

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 20.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 14, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

## Fear Or Freedom

Dr. Erich Fromm's *The Fear of Freedom* first appeared in this country in 1942, and the sixth impression was brought out ten years later. It forms part of the International Library of Sociology and Reconstruction, one of the three members of its Advisory Board being Sir Alexander Carr-Saunders, M.A., Director of the London School of Economics.

At points the book promises much, but its conclusion is strikingly disappointing. Otherwise it would doubtless not have appeared under these auspices. The American psychologist makes some useful points concerning Freedom, Work, what opposes freedom and present potentialities, and a summary of his views on each of these subjects should give a clear outline of his theme.

In his Foreword he says, "The basic entity of the social process is the individual. Modern man, freed from the bonds of pre-individualistic society which simultaneously gave him security and limited him, has not gained freedom in the positive sense of the realisation of his individual self." The thesis of man's former thralldom receives rather poor support from a passage quoted about the middle class peasants, who, "living in a semi-independent community near the estate of the lord, became aware that the increase of dues and services was transforming him into a state of practical serfdom."

Freedom indeed would appear to have declined in the sixteenth century just when it was supposed to have emerged. For the author notes that from that time, man in Northern Europe "developed an obsessional craving for work which had been lacking in a free man before that period." At that time, evidently, the doctrine of work for work's sake arose. "Work became increasingly a supreme value. . . . Too many holidays began to appear as a misfortune. . . . The concept of time in the modern sense began to develop."

His statement that the "essential roots" of the modern system are not to be found in Italy needs the qualification that one very significant root may be traced back to an Italian source, if not beyond it. For Fr. Watt, in his *Ethics of Interest*, described the facility with which Italian bankers created money by writing figures in a book. But Dr. Fromm's proposition that Calvin's alarming pronouncements led to "the development of a frantic activity and a striving to do something," may be accepted. He adds: "This new attitude towards effort and work as an aim in itself may be assumed to be the most important psychological change which has happened to man since the end of the Middle Ages." Previously there had been no urge to work more than was necessary "to maintain the traditional standard of living," and work did not have "that abstract character of producing some commodity that might be profit-

ably sold." In fact, to use the language of psychology, a new character structure arose.

The trouble is that "the lag between 'freedom from' and 'freedom to' has grown . . . and led in Europe to a panicky flight from freedom into new ties or at least into complete indifference." Man in fact has picked up a work obsession, and accepted from Luther it seems a role in which "his life became a means to purposes outside himself," or as he expressed it elsewhere, "becoming an instrument in the hands of an overwhelmingly strong power." This outlook eliminates the individual.

He distinguishes what he calls 'rational authority,' like the relationship between teacher and pupil, from 'inhibiting authority,' which resembles the master's relationship to the slave. Perhaps the use of the terms Authority and Power would clarify the difference. And he adds, "Instead of overt authority, 'anonymous' authority reigns." So that we may now consider Dr. Fromm's strictures on the opponents of freedom. The active and passive elements of his analysis need watching.

He describes, without ascribing, the active elements. He says: "Powerful groups have the power to control the educational system, schools, church, press, theatre. . . . An enormous though secret power over the whole of society is exercised by a small group." Then he rounds not only on education but on psychiatry. Education, he complains, discourages original thinking and puts ready made thoughts into people's heads. It propagates the fallacy that "one arrives at knowledge of reality" by knowing more and more facts. Further, "Truth is declared to be an entirely subjective matter, almost a matter of taste . . . there are groups whose interests are served by concealing truth."

In fact, Dr. Fromm gives a useful, if rather vague, account of certain elements that actively promote control and distort truth. Among their tools, psychiatry "has made itself an instrument of the general trends in the manipulation of personality." That is, the *normal* personality is the sort that suits the powerful group, who register their opponents as *abnormal*. But his account of those who receive the powerful group's treatment is not quite so convincing.

"Economic crises, unemployment, war, govern man's fate . . . he has become an instrument for the purposes of the very machine his hands have built." In these words we are introduced to another force, much more abstract than the powerful group or groups. Either the group has abandoned its power to these phantoms, or the group uses these threats to force man's submission, and to persuade him to "get rid of the burden of freedom." Dr. Fromm cannot expect our assent to both sets of power, the concrete and the abstract. The small business man "is convinced that

(Continued on page 2, col. 2.)

## VOICE

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

"Liberty consists in the freedom 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: PENRHYN  
LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1.

