

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 21.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

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. Euston: 3893.

Dr. Oldham and Work: Part I

Dr. Oldham's booklet,* which several bishops have recommended, is the "chief study document" for an enquiry into the *meaning of work*, undertaken by the Study Department Committee of the World Council of Churches, so that it presents the agenda. Part I deals with Work in Modern Society.

The author requires that Christian thought should "come to terms in a way that it has not yet done with the far-reaching changes in the conditions of human life . . . that have resulted from the technical and industrial developments of recent centuries. Modern society has become a Leviathan which threatens the survival of man's humanity. The worth and dignity of man are at stake." He calls for "new pioneering efforts on the part of the Churches [involving] the *marriage* of different types of experience." He invites criticism and intends to provoke discussion. *Voice* has at least accepted the challenge and attains some fusion among individuals of different experience.

He will focus attention on "the problem of work in modern industry," although "work must not be identified with gainful employment." I should, responding to the request for criticism, have preferred a definition of work at the beginning rather than towards the end of his thesis. Mr. Eliot has written of the pre-political, and we need the same kind of basic thought about work, before our thought is focussed on modern industry.

The following words do not lag behind the times, as would a mere discussion of industrial problems: "With increasing mechanisation in industry and the increasing bureaucratization of society, we can envisage a state of things when this administrative class will outnumber the industrial wage-earners. . . . The tendency of administration is to extend its control over the whole of the life of society.

**Work in Modern Society*, by J. H. Oldham, D.D., S.C.M. Press, 3/6, 1950.

Even the professions . . . are in danger of being subjected increasingly to central direction and regulation."

He further complains of the domination of "functional or technical rationality," with the result that man's work "is divorced from his personal life"; moreover, provision for the future "is taken step by step from the individual and transferred to the State." Work loses its personal quality "insofar as man is reduced to the position of a mere functionary." This divorce, he says, is "the heart of the problem of work in modern society." I believe it to be an aspect: the *heart* surely concerns the amount of this "work" that is necessary, the right of personal choice of work, and freedom from unnecessary work.

The importance of such questions appears when he notes that those employed do not find self-fulfilment and many of them display "an entire lack of interest in their work," although they are haunted by the memory of unemployment. Even the possibilities of the team spirit evidently fail to arouse much enthusiasm. He quotes an article of Fr. de Lubac of 1947: "The new concept of an industrial civilisation based on labour has appeared." Yet Dr. Oldham has remarked that administrators may outnumber other wage-earners, while there is no novelty in *ergastula* or labour camps.

He can only "raise the question" of the Attitude of Women. The *Daily Express* recently reported that about four million women were now "employed" compared with some million before the war; it quoted the Bishop of Derby's disapprobation, while several of the "workers" said that they only did it for money. Undoubtedly money and its purchasing power have a lot to do with the question.

In treating Incentives, he says that little is known of the motives that lead men to work. He has mentioned the fear of "unemployment," which is a form of leisure without money. Responsibility of course enters into it, and he notes the impulse to "much work that is unpaid," while in the industrial sphere "human and social factors" have been left out.

Then he goes rather deeper, looking at the industrial labour camp from the outside: "It is in the power of men to choose whether production is for man or man is for production. The primary purpose of industry is undoubtedly to serve the community by producing goods as efficiently as possible." This means that the end of production is consumption, and that labour-saving (efficiency) is commendable. But then he quotes Sir George Schuster on the need of making industrial employment 'an essential part of satisfactory human life.' But labour-saving devices (efficiency) should *reduce* this part of human life,* and administration should be eliminating it! As Dr. Oldham at once remarks, "the industrial age is passing into the

*[Note] i.f., industrial employment.

administrative age . . . it is the essence of administration to control men—in the service of what?” This indeed approaches the *heart* of the problem: we must ask *who* is pursuing this policy of control and why. For Christian philosophy opposes tyranny, armed or administrative, and holds that administration should be the servant of policy.

Turning to leisure, he says that a fundamental problem of industry is “the deliberate and purposeful re-creation of the labour supply.” The Bishop of Oxford has dealt with this attitude to leisure in a masterly sentence. Dr. Oldham complains that “work in industry tends to develop the functionary rather than the person,” while industry should become “an association of free men freely co-operating in a common enterprise.” The present set-up renders this increasingly impossible. He recognises that the person “may need protection against enslavement to impersonal ends.” But *someone* must be pursuing the policy of depersonalising.

