax Act, under which the Bank of England is allowed to assess itself for income tax. What is being hidden from the public? And what are the *Church Times*, and those who read it, doing about their indebtedness? Are they making any effort to ascertain the truth about these matters?

Or, are they, with hypocritical excuses, attempting to justify this evil to their own consciences?

It is a lie which they justify. It is Mammon which they enthone, even if they pay lip service to God. And it is they who daily pray: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, in earth, as it is in heaven."

Can it be wondered at if the British worker is frustrated, disillusioned, restless? Can it be wondered at if he falls a prey to the false ideas with which the money-changers' Press and political organisations feed him? What would have been his attitude to work if the money system had reflected Reality, the Truth—if prices had fallen in proportion to the real cost?

And it is not only money which is inflated; work also is greatly inflated. Full Employment is nothing else but the doctrine that man must be enslaved to Mammon—a moloch with an insatiable capacity for creating work. But the work which is created is not for Christian ends, it is to serve Mammon. It is only in leisure, which can be abundant for everyone if money is made to reflect Reality, that men's thoughts and activities can be turned to the service of Godly things.

WITH ONE VOICE

WHICH IS TO GUIDE SOCIETY?

CHRISTIAN TRUTH OR A GODLESS MATERIALISM?

There are three alternatives:

1. The Church can completely ignore and abandon any responsibility towards social, political and economic policies, and leave society at the mercy of selfish power-mongering materialistic forces. If they do this an increasing pressure of technology will more and more dominate education, thought and people's habits of life.

2. The Church can continue as at present, a Body with many differing and uncertain voices—another Tower of Babel—at the best a very inefficient brake on catastrophic trends.

3. The Church can be one in the Truth, crying it “from the roof-tops”—an Authoritative guide to the public, not on technical matters, but on what are Christian social policies.

If the bishops and clergy will now speak with *one* voice in agreement with the Bishop of Oxford, they will give a new and true direction to men's thoughts on the proper place of work, how leisure may be constructively and creatively used, what steps are necessary to prepare people for it; and at the same time provide society with a central guiding Truth which all can recognise as something to which economic and financial policies should be subordinated.

As a first step to this end we invite the bishops and clergy to tell us that they agree with what the Bishop of Oxford has said, as quoted below, and to sign their agreement.

What the Bishop of Oxford said

“ . . . The introduction of shorter working hours has given a larger amount of free time to a whole section of our population, though at the same time social changes and the shortage of domestic help have deprived others of some of the leisure they would normally have expected forty or fifty years ago. . . . Provided that enough work is done to sustain the common life of the nation, I do not see any reason to regret these changes, in so far as they have brought more leisure to more people. Work for work's sake is not a Christian maxim. We work in order to live. To reverse this principle would be to suggest that man is a mere producing or organising machine, which must indeed have a rest sometimes, but merely as a biological necessity, in order once again to go to work efficiently. Man's life, on any Christian view is something far greater and more profound than his capacity to produce goods or organise their production. Freedom from unnecessary work is something to be welcomed and even extended as far as possible. But this, like all forms of freedoms, brings its responsibilities. If leisure may be defined as the time we have free from prescribed duties, we have to give some thought to how this time is to be used. Our time is given us on trust; there is a limited amount of it; this is one of the conditions of our life here as God has given it.

“Perhaps the danger to-day is that so many people are thinking of life solely in terms of work and amusement. . . .”

The following bishops have signified their agreement with the Bishop of Oxford:

The Bishop of Liverpool.
 The Bishop of Chichester.
 The Bishop of Bath and Wells.
 The Bishop of Sheffield.
 The Bishop of Chester.
 The Bishop of Ely.
 The Bishop of Birmingham.
 The Bishop of Lewes.
 The Bishop of Buckingham.

A number of other bishops have expressed full agreement with the Bishop of Oxford, but we are not yet in a position to publish their names.

I AGREE WITH, AND WISH TO SUPPORT THE BISHOP OF OXFORD IN WHAT HE IS QUOTED ABOVE AS SAYING IN REGARD TO CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

SIGNED.....

PARISH.....