### From the Bishop of Sheffield

"The Bishop of Oxford's statement seems to me to put the Christian position truly as far as it can be done in a short paragraph. In the sense that a man has to eat in order to live, it might be said that work comes first, but because a man has to eat in order to live it does not follow that he has got to live to eat. Although no-one thrives on idleness, yet the kind of work a man does and the object of it are extremely important considerations from the Christian point of view. It is also very natural, though possibly not far-sighted, that simple men should be afraid of liberating machinery causing unemployment though industrial history shows that it does not do so in the long run, whatever temporary dislocation it may cause in the labour market.

"Might I commend to you an extremely good pamphlet or small booklet on the subject of Work written by Dr. J. H. Oldham, entitled *Work in Modern Society*, and published by the S.C.M. Press for the Study Department of the World Council of Churches."

### The Archbishop of Wales

"With mechanisation and the conveyor belt, a great deal of talk about the dignity of human labour had become mere humbug. Here is an opportunity for those who know the truth, to speak out and be sure of a welcome response. People know that something has gone terribly wrong with the position of man in society."—From a *Church Times* report of the Monmouth Diocesan Conference.

### "In the Inner Man"

"In the inner man resides not only truth but liberty as well: both coming from that Divine Spirit which, because it is Spirit, is liberty. ('Where the spirit of God is, there is liberty,' II. Cor. III, 17). His Liberty is not a gift or privilege of 'nature' but a gift or privilege bestowed on man by God."—Guido Manacorda, *ABC*, Rome.

ducers have evidently succeeded magnificently if they have solved the problem of production. Obviously another system, that of distribution, must be interfering with man's freedom and corrupting his "character structure." We may hope that Dr. Fromm or one of his followers may succeed in writing a satisfactory conclusion to a study whose promise, as it stands, is not fulfilled.

H.S.

### FEAR OR FREEDOM— (continued from page 1.)

life is determined by forces outside man's own self": but he has recently affirmed that these "forces" are embodied in a *powerful group*. As a result, man gives up his individual self and will "become an automaton . . . we have become automatons."

But people who have been persuaded to abandon themselves to a "magic helper" or to develop a "pseudo self" will be the perfect instruments for the dominant group. Ideal specimens were the German lower middle class, whose "whole life was based on the principle of scarcity." We begin to see why Freud's obscurities received such welcoming publicity: "Freud's psychology is a psychology of want . . . he had a profound conviction of the wickedness of human nature." The powerful group could want nothing better: *science* was recruited to chloroform complaints and to etherize ethics.

We may now see what Dr. Fromm says about future potentialities. We may, he writes, visualise a future "in which the continual struggle for the satisfaction of material needs will cease." This of course states the position very mildly for a continent choked with surpluses. Referring to the modern industrial system, he says that it "has virtually a capacity to produce an economically secure life for everybody . . . at the same time reducing considerably the hours of work." Most unfortunately, while discriminating between two kinds of freedom and two kinds of "authority," he has failed to distinguish between chosen creative work, and work for money or employment. He continues: "The problem of production is solved . . . and we can visualise a future of abundance in which the fight for economic privileges is no longer necessitated by economic scarcity. . . . Progress for democracy lies in enhancing the actual freedom, initiative and spontaneity of the individual."

He has assembled all the evidence, although abundance should be described in the present tense rather than the future. "Positive freedom consists in the spontaneous activity of the total integrated personality. . . . The victory of freedom is possible only if democracy develops into a society in which the individual is the aim and purpose of culture." Then he produces his remedy which, I suggested, is rather disappointing. For instead of any arrangement to enhance individual freedom by releasing the potential abundance, removing fear and isolation, he says this: "The irrational and planless character of society must be replaced by a planned economy. . . . One condition for this is the elimination of those who, though few in number, wield great economic power without any responsibility."

So that man, who has previously been scared and manipulated by a powerful group, is instead to have another group to plan his life. For a plan necessitates planners. And they will certainly manipulate him to fit into their plan, and scare him if he declines. The powerful group may be the planners' rival or their patron. (The London School of Economics was under the patronage of Sir Ernest Cassel.) This irrational conclusion, which by a strange coincidence is identical with the conclusion of a religious work we examined a few weeks ago, does not follow from the facts that Dr. Fromm assembled, but rather from the "scarcity and wickedness" mentality of a Freud. Moreover, the pro-

(continued at foot of Col. 1.)

## Some Reflections on Means and Ends

by BEATRICE C. BEST.

(Concluded.)

It was found simple, however, to supply another and incidentally a more powerful sanction for maintaining the curse of Adam and keeping man's nose to the grindstone; for, as a moral being, man was easily persuaded that to work for a living was a virtue and a moral necessity even when by his own scientific achievements it had ceased to be a practical one. So the leisure which might have been enjoyed by all was transformed into 'unemployment.' The Church assisted by adding a 'religious' sanction to the obligation to work for a living, so we have the nauseating spectacle of unbeliever and Christian, politician and priest, all one in their support of the policy of 'full employment.'