The danger of a new puritanism, barely distinguishable from the puritanism of the Soviet labour camp, chills the reader. And we may ask whether Christianity can restore man to an *end*, instead of being the means of some distant policy (“impersonal ends”). Part II, which we shall examine in the next issue, deals with “The Christian Approach to the Meaning of Work.” H.S.

*“The Promised Land of Plenty and Leisure.”

A New Year Message, 1956,

from Mrs. GERALDINE STARKY.

“Ho, everyone that thirsteth, come ye to the waters [pure waters], and he that hath no money; come ye and buy and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money, and without price.

“Wherefore do ye spend money for that which is not bread? and your labour for that which satisfieth not? hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye that which is good, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.

“Incline your ear, and come unto me: hear, and your soul shall live; and I will make an everlasting covenant with you. . . .”

• • •

“Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near:

“Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto the Lord, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon.

“For my thoughts are not your thoughts, neither are your ways my ways, saith the Lord.

“For as the heavens are higher than the earth, so are my ways higher than your ways, and my thoughts than your thoughts.

*“Perhaps the fairest material prospect opened to human vision, the Promised Land of Plenty and Leisure appeared . . . to be at hand.” C. H. Douglas in “The Objectives of Total War,” published in July, 1946, quoted in *The Social Crediter* of December 24, 1955.

“For as the rain cometh down, and the snow from heaven, and returneth not thither, but watereth the earth, and maketh it bring forth and bud, that it may give seed to the sower, and bread to the eater:

“So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void, but it shall accomplish that which I please, and it shall prosper in the thing whereto I sent it.

“For ye shall go out with joy, and be led forth with peace: the mountains and hills shall break forth before you into singing, and all the trees of the field shall clap their hands.

“Instead of the thorn shall come up the fir tree, and instead of the brier shall come up the myrtle tree: and it shall be to the Lord for a name, for an everlasting sign that shall not be cut off.”

We stand spell bound while a voice from the Chancel chants these words flooding us with gracious images of the body, soul and spirit, of the mind and intelligence, on this auspicious day.

We have heard these words from the fifty-fifth chapter of Isaiah before, yet they had never seemed more hopeful, more faithful or more lovely, more in keeping with what *Voice* is standing for and calls on us to consider.

“Thy word shall not return unto me void,” it shall “accomplish that which I have spoken which I please”; but only if we help, are on His side. May He not withdraw, withdraw His aid from us? Then the reality of our fate would indeed be appalling, it would be the end of all things “for in Him we live and move and have our being.”

The Pope Speaks

His Holiness the Pope, in his Christmas address, spoke in the tradition of former Popes who have indicated the false direction of the present social system. In 1891, the encyclical of Leo XIII condemned sweated labour, and forty years later, Pius XI condemned the international vampires of finance. The dates of these pronouncements should be marked.

The headline of the *Catholic Herald* report of the Pope declares, *Production is made into superstition*, and quotes His Holiness as saying that liberty in the non-communist part of the world “will be a very dubious possession if man’s security is not derived to a greater extent from a condition of things which corresponds to his true nature.

“The erroneous belief which makes security rest on the ever mounting process of social production is a superstition of our rationalistic age of industry. . . .”

He warns Christians against being satisfied with an anti-Communism “founded on slogans and the defence of a liberty which is devoid of substance.” He urges rather building a society “in which man’s security rests on the moral order and which recognises true human nature.” He warns against overvaluing human power and “the undervaluing of objective reality. The same errors . . . are being repeated in the field of economic activity and production.” And production becomes “a substitute for religion.”

We may notice in these wise words that His Holiness opposes the facts of objective reality to the *abstraction* of "Production."

We also note some words of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Shrewsbury, quoted in the *Catholic Herald*: "The common man is flattered and courted as a worker, as a potential vote, as a customer, as a client, or liquidated as a reactionary. His emotions are played upon by politicians, by planners, false prophets and advertisers. There is no one on God's earth who wants him just for himself.

"Everyone wants to make him more efficient, more party minded, more citizen minded, and less family minded . . .

"The State will build you marvellous factories and hospitals and schools, all built in cold steel, and marble and stone. It will be for you . . . to light the fires in these ice boxes and turn them into homes."

And, he warns, if the love of God is forgotten, "Look out for a huge loveless labour camp, a huge workhouse where men wither away in hate, because they have forgotten how to love."

