

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 5.

SATURDAY, JUNE 18, 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.*

Strikers Can Win if their Case is Based on Realism

So Can the British Public

The British railway strike takes place in the same month that for the first time in history a Conference is held in this country on "The Automatic Factory." It is organised by the Institution of Production Engineers.

On the one hand some of the most skilled and responsible workmen in the country are denied an adequate remuneration, and to enforce their just claims feel impelled to deny their services which are essential to the community.

On the other hand Industry has already begun to dispense with the services of the mass of unskilled and semi-skilled, replacing them with automatic devices electronically controlled.

It has been a fact for at least thirty-five years that the national cake of goods and services which our productive organisms and mechanisms *could* make available for the British public to share has been far greater than the controllers of the Financial system (who control the Government) have ever allowed them to enjoy. Access to that cake is restricted by money, and only by money.

If in 1926, or earlier, or at any time since the British Trades Unionist had used his power to withhold his services, that is to say to strike, to support a demand that as of right those who are unemployed, that is to say those whose services power-machine driven Industry doesn't want, should be adequately paid so that they could enjoy the products of the machine which has replaced them, they would finally and completely have won their battle long ago.

By establishing 'unemployment' as a condition of well-paid leisure, they would have strengthened as nothing else could the position of the employed so that they could compel desirable working conditions from employers.

Hitherto the possibility of leisure for the million, well-

paid and secure as a prospect on which they could rely for a lifetime, has been successfully hidden from the people by the Money Masters through various devices which need not be discussed here. The significance of the post-war development of automation is not that it can provide abundance for everyone by the skilled labour of a small proportion of the population—that has been possible for a long time—it is that it gives this possibility such a new dynamic drive that the Money Masters will find it much more difficult to conceal the possibility.

This is the reality on which the Trades Unions should base their policy. What is physically possible can be made financially possible. The Trades Unions have the sanctions which can force the Money Power to devise the means. If they persistently strike for higher wages, which means endless inflation, and only a short-lived gain for any section of the population, they will alienate the public, and their best interests will be surrendered through another fake 'peace in industry' by careerists on either side as happened in the Mond-Turnerism of 1926.

A Full Employment policy, as we have shown in this paper, is an abominable and wicked anachronism. If Trades Unionists will take for their main objective well-paid leisure, they can torpedo that production policy, and what is more they will have the public with them if they make it clear that in return for this secure base for workers all Trades Union restrictive practices will be abandoned as no longer necessary to protect Trades Union members.

This is the ground on which they can serve the public as well as themselves. It is the ground on which they cannot be defeated.

Full Employment and More Government

So many of the world betterment schemes have involved the "full employment" idea. It sounds innocuous enough until one looks behind the label. One of the best descriptions of what is meant by "full employment" can be found in a report published by UN in 1949 entitled "National and International Measures for Full Employment." In this report we find that unnecessary unemployment is due to the deficiency in effective demand. And how is it to be corrected? "The attainment of full employment and its maintenance may therefore require sustained action, purposely directed to that end; and while numerous agencies may co-operate, the central role must be assumed by government."

The government interventions recommended include offsetting fluctuations in public investments—and enlarged governmental expenditures. They also include controls of prices and profit margins. . . —William H. Peterson "A Tale of Two Leagues" in *The Freeman*, March, 1955.

Sir Arthur Bryant's Mistake

In an article in *The Illustrated London News* for May 21, Sir Arthur Bryant has made the novel suggestion that the National Debt should be liquidated by Death Duties. Because the banks and other financial institutions are "undying corporations" the money which they lend to the State escapes this liquidating penalty, "while an individual loan to the State is automatically reduced in each generation and ultimately extinguished by the cumulative effect of death duties." He therefore advocates "Some kind of gradual and corrective modification in the tax-payers' favour of this principle, which has grown up entirely accidentally and almost unperceived in the past two-and-a-half centuries—and particularly and, on a gigantic scale, in the past four decades." Dr. Bryant suggests "a new and twentieth-century Mortmain applied to those great modern corporations which, while performing, with the highest technical skill and integrity, the high public service of creating credit, lend the credit so created to the country."

Dr. Bryant is mistaken in thinking that an individual loan is either reduced or extinguished by death duties: it is merely transferred. If it were not so the State would become the owner of the securities sold, and after all these years of duties, applied not only to loans to the State, but to all estate, would by now own practically the whole of the land and property in the country.