Thus the worker, or wage-earner, though he may secretly envy the independence of the man with a free income who, though he may work need not work for a living, feels entitled to regard him with contempt as a parasite (the 'idle rich'), and Mr. Churchill's reference to 'drones' will have his full approval also.

At one time the Worker's slogan, "Work or Maintenance" betrayed a glimmering perception of the real situation, and a faint understanding that 'full employment' was not the solution. However, the dole, with all its attendant disadvantages, conditions and restrictions, helped to depopularise the idea of maintenance. But something more was required to make assurance doubly sure. It was found necessary, therefore, to bring about an illusion of scarcity and of threatened starvation in order that a new slogan, "Work or Want," well and truly advertised by the government, could be given justification and replace the dangerous idea suggested in "Work or Maintenance."

It is interesting and important to observe that the 'advance' into the "Welfare State" is, in reality, a retrogression into a state of universal chattel slavery. For the difference between the chattel and the wage slave lay in the fact that the wage slave was free, legally anyway, to choose his work and change his master, and, if he wished, and circumstances permitted, did so. But with the advent of nationalisation this distinction will disappear. Probably the wage or salary will continue to be distributed to conceal this fact, and for reasons of convenience.

It must not be lost sight of, however, that all this has come about not by elevating the means into the end, but by dissociating, or forcibly separating them, and thus destroying their essential unity which must be kept intact, and the breaking down of which is always and forever the first objective of the enemy. For through the breach thus effected, misdirections, lies and deceits can be introduced and established. Nothing else can explain the strange spectacle of a nation claiming to love freedom—and sincerely, so far as the people are concerned—hell bent for slavery.

A final judgment demands the recognition of a third factor essential to a full understanding of this relationship between ends and means. This factor involves a three in one association. The matter is not simply one of ends and means, it is one of the *end*, the *way*, and the *means*. For example: I may be standing on the bank of a deep and swiftly flowing river wanting to reach the other side. My

*end* is quite clear—arrival at the opposite bank of the river. I can see furthermore that my only safe *way* to reach it is by a bridge. But I can also see that to get my bridge—my *way*—I must seek the expert advice and help of an engineer who will apply the best *means* or technique for building my bridge. My responsibility is to demand the bridge (the *way*) and to see that the engineer is made responsible for building me a safe and efficient one (the *means*).

The end and aim of Social Credit is freedom, freedom to choose, to contract out, to be able to plan my own life and refuse to allow it to be planned by others. The only way to this freedom is a free and independent income. But this income must be based on the national inheritance, the "unearned increment of association," and not one decided upon by the Government, based on its own peculiar ideas and fancies, and doled out on its own terms. And as, in the given illustration, I do not tell the engineer I want to cross the river—he might advise me to swim or take a boat—I order him to build a bridge. So, by the same token, I do not tell the Government I want to be free, for then I might be told to fight a war, or beg for Marshall Aid, or work harder, or export more. My business and responsibility is to demand the distribution of the National Inheritance by way of a National Dividend. After that it is the Government's responsibility to see that its experts devise the best means for doing so. And if I am sure of my end, and the way to reach it, I am in a position to judge by results, and the Government will not be able to deceive me.

It is a lamentable fact that the Christian is often not interested in the end or aim of economic freedom, or at any rate is not yet alive to the need for it. But this indifference leads him to be indifferent to a number of questions he, as a Christian, has no right to ignore. Is he indifferent to a man's right to choose his work or occupation—to the fact that a man may have to wrap his talent in a napkin and bury it in the ground—that he may be forced to engage in work he may consider useless or ignoble? If he replies indignantly, as he probably will, that, of course he is not indifferent to these things, but that a man is always free to choose the right, then he should be asked to ponder the fact that when he pays his taxes, or allows them to be taken from him he is perforce, perhaps unwittingly, yet nevertheless, in the position of one who compounds a felony.

The question, at bottom, is one of integrity; in reality, for the Christian, one of incarnation, not the word alone, but the word made flesh, freedom incarnate in the truth. Divided, anything can be paraded as the truth, and freedom can be enlisted in the service of those determined to destroy it. Moreover, the Christian deludes himself if he supposes personal integrity can remain unimpaired within a system calculated to undermine it. The extent to which it has suffered in the service of the destructive forces aiming at world control is revealed in the statement of Dr. Toynebee when he said in Copenhagen in 1932: "I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. *And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.*" It is not easy to see how the promotion of a policy by a method founded on falsehood and deceit could be more frankly advocated.

