

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 14.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

Church and State Reply

We publish in this issue, space permitting, replies from a Bishop and a prominent member of the Opposition to a letter from Dr. Steele, in the first instance, enclosing a copy of Dr. B. W. Monahan's *Neither Do They Spin . . .*, and to a letter from Mr. Brummitt in the second. The Bishop allows us to print his views but desires his name to be withheld. He says,

"I have read *Neither Do They Spin . . .* with the very greatest interest. The Author has clarified and brought together the thoughts and fears of many of us who are trying to bring to bear Christian principles on this higger-mugger so called civilisation in which we live. I have not the skill to make any critical observations on for instance Section XI. But I would be greatly interested in the remarks of some Christian Economist on that particular section.

"To me the whole fundamental question of our present ridiculous and dangerous situation goes back to one basic Christian Doctrine. In each age in its turn it seems that there is one Doctrine which attains a supreme importance. Today it is the doctrine of Man. To the question 'What is man?' there are only two solutions which cut any ice; the Christian solution and the Communist solution. Until that question is answered it is quite useless to make any plans for building society. Unless you are quite certain of the *nature* of the materials at your disposal, any building you erect is bound to prove both unsound and unsafe. The Marxist has his answer and is building upon that answer. I believe him to be profoundly wrong and because of that his Vision of the future society is so much moonshine. I don't believe it is an oversimplification of the situation to say that Elijah stands today once again on Mount Carmel and is crying to the world, 'If Christ be God, follow him; if Karl Marx then follow him.' 'How long halt ye between two opinions?'"

Another Bishop has expressed his agreement with the booklet, and a third has written a long letter from which we quote briefly. He says, "I have read the booklet *Neither Do They Spin . . .* with interest. With its main contentions—which I take to be that all men should be free to develop their personalities—I am in complete agreement. And I wish it were true that all schools, and especially church schools, were chiefly concerned with this, instead of too often trying to give the children what will enable them to earn their living in the world outside." But the Bishop cannot follow the author when he goes on to speak of leisure.

We are certainly grateful to the Bishop for taking the trouble to write. He concludes by saying his remarks "do not alter the statement with which I began, that I am in agreement with the main contention of the booklet. Dis-

agreements might perhaps be narrowed down if we pointed out that the contrary belief to our own is that unnecessary and even vicious "work" is preferable to leisure, and all labour-saving inventions are diabolical. Work that is creative or vocational or useful or necessary *in itself* is on a different plane from work that is undertaken merely as a licence to live.

"The Kahal System"

Mr. H. Briscoe writes from Boston:

"We in America are totally ignorant of the state of schools in England and of university curricula. Our own squalor passes imagination. The forty historical facts most useful to understanding the wiles of the devil are hardly touched on in college courses. Our greatest historian Del Mar inveighs against papal obfuscation of history, he piles up incontrovertible fact after fact, but utters no warning against the kahal system, *i.e.*, that of irresponsible oligarchy in the hands of the richest men of any community. This has been the *de facto* system in the U.S., destroying the constitution and bill of rights. Brooks Adams dates it from Waterloo. Milder analysts might date it from the convenient assassination of Lincoln.

"After 1880 the decline of historical awareness accelerated: an occasional historian like H. V. Ames or the more careful Beard or the banned Barnes have displayed curiosities.

"The simplest safeguards used to be taught in the home, but the rising generation seems unaware of them. The ease with which money can be borrowed, the propaganda for poison and various kinds and degrees of brainwashing leave young men unprepared for offers to print in periodicals. The present writer was recommended to trust his work to some people who were deeply in debt, but 'had no trouble in getting money.'

"Perhaps *Voice* could be persuaded to tabulate at least some of the forty facts which the major parties keep under heavy wrapping, and which even the conservative rebels seem to regard as nugatory. The whole question of sovereignty is left obscure."

[The public is fed on theories and abstractions and find Facts very hard to digest—such facts for instance as that the National Debt has not always existed, that civilisation was possible without a central Bank, that Income Tax is a comparative innovation.—Ed.]

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

Contributions to The Treasurer, Christian Campaign
For Freedom, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London,
N.W.1.

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.

The Banned Canon

In April and May this year we printed two sermons preached by Canon E. Blackwood Moore in St. Matthew's Church, Auckland, New Zealand, in which the Canon advocated loyalty to Queen and Country and to the Faith of which he is an exponent. No theological heterodoxy appeared in these stimulating addresses, of which copies were circulated, and we have not heard of any ecclesiastical censure on his forthright views. Our readers will be interested in the following cutting, which appeared in the *Grimsby Evening Telegraph* on October 16, 1956. It is headed, "Broadcast ban on a church," and is as follows:

"St. Matthew's Church in Auckland, New Zealand, has been removed from the list of churches that may broadcast in New Zealand because of an alleged breach of broadcasting principles by the vicar who earlier this year broadcast a sermon criticising U.N.E.S.C.O."

From this brief statement we may gather that the long arm of U.N.E.S.C.O. has reached out to interfere with the internal affairs of the Church in New Zealand, and we should be interested in any details of the process. *Criticism* is not a crime in divinity and cannot be claimed in itself to violate any "broadcasting principles," and we can only conclude that U.N.E.S.C.O. is above criticism and is more sacrosanct than the doctrines of the Church, which are criticised on the radio now and then.

The sacred nature of U.N.E.S.C.O. constitutes a novel dogma, and for its universal or catholic acceptance would require a council of the whole Church, and we are not aware of any *ex cathedra* or archiepiscopal or moderatorial pronouncement on the new doctrine so far, and we should like to know which side of the fence the Church leaders favour. The only other possible explanation for this violation not of "broadcasting principles" but of the freedom of the air is that U.N.E.S.C.O. fears criticism and is unable or unwilling to meet the Canon's challenge and, like a tyrannical coward, shelters behind a censorship.