The only value money has for anyone is that it is a claim on real wealth. A private estate owner may own real wealth in the form of property of some description or have a share in some company property or asset, or he may have part of his capital as 'cash at the bank' (*i.e.*, it may be still in claims on real wealth). In any case he is a *legitimate* owner or claimant-owner of real wealth. When a bank by a book-keeping process creates credit, it creates claims on real wealth, but it neither creates, in doing so, real wealth, nor has it itself in any legitimate sense a claim on real wealth, whether the credit which it creates is used to claim the real wealth of someone who has to exchange his property for credit to pay death duties or whether it is used to claim ownership of the real wealth which a government has to pay for and for which purpose it seeks credit. But, *in fact*, a bank is allowed under existing arrangements by the mere fact of creating *book* credits to become at the moment of creation a claimant on someone else's *real* credit.

No, Sir Arthur, a bank performs a very useful service in creating credit, and is entitled to a fee for its services—a single payment, but no more. But the true claimant on the real wealth which the bank's financial credit will be used to purchase, is not the bank, but the British public; and this being the case the *debt* to the bank for money loaned by it to the State is fictitious from inception. There is no question of a need to apply the principle of Death Duties to this 'debt,' it was never born. The only thing that was born was a false claim.

Real Idleness

It is estimated that nine out of ten employees in Industry are engaged on work well below their mental capacity.

Incomprehensible

The Archbishop of Canterbury returns from Africa announcing that he has addressed sixty-eight meetings and only once referred to morality. Of all the things which are inadequate in a chaotic world, few, if any, are more inadequate than the Archbishop of Canterbury. Morality is concerned with the principles of right and wrong conduct, and that is moral which works best, and that works best which is most in harmony with the laws of the Universe, which is to say Reality. True religion is a binding back to Reality. And Reality is Truth. And the Founder of Christianity came in the cause of Truth. Has the Archbishop been on holiday? Or, is he always on holiday? He is a good after-dinner speaker.

No one is in any doubt that Communism is fundamentally concerned with the complete deification of Caesar, and the complete subordination of the individual person to Caesar, mentally, morally and physically to the exclusion of spirituality. Nothing is to be rendered unto God. The much publicised apostle of "Christianity" and Evangelist, Billy Graham, has been asked whether a Communist can be a Christian, and has replied that he would "want notice of that question."

Automation is the "last word" in labour-saving developments; so much so that on the most convincing practical evidence all the material requirements of the populations of industrialised countries *could* be provided with the employment in productive undertakings, working shorter hours, of about a tenth of the adult male population.

In an article on "Automation" in the June issue of *Readers Digest* the sub-title says: "Amazing new techniques which promise more jobs." We do not wish to paint the lily, or perfume the violet, but could fatuity of comment be carried further?

From the post-prandial bishopric, Communist 'Christians' and ill digested facts, Good Lord deliver us.

Letter to an Elder of The Church of Scotland

Following is the text of a letter to an Elder of the Church of Scotland:—

I am grateful for the trouble you have taken in answering my letter. But the point which I am making is of such vital importance that I must ask you to consider what I have to say.

In the first place, the question of whether fluoridation of water is effective or ineffective from the dental point of view in regard to the claims which are made for it, is not one which I am arguing. On the contrary I am convinced that it is sound principle that the general public, whether as electors, consumers or in any other capacity should not be concerned with technical matters, because such matters are outside both their responsibility and their competence. One of the main reasons why 'Democracy' is

(Continued on page 4.)

Catholic 'Principles' and Catholic Interpretations

[In our issue for May 7, we discussed the Church's role in politics, and we quoted at length from a memorable statement by the Bishop of Cork. In this statement the Bishop asserted that in matters of moral principle it is the role of the Church to be arbiter of right and wrong in politics, and he proceeded to express authority on moral principle to a socialised Health Service. We received a number of letters from indignant clergymen defending the Health Service, and criticising the Roman Catholic Church on grounds irrelevant to the point at issue. But, although we pointed out where a Socialised Health Service contravenes the Moral Law, no one has attempted to contradict it. We now publish an article by a contributor which criticises the Roman Catholic Church in Eire for speaking with two voices, and for failing to express Authority on a matter which is wider than, but directly relevant to the Health Service. If Authority had been expressed here, and heeded, we should never have heard a suggestion of a need for a Health Service.]

