

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 18.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 29, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

Further Correspondence with a Bishop

In his reply to the Chairman of the Christian Campaign, the Bishop, whose first letter was printed in *Voice* (December 1, 1956) writes:

7th November, 1956.

Thank you for your letter. It is indeed kind of you to have troubled to get an answer from Dr. Monahan himself, and I have read it with interest. He says the root of the position is this: "Is it true that a man is happier when forced by starvation to do any sort of work than he would be if he had an income sufficient to keep him from starvation plus the opportunity of increasing his income by paid employment?" My contention is that, in the second case, a large number of people, I think probably the majority, would sit back and live on their sufficient incomes: in other words would allow themselves to be kept as parasites by those who were doing the work. I would be disposed to agree with him that if the alternative of sufficient income plus the work of one's own choice was feasible, it would be ideal—but is it? After all, work is an exacting and tiring thing. It means making an effort, and a great many people if they had independent incomes would not make the effort, and, therefore "fail to pay the rent for the room which they occupy on earth." . . .

The Chairman replied to the Bishop as follows:

6th December, 1956.

. . . The letter you so kindly wrote to me on 7th November, in reply to one from myself, raises some important points, and I feel that you might like to consider the following:—

The consumable wealth of the world arises from two separate sources,

(a) accumulated knowledge of technics, built up mainly, though not entirely, by the efforts of men who are dead, and

(b) the very economical employment of this knowledge by the agency of living man, the need for whose work is diminishing in proportion as the knowledge of means increases.

No individual has a *moral* right to more than an equal share of what arises under (a), though he has an inalienable right to agreed remuneration for what he may do under (b).

The true nature of (a) is that of a Dividend paid by our ancestors and should not be a cost in industry. Its value has been computed to be sufficient to prevent exploitation of the individual, which occurs under economic duress. This itself is a professed moral objective of the Church.

With regard to the misemployment of leisure, several things may justly be said:

(1) It is largely a result of the atrophy of the creative impulse and a part of the retribution society has to pay for its mismanagement of the consequences of the invention of the steam engine and dynamo, *etc.* Some retributive consequences of this kind are inescapable, and we should aim to minimise them, not accepting them as committing us to pursuit of a further descent on the path of civilisation—which is not inevitable.

(2) Nothing—*i.e.*, no dictate of a false expediency—can reverse the moral law that the individual is himself responsible for the development of his own life. In the end it is preferable that Engand should be free rather than sober, if insobriety is implanted in the nature of man. It is implanted in the nature of *some* men, but on the whole nature favours ascent. If it were otherwise it would be a falsification of the human balance sheet by duress to make men "moral." . . .

Britain First

We would draw our readers' attention to some remarks which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* over the signature of F. A. Voigt, on December 12, 1956, headed, "Britain Comes First," in the course of which Mr. Voigt said, "If we imagine we can bribe these nations out of Communism—or 'Communist infiltration'—let us reflect that it is not their penurious multitudes but their politicians, civil servants, lawyers, *literati*, and the like who are the principal promoters of communism. It is these people who see, with every prospect of increasing wealth, increased opportunities of establishing Communist despotism which will enable them to dominate the multitudes and engage in predatory expeditions abroad.

" . . . The supreme object of British foreign policy, to which all other objects should be kept in severest subordination, is, or ought to be, the honour and security of Britain. It will be quite enough if the nations of Europe will combine in defence against whatever enemy is our enemy also."

This refreshing piece of realism contrasts with much that we have read and heard lately, and if this course had been consistently followed, a great many tragedies would have been averted. When Mr. Eden (as he then was) announced at the beginning of the Second World War that a new world was to be built through war, he either had the kind of indoctrinated mess that we now inhabit in mind, or he made the grossest error of judgment. At present, we are apparently supposed to think that the British role is finished (*q.e.d.*) and that the ball is at the feet of the "big" fellows. In fact, of course, a few politicians cannot radically alter the facts—although they may cook the books—nor have we been actually "ruined" by the diversion of some oil, although all are grossly inconvenienced. The fact is that

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.

Britain remains, however mishandled, the country that together with her sister countries (not the step-sisters necessarily) avoids the American hysteria and the Soviet brutality. What she could do—if freed from financial shackles—would startle the "big" fellows into a healthy respect.

To bring our minds in contact with these issues, we might ask a few leading questions:

Why do we pay taxes?