Social Credit has exposed the error that misrepresents and distorts the facts, and so destroys the truth and integrity of our economic existence; turning what should be a credit into a debt; what might be enjoyed as leisure into unemployment; what could be a state of peace and freedom into a state of conflict, conscription and war. It has also shown the way by which the error could be eradicated and the truth made to prevail. If the Christian cannot be looked to for support in this work of enlightenment to whom should one more rightly turn? And may it not be asked, with justice and without impertinence, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation—" (*Heb. 23.*)

### "The Business of Government"

"I should like to see the teaching of the Church, and of all Christian Churches, brought rather more into the realm of secular government than less. By this I do not mean that the Churches and their ministers should take any part in ruling us or framing our laws—a thing I should deplore—but merely that the great and enduring truths of which they are the guardians should be more publicly associated, as in the past, with the principles upon which government, is based. Had, for instance, to take a comparatively trivial example, the Old Testament prohibition about moving a neighbour's landmark—and it is a very wise and sound one—been more generally taught and proclaimed, there would probably have been no Crichel Down. To proclaim, as we do in our ancient and deeply-moving Coronation Service, that the business of Government is to 'do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the Holy Church of God, help and defend widows and orphans, restore the things which are gone to decay, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order,' is something which cannot conceivably do a community any harm, and which, if widely and frequently enough proclaimed, will almost certainly do it good. It was of this, and not of any narrow sectarian or doctrinal view, that the Duke of Wellington was thinking when he said that it was the Church of England that had made England a nation of honest men."—Arthur Bryant, in *The Illustrated London News*.

### "Man, the Image of God"

"There are theologians, some highly placed, who like to identify Christianity with socialism. . . . To the layman, the argument of these learned gentlemen is difficult to follow, particularly since they cite one another as supporting evidence. . . . The best an untutored mind can do is to dig into the Gospels. And there he finds nothing to support the thesis of the theologians, that the State is the instrument, if not the co-equal, of God. It is a thoroughly individualistic philosophy that Jesus teaches, in that he puts the responsibility for behaviour on the individual, and does not suggest any way of transferring that responsibility to a government agency or a voting bloc. He offers no formula for the collectivization of the soul; man, the image of God, is man and not a sample of the mass. . . . He did not identify His laws with the wisdom of the planner, the say-so of a bureaucrat or the edicts of a politburo."—From *The Freeman*, Irvington-on-Hudson, N.Y.

### about bus "Mind Twisting"

"The key bastion of the American Heritage—the public schools of the states—is now beleaguered. [The American public schools are the schools open to the public—Ed.] For more than a quarter of a century, Communists, Socialists and even well-intentioned Americans have hammered at Congress to subsidize our public schools . . . on the same false premise that the states and local communities were unable to meet their school needs. Up to a few months ago, Congress had always firmly rejected this plea and refused to imperil the local autonomy of the public schools.

"In the last session of Congress, this wall of legislative resistance was finally breached. . . . In the coming congressional session, there is the gravest danger that this bill may pass. . . . Those plotting for the socialist state here will then have acquired the means to insure its triumph.

"The basic technique employed alike by Communists and Socialists to undermine a free society is the corruption of its educational life. Indoctrinated children can eventually supply voting power guaranteeing extinction of the free franchise. . . .

"It is in social science classes that young minds can be 'bent' to collectivism. . . . Much of the mind twisting would have been impossible but for the co-operation of the National Education Association. . . .

"In petitions filed with the Senate Judiciary Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee, the Sons of the American Revolution charged that NEA 'Has acquired a virtual monopoly over the courses of study and educational programmes in the public schools.'

"NEA propaganda has praised Socialism and socialist organisations, preached the inevitability of 'collectivism,' exhorted teachers to promote the new order and even had a good word for violent revolution.

"NEA has promoted school texts and education pamphlets which have sneered at the Constitution, approved the Court-packing plan of President Roosevelt, rolled the drums for socialised medicine, public housing and public power, flayed private enterprise and advocated the nationalising of industries. . . .

"The truth is that the demand for federal aid to school construction is nothing but a New Deal proposal with its usual hidden purpose to promote the Socialist State in America."—(From "Education's Armageddon," by Congressman Ralph W. Gwinn, in *Human Events*.)

The armageddon in which we are involved concerns the individual, and education is only an aspect of the individual's free life. The idea of imposing conditions for the distribution of America's abundance to Americans is as absurd as it is evil. We certainly wish the Congressman godspeed, but would like to know how he proposes to rout the collectivists if he leaves them their mightiest weapons in their hands.

### Bishops Agree

The Bishop of Truro and the Bishop of Barking have signified their agreement with the Bishop of Oxford.