A Poet Among the Politicians

Mr. T. S. Eliot, O.M., gave a Lecture at a Conservative Political Centre luncheon in April, 1955, which has been reprinted with a brief introduction by the Right Hon. Sir Anthony Eden, K.G., M.C., M.P. "It was enterprising of our Conservative Political Centre," writes Sir Anthony. To have bagged Mr. Eliot, he might have concluded.

In the lecture, entitled *The Literature of Politics*, Mr. Eliot suggests accepting the derivation of Conservatism from "a fusion of Tory and Whig elements, due largely to the effect of the French Revolution upon the mind of Burke." From this fusion emerged, presumably, *the great conservative party that destroys everything*, as Disraeli named it. For Mr. Eliot remarks that "Disraeli delivered himself through his novels," partly; and in these novels we find Disraeli saying that the seat of power has constantly shifted, from King to Lords to Commons, that none of these has reigned long, and that obscure financiers, mostly Hebrews, were in real control by the middle of the nineteenth century.

Determinism, Mr. Eliot continues, can appeal to the "same type of mind as that which believes in the unlimited possibilities of planning." We have all heard, he remarks, that "freedom is to be found only in the acceptance of necessity." Such evidently are not Mr. Eliot's views, but we find them in all sorts of places—in religious and psychological books, and in the mouth of 'conservatives.'

An article on Conservatism in America noted that "the true conservatives in that country in recent times had none of them been political figures." The conservatives there were philosophic observers: "not a very healthy state of affairs . . . there are obvious dangers for society when functions are so sharply divided that men of one profession can no longer understand the mind and temperament of men of another . . . there should be no complete separation of function between men of thought and men of action." Since at least the time of Disraeli, the question has been *who* shall do it, not *what* shall be done: policy has been decided elsewhere, while the conservation of anything except Finance has been notably absent.

Mr. Eliot recommends, in conclusion, the *pre-political* area, on the ground that "it is the stratum down to which any sound political thinking must push its roots." A still more fundamental distinction is between those who pursue rewards, by way of expediency however short-sighted, and those who pursue the Truth. I have no doubts on Mr. Eliot's integrity but wish I had a stronger faith in that of his hosts. Their fruits do not commend them.

The People Give, The State Takes Away

"The high cost of living is largely due to the innumerable regulations imposed by the State, by the Regions, by the Districts and by the police on the movement and sale of goods. . . ."—Olivia Rossetti Agresti, in *ABC*, Rome.

In view of suggestions that we should entrust our fate, national and personal, to planners and world planners, the following from the son of a Palestinian Presbyterian minister should be noted:

"The people of Palestine who had occupied the land from time immemorial were never consulted by the United Nations. Nor was the United Nations lacking in authoritative information about their categorical rejection of partition. Partition was thus literally *imposed* on the legal inhabitants and rightful owners of Palestine, in utter disregard of the elemental principles of democracy and self-determination. . . .

"Thus, setting out to alleviate the plight of some Jewish communities in Europe and elsewhere, the United Nations—by its actions and more so by its inaction—has in fact 'succeeded' in creating a quantitatively and qualitatively graver problem, the problem of the Arabs of Palestine, over one million of whom are now destitute, homeless refugees, and some 175,000 of whom are today an underprivileged and downtrodden minority in the State of Israel."—Fayez A. Sayegh, in *The American Mercury*.

Gov. J. Bracken Lee Won't Pay Income Tax

"Unconstitutional to tax citizens for support of foreign nations." "The American People have to be awakened to demand some limitation of the government's taxing power."

The Governor made this announcement on Friday, October 7, 1955.—*Women's Voice*, Chicago.

'Under the Banner of Justice'

"There are in our midst certain people who make it their profession and business to promote class war and to stir up strikes in factories, regardless of the inevitable misery they cause in ever-widening circles. Sheltering under the banner of justice, and demanding the rights of all workers, in reality they have not the good of the workers at heart at all, but simply and solely the policy and spread of their godless and immoral organisation, which, if it were to prevail, would bring in its train a reign of terror and a state of awful misery and slavery for all."

—From the Pastoral Letter of the Scottish Bishops of Glasgow Province, quoted in *The Tablet*.

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 Gloucester.
The Bishop of Chichester.	The Bishop of Exeter.
The Bishop of Bath and Wells.	The Bishop of Truro.
The Bishop of Sheffield.	The Bishop of Chelmsford.
The Bishop of Chester.	The Bishop of Lewes.
The Bishop of Ely.	The Bishop of Buckingham.
The Bishop of Birmingham.	The Bishop of Barking..
The Bishop of Carlisle.	

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.....