How many innocent acts are made into crimes and offences by Law, under the superstition that the government needs to get money by taxing something?

What does it cost to collect the present taxes, and chase those who are not vicious but merely made "criminal" by legal superstition?

We cordially agree with *The Recorder* (December 8, 1956) that "The Conservatives have failed—the Socialists are a menace," which is their headline for the day. We especially like the reference to Mr. Macmillan who "warns he will use this 'weapon' (income tax) if required to solve the economic crisis," and continues, "Are the tax-payers a lot of criminals or wrong-doers who have to be threatened with a 'weapon'? If the people are to be bludgeoned it is not for any guilty act of theirs in the present business. The blustering arrogance of politicians matches (or hides) their incompetence."

This is well enough said, but when the journal suggests remedies one is not so happy. In Foreign Affairs we find suggested "the development of an equal partnership with the United States of America." I find this, in view of the easing out of Britain from the Middle East, in view of the dislike Roosevelt expressed for the British system, and in view of the dollar racket, a statement that could only have been made by someone suffering from batlike blindness. I have an affection for some Americans but distrust their politicians and kitchen cabinets and pressure groups. At its highest, America cannot save Europe from itself or Britain from her own unworkable and iniquitous financial system. We have to "go it alone" in setting our own house in order, and first have to decide *what* that house or country is to be. Do not let us run to Washington or UNO for a policy or for a dole. I have edited *Voice* for a year now and have repeatedly pointed out that the decision between free-

dom and slavery rests with *us*, and that it is our duty to take decisions on our own destiny. If we decided on a freedom and leisure policy—in accordance with the physical facts—we might find ourselves much less reliant on canals, oil, markets, let alone financial figments like the dollar.

Once accept *The Recorder's* thesis that the Conservatives have failed and the Socialists are a menace, and the question of alternatives becomes the leading question for all who have graduated from the infants' class. We prefer the Honour and Security of Britain to this equal partnership suggestion, and I think *The Recorder* does, for the same article a few lines lower suggests we bind the Commonwealth together into a unit "equal in strength and power to Russia and the United States and so resume the leadership of the world for which America has proved unfitted."

Fitness for leadership must rest on integrity and responsibility, and these are home-spun virtues (which cannot be "imported" along with a cargo of Hollywood films), and spring from true religion and from an understanding of the difference between a man and a bee or an ant. The soviets are so detested because they treat men as ants—this violates human nature. Opposition which grants that man is half ant or a third or any part ant can hardly convince for long. The view for which *Voice* stands is that man is man. We plead for intelligence in the faith that our Creator displays intelligence in creation, and that we are not the production of materialistic chance. But the mills of God are grinding rather fast, and unless we make up our minds, a great deal of our cultural heritage will be irrevocably lost (not to mention sharper suffering which will occur) when there is not the slightest real need for the loss.

H.S.

Midwife to a Cuckoo

The following remarks appeared in a letter in *The Tablet* (December 1, 1956): "Unfortunately, that opposition needs no stimulation, and it will remain so long as Britain's role of midwife to the State of Israel is remembered. Britain must reconcile herself to the unpalatable fact that she is not liked and that only local rivalries and the greater fear of Russian Communism prevent other Asian and Arab States from following Nasser's lead in the assault."

The Palestinian refugees number some eight times as many as the Hungarian refugees, whose numbers are startling enough, and their expulsion surely was no less tragic: in fact no one much wanted them and many remain near their old homes. No wonder that Douglas Reed said that a time bomb was placed in the middle east, or that a situation tainted with such an injustice fails to relapse into a "status quo." The unprincipled may attain and hold power for a time, but can never guarantee stability: this must rest on a basis of honesty.

For these reasons I cannot accept the suggestion, widely canvassed just now, that Israel should be admitted into the British Commonwealth. This would amount to rather a large acquisition, even to an ambitious state.

Review

Stumbling Block

The Stumbling Block by Francois Mauriac, translated by Gerard Hopkins, The Harvill Press, London, 9/6d. 90 pp.

In this slight, if expensive, volume, the French Catholic novelist examines some aspects of his faith and its perversions. I would call attention to the following:

"In the case of those who speak in the name of God, no lie can be regarded as trivial. No Christian can turn the Word of God to his own purposes, nor make use of it in his own way. This 'making use' is the vice peculiar to clerics."