The April number of *Christus Rex*, 'An Irish Journal of Sociology,' edited at St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, publishes an article on "Social Insurance—Its History and Morality," by the Rev. James Good, D.D., D.Ph., Lecturer in Philosophy, University College, Cork. In this article Dr. Good states that "the classic statement of the 'Principle of Subsidiarity' is to be found in 'Quadragesimo Anno':

'Just as it is wrong to withdraw from the individual and commit to the community at large what private enterprise and industry can accomplish, so, too, it is an injustice, a grave evil and a disturbance of right order for a larger and higher organisation to arrogate to itself functions which can be performed efficiently by smaller and lower bodies. This is a fundamental principle of social philosophy, unshaken and unchangeable, and it retains its full truth today. Of its very nature the true aim of all social activity should be to help individual members of the social body, but never to destroy them.'

The principle thus stated "emphasises that what the community gives to the individual is a true 'subsidiary,' supplementing his efforts and thus enabling him to attain his ends." And Dr. Good stresses this principle's "almost infinite elasticity or flexibility, which makes it fit every situation, even one which needs a vast amount of State control and intervention" and how it is possible to conceive a situation "in which an almost complete control by the State is called for on account of extra-ordinary conditions prevailing." Such "extra-ordinary conditions" would appear to prevail since "very large-scale intervention [is] justified in the actually existing circumstances."

"Circumstances," as we have been often informed, alter cases, but we did not know that they could alter the Authority of God himself. Two world wars, however, "forced the State to accept controls over industry which would never have been necessary in peacetime," and the "present world situation is tending to increase the area of control still more." Much of this expansion "has been called for by changes

in the economic system itself" since "national economies have become parts of international economy" and international trade, "if it is to exist at all, needs at least the supervision of the States involved." And are not the economists "insisting more and more on the need for the State to keep the whole of the national economy balanced"? Hence the conclusion: "For any economy to carry on as if this change had not occurred is to invite disaster, while to recognise that it has taken place is to admit that industry needs regulation, and hence that the State must play a larger part than heretofore."

'Moral Principles,' by Dr. O'Rahilly, is quoted in support: "Whether we like it or not, the State in most countries is going to intervene in banks, railways, public utilities, natural monopolies, and so on. Some of us may disagree with the proposals; *but we have no right to oppose them as Catholics.* . . . For the need of State intervention arose, not from power-mania or depreciation of individual liberty, but from the practical evils due to men's abuse of liberty and from their defective morality." (Emphasis in original.)

"We are, perhaps, too inclined to condemn as 'unjustified intervention in the life of the individual' much that is within the lawful competence of the State"—to continue Dr. Good. And if all this seems somewhat akin to Marxist lore, we are reminded by another contributor that "the extension of State participation in economic life appears to be a natural development of the capitalism of our time," and that in any case "much of the nationalisation that has occurred here has occurred through the failure of private enterprise."

It is to these "changing facts of the economic order and not to any hypothetical system of our own imagination, that we must apply the unchanging principles of Social Philosophy." "Our principles, because they are based on the nature of man and of society, will not need to be changed to meet this new situation, but we must be quite sure we are applying them correctly, and above all that we are applying them to the correct facts." The Catholic apologists for increasing State intervention have been willing to quote the 'Principle of Subsidiarity,' to 'supplement not supplant,' but "we have not taken the trouble to examine what exactly is meant by supplementation in the economic and social circumstances of our times."

Wrestle not against principalities, against powers, but apply to them the unchanging principles of Social Philosophy. Render unto Caesar the things which are God's, for only by the grace of Caesar, if not of the devil himself, are we able to live and have our being in society. Such would seem to be the philosophy of this supposedly Catholic Quarterly. For elsewhere in the same issue we read, "We have gone a long way from the stage at which we allowed our livelihood to be at the mercy of the play of the market, but the need for organisation spreads wider than economic defence" and "corporative organisation is the only institution that can bring security to every grade of producer."

'The 1955 Congress of Social Study for Priests' was held by 'The Christus Rex Society' at Killarney during April, under the patronage of the Lord Bishop of Kerry on the theme: "The Priest and Social Action." The Bishop of Cork, speaking at the Congress, insisted that the Church "is the final arbiter of right and wrong even in

political matters" and "is the divinely appointed guardian and interpreter of the moral law." He also issued a warning against those who cried out "that they were being ruled from Maynooth rather than from Leinster House, as if heeding the voice of the Church in a matter of ultimate principle was not in order in an overwhelmingly Catholic country."