This underlines our emphasis on the necessity for Truth. The saying of the Bishop of Portsmouth that "All the great political and international questions of the day are primarily theological" (in his address to the Diocesan Conference, printed in the *Portsmouth Diocesan News*, December, 1956) brings Mauriac's text down to earth. An equivocal or evasive attitude to these great questions raises an effective stumbling block for Britons today.

Pronouncements on Communism usually date, and that of M. Mauriac is no exception; "The duel between the Christian City and the Marxist City is apparent at two different levels. The Church as a temporal power is in conflict with Stalin's Church insofar as that Church, too, has enlisted the Revolution in the service of imperialism. The two cities offer this common characteristic, or, rather, obey this common law which tends to separate the chapel from the laboratory, 'mystique' from politics. . . . It is at what Pascal calls the 'level of charity' that the two cities lay down their arms."

Apart from the fact that Moscow has thrown away any vestige of 'mystique' at present, the laying down of arms and clasping of hands can only arise at the human level, despite what the author relates of happenings in a concentration camp. For as communist, man divests himself of his humanity and turns into an Ignatian of matter without will or sense of his own. The prayer of St. Ignatius Loyola will be familiar to readers.

But when he considers power as it works, M. Mauriac's words (first written in 1948) might have appeared yesterday:

"One piece of evidence there is which ought at once to be recognised by us Christians: the degree to which the two Great Powers, the United States of America and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics, resemble one another insofar as both are incarnations of the same superstition, the same idolatry—technical efficiency and the pre-eminence of economics. . . . The order of charity is of no interest to empires." We may note, these two "empires" are willing enough to combine forces when it suits them, as in the case of establishing Israel, or when another country raises its head. The American charge of "colonialism" brought against Britain means that America wants the power we held and the Soviet charge of "imperialism" means that Russia wants it. By "America" and "Russia" we mean of course the handful of rascals who control the machine, and who manage quite satisfactorily though the President may be dying (Roosevelt), on vacation (Eisenhower) and the foreign minister (Dulles) in hospital (while the British Prime Minister takes

a holiday, although we are assured he was "not ill")

M. Mauriac does not conclude very cheerfully: "At a time like this, when the human race has obviously fallen into profound despair, when I have yet to meet a single socialist who has inherited the faith of Jaurès, or one communist who does not feel himself to be personally committed to Slav imperialism; at a time when the world of the concentration camps has survived the infamous political systems which gave them birth, when men's torture of their fellow men has set the coping stone on men's exploitation of their fellow men now at a point at which there seems to be no cure (since exploitation is no longer the work of an employer class, but of that very proletarian party, impeccable and infallible, whose privileges are unlimited): at a time like this the only thing we Christians can do is to confront our appalling world with the Catholic Church, that ancient vessel of antique shape, still laden with the cargo of Truth. . . ."

The policy of "exploitation" evidently has not deviated, although the agents have exchanged a top hat for a cloth cap; yet there is no physical reason for profound despair, whatever may have happened to the faith of Jaurès, or however much brutality may survive. For the cure at hand is to place the individual *beyond exploitation* by ensuring him at least the necessities of life: if we have not inherited these, our forefathers appear as a good deal more futile than we can believe them to be. The necessities are at hand, or very soon could be if we, the heirs, took the right action.

On the Record

There is not the slightest hope of salvaging American influence in the Arab world until, or unless, the United States shakes off the stranglehold that Israel via the powerful Zionist Organisation of America, has exercised over our policies.

In all American history there is no comparable example of a national minority, or that part of it who claim to speak in its name, exercising such influence on behalf of a foreign state upon the media of communications, the legislatures, and the Executive.

America cannot have any policy on the Middle East if her actions are dictated by the interests of one single Middle Eastern state, a newcomer at that, and one established against the vehement protests of the whole Moslem world.

—Dorothy Thompson, *Globe and Mail*, Toronto, November 9, 1956.

Welcome

We have just received *The Edge*, a new monthly from Melbourne, edited by Noel Stock. We note an article by S. V. Yankowski on Richard St. Victor, in which the twelfth century writer deals with *contemplation*, suggesting that we are eight hundred years behind the times. The issue also contains some new translations by E. Pound, and a short article reprinted from *Voice*. Single issues are obtainable for 7/3d. from 436, Nepean Road, East Brighton, S.6., Melbourne, Australia.