But therein lies the question—is the voice of Maynooth and of its organ *Christus Rex* the voice of the Church or is it a travesty of that voice? In what fundamental way would the voice of Leinster House differ from the voice of Maynooth? In what fundamental way do the principles of Catholic Social Philosophy, as interpreted by the *Maynooth schoolmen*, differ from the principles of the Marxist Social Philosophy?

It is true that the Bishop of Cork also spoke of "a natural duty" to provide for one's own health and that of one's dependents and asserted that the Minister of State or deputy had no right "to inaugurate a so-called free health service and make medicine, in effect, a State monopoly." But the supposed Minister of State or deputy could well reply in the words of Dr. Good himself: "It is natural for man to seek assistance from groups and free associations. It is only when he finds these insufficient for his purpose that he is forced to turn to the larger community, the State, for the help that he requires."

One does not expect a Catholic lecturer in philosophy to confuse at this late date the "community" with the "State." But more important to the present purpose—how does the Bishop propose to alleviate that financial constraint which "forces" the individual to turn to the State "for the help that he requires"? Is the Bishop satisfied that the present financial constraint is "natural," in conformity with natural law? If it is, why complain of that State help which must of its nature tend to be monopolistic? If it is not, why tolerate an unnatural financial system which makes such a State monopoly inevitable?

On November 2, the Pope informed some 250 cardinals and bishops assembled in Rome that the Church's "authority established by God to see to a just order and to direct the consciences and actions of men along the path to their true and final destiny" should be shouted "from the rooftops" in the front line, in the midst of the struggle that rages between truth and error, virtue and vice, between the 'world' and the kingdom of God, between the prince of this world and Christ its Saviour." But if the "just order" envisaged by the Church is that accepted by the 'Principles of Subsidiarity' as already exemplified, wherefore the need for shouting it from the rooftops? In what way, if at all, is the "prince of this world" to be denied all the power that he could possibly desire?

T. V. HOLMES.

LETTER TO AN ELDER— (Continued from page 2.)

failing is because this principle is almost universally disregarded. But, nevertheless, it is of the utmost importance that experts should be at the service of the general public, not as a herd, but as individuals: "And he that is greatest among you let him be your servant." This principle is served only by the ability to contract-out if you do not like

the services or the results produced by the expert. The moral force of this principle is in no way lessened whether those who would contract-out are a minority of 1% or 49%, or a majority of 51%. Would you agree that the Church of Scotland should be subordinated to the Church of England or the Roman Church because it is numerically weaker? Or that religion should not be taught in schools, because a majority are not in favour of it, or the State experts on education think it is out of place or harmful?

Of course you wouldn't. But that is just the door which you are opening in agreeing to the principle in another sphere. Once you agree to monopoly, whether of the contents of the water supply or of what should be taught in schools, or what should be printed in the newspapers, you become the slave of the experts and their bosses. "All power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely."

God created each person different from another, as He created each flower different from another. You do not demonstrate or practise the love of God or your neighbour by trying to flout His law and bring them all into conformity. On the contrary you are practising communism.

I quite realise that in an imperfect world there have to be some laws which make for conformity. Such as for instance a law to compel people to drive on the left of the road, or to chlorinate water where there is a risk that the supply may not be wholesome. But it is most important that there should be a minimum of such laws. Flouridation is in an entirely different category, just as is the compulsory addition of chemicals to food. In this connection the withholding of the subsidy on whole meal flour and bread while giving it on the de-natured and chemicalised 'national loaf' is an unwarrantable infringement of freedom. The technique of socialism by gradualness is precisely in getting people to agree to abandon this principle in small ways and then in larger until eventually we get the Communist, Atheistical World-State—the final monopolistic tyranny, the rule of Anti-Christ.

God created 'Johnnie' out of step; and also created a Moral Law to which he must conform; that is, within the bounds of that Moral Law he should be out of step. A perfect State is one whose laws are no more and no less than those which conform with the Moral Law. It is the business of the Church to know and preach this Moral Law.

Advocacy of World Government built on immoral foundations can only lead to almost inconceivable suffering and disaster.

Socialism—354 B.C.

When I was a boy, wealth was regarded as a thing so secure as well as admirable that almost everyone affected to own more property than he actually possessed. . . Now, on the other hand, a man has to be ready to defend himself against being rich as if it were the worst of crimes; for it has become far more dangerous to be suspected of being well-off than to be detected in crime.—Socrates.