Education and the State

To the Editor of *The Times*.

Sir,—It is difficult indeed for anyone concerned with education, and with human values rather than with economic considerations, to read without alarm your report (November 22) of the debate in the House of Lords initiated by Lord Simon of Wythenshaw. I have long assumed that I and my colleagues, whether teaching the humanities or the scientific subjects, are properly concerned to meet the intellectual and perhaps the spiritual, requirements of my pupils as individual human beings: it is a shock to learn that we ought to be organising ourselves almost exclusively to meet the economic requirements of the community.

The logical outcome of this heresy is to be seen in the remarks of Lord Cherwell who blandly suggests that education should, in effect, be withheld from those who are unwilling to accept the particular kind of vocational training which the authorities may wish to encourage. The noble lord has evidently paid very close attention to the Russian example! I can imagine no more insidious exaltation of the State over the individuals for whom it ought properly to exist than is inherent in the attempt to make education subserve the requirements of the State rather than of individuals: it is far more dangerous than the bureaucratic interference with the particular rights of isolated individuals which has quite properly caused alarm in recent years. If this is indeed the price of our survival, economically, as what is called a "great power," then there is evidently a kind of greatness which we must forgo.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(signed) R. E. S. YOUNGS,

4, Claremont Terrace, Jersey, Channel Islands.

—From *The Times*, November 28, 1956.

Question

A letter, addressed to the Editor of *Voice* has been received, dated 20th November, raising questions in connection with John Brummitt's articles in *Voice*. The letter was written by Oliver Smedley, 24, Austin Friar's, London, E.C.2.

Mr. Smedley writes:—

... I have read with great interest Mr. John Brummitt's letter addressed to the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson. I really do suspect such statements as the following:—

"During the Second World War the National Debt increased by about £20,000 millions. These sums were created by the simple expedient of writing up the Chancellor's account at the Bank of England.

"This is the process indicated by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which states that 'Banks create the means of payment out of nothing.'

"That means to say that the other five-sixths of the Chancellor's expenditure were paid with delightful simplicity in the manner outlined above.

"This appears to me to dispose of the claim that government expenditure can only be financed out of taxation. We have witnessed a demonstration that the government can spend thousands of millions of pounds without anyone being any poorer, because the money was created,

and created costlessly. Under these circumstances there is no reason why these enormous sums should be repaid."

With the greatest respect, I just don't believe these statements are true whatever the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* may state. Banks do not, in fact, ever lend more money than has been deposited with them in the first place. There are certain distinct processes by which money that has been deposited with Banks is put back again into circulation but if Mr. Brummitt enunciates the theory that every time the Bank lends money, it is creating money, then, by the same token, every time the Bank borrows money by accepting a deposit, it must destroy it. There is a certain quotation from Hawtrey which is much used by Social Crediters and others lifted out of its context. If you study Banks' Balance Sheets, however, you will find that deposits always vastly exceed advances.

Inflation is caused by the Government spending too much of our money, in other words, putting into circulation a very large volume of money on expenditures which do not, in their turn, create a corresponding quantity of goods. I think it is wrong to blame the Banking system. Yours faithfully. . . .

Answer

Mr. Brummitt replies:

"Your criticisms of my article in *Voice* have been forwarded to me, and I am very sorry I have not had time to try to answer them before this.

"The sum total of all our coin, treasury notes and Bank of England notes is called the fiduciary issue. This stood at £400 millions when war was declared. On the same day Parliament voted £1,000 millions for war purposes. The money was not printed; that would have raised the fiduciary issue to £1,400 millions but it did not so rise. Every three months for the duration of the war another £1,000 millions was voted by Parliament, so that by the end of the war, about £20,000 millions had been voted, and SPENT. The fiduciary issue then stood at a little over £1,000 millions.

I can see no explanation for this conjuring trick except that the FIGURES were written into the Chancellor's balance at the Bank, and the FIGURES were transferred to other accounts by cheque. All these cheques would be immediately paid into banks and would swell the total of deposits. Every inducement was offered to people to buy War Bonds and Defence Bonds and Savings Certificates so as to reduce the fantastic array of deposits which were quite clearly giving the game away. How could the nation deposit what it collectively had not got?

Yours sincerely,

John Brummitt.

Christian Campaign for Freedom,
Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1.

WANTED

Could any supporter lend typewriter to active Campaign helper?

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