We may well be led to ask what U.N.E.S.C.O. is, or, more accurately, who the people are who form this abstraction which evidently lays down broadcasting principles for New Zealand at least, for there must be individuals involved to carry out the policy. The policy itself, of controlling people's minds, stands revealed, and we wonder whether the U.N.E.S.C.O. code of broadcasting principles is universally accepted, whether the people of New Zealand have subscribed to it and whether the Church approves of it. Otherwise the

real process of affecting people's minds is not a very "democratic" business, is it?

The Next Election

The Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson,
Member for Huyton,
House of Commons.

Dear Sir,

The present government seems to be making itself so unpopular with its tyrannical financial policies that at the next election it is quite likely to be voted out. This seems to be the common experience of all governments. They are all unpopular. From which we deduce that the struggle between parties is in the nature of a stage battle whilst the real struggle is between the people and the government of the day. So that if we are to have a new government we must see to it beforehand that its policy is likely to be acceptable, instead of the medicine as before. It is a change of policy which is wanted, not a continuation of it.

Your Special Responsibility

I have your letter informing me that you are a member of the shadow cabinet, and the newspapers say that you are the candidate for the position of Chancellor of the Exchequer. I count myself fortunate therefore that I am able to approach a probable future Chancellor as one of his constituents. It is a key position, perhaps THE key position, because people are controlled through money. Offer money for guns and they will make guns. Pay for butter and they will make butter. Tax people heavily and they have to work harder and longer in order to get enough money to live. Finance controls nearly all human activity and the controller of finance is the uncrowned despot. More than any other official, it is important that the Chancellor of the Exchequer should be a true servant of the people, and not the passive tool of "interests."

Focus on the Past

During the First World War the National Debt increased by about £8,000 millions. 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. Having his balance visibly swelled by the addition of such welcome figures, the Chancellor was able to pay away the large cheques which were necessary to pay for the insatiable requirements of war. It was only the figures which were transferable to other accounts, as there was nothing there at all really. I know that it is not necessary to inform you that the money was not lent, because so much money did not exist. It was created by writing the figures in the Chancellor's account and has no other existence than in those figures. This is the process indicated by the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* which states that "banks create the means of payment out of nothing."

Reference to contemporary war time figures shows that taxation paid only for about one-sixth of the expenditure. That means to say that the other five-sixths of the Chancellor's expenditure were paid with delightful simplicity in the manner outlined above.

Deduction

The conclusion is inescapable that some person or persons in the Bank of England knew how to create the means of payment of any sum required. He must have known how, because he did in fact do it. During the more recent episode of the war it was admitted that at no time was any plan held up for the lack of money. Whatever was required was forthcoming.

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. That is to say that taxation is unnecessary. Furthermore, if any of the money is recovered by taxation and repaid to the Bank of England, it is destroyed by the Bank of England. We have the authority of Mr. Reginald McKenna, one time Chairman of the Midland Bank and Chancellor of the Exchequer, for that. "Every repayment of a loan to a bank destroys a deposit." Taxation as practised by past and present governments is only possible because most people do not know that every penny they pay is destroyed. If it were possible to raise £30,000,000,000 and apply it to the repayment of the National Debt, the Debt would be wiped out and the £30,000,000,000 would have disappeared too. But this is a purely imaginary situation because all the notes and coins in existence only add up to about £2,000,000,000—one-fifteenth of what it would take.

Meanwhile we are paying £500,000,000 a year interest on a purely fictional National Debt whose only existence is in the imagination and in eleven figures on a ledger in the Bank of England.

Taxation for its own sake

We note with interest that about ten years ago the Bank of England was "nationalised" by the government of the day, presumably to compel the Bank to a course of action which would benefit the people of this country. But instead of some financial advantage emerging from this move, taxation absorbs more money than ever before and the present Chancellor has stated that he aims at raising £400,000,000 more this year than he expects to spend. It would be difficult to find in all history a clearer illustration that taxation is imposed for some unspecified end, not because it is dictated by necessity. The result is that every one is poorer, and I cannot see that that result is not the undisclosed purpose of taxation. No case whatever can be made out for any claim that this policy is democratic. No one who understands what is going on could support it. It is an oppressive policy of a most vicious and tyrannical kind. The present Chancellor has spoken of his "advisers," as if he wishes to exonerate himself, so he is probably not utterly base.

But you, Sir, as Chancellor would have the same advisers, the same permanent officials in the Treasury and in the Bank of England.

Taxation in the future

I now come to the purpose of this letter. The people of these islands in general, and your constituents in par-

ticular, have every right to know whether they are going to be offered a change of policy at the next election. If not, there is no point in voting, since a vote cast for either party would be a vote for the continuation of the present taxation system, and I for one would withhold my vote as an expression of "no confidence." The electorate is not really apathetic; neither political party offers anything worth voting for. If your party offered a change of direction it would be supported.

I therefore invite you to state in the clearest possible terms your personal attitude to taxation. In the event of your intention to abolish taxation, a policy which would have the support of every Englishman, would you have the support of the other members of the Cabinet? Would you over-ride the anonymous advisers in the Treasury and in the Bank?

Fighting Inflation

If any one should attempt to convince you that the use of these costlessly-created bank credits did harm to our economy by forcing up prices, your answer would be that some of the credits were used as food-subsidies and had the effect of causing food prices to FALL. Had other bank credits been similarly applied to all other commodities ALL prices could have fallen. The cause of the war-time (and present) rise in prices is largely taxation.

I am much indebted to you for courteous replies to my letters over a period of many years, but in case you should think it hardly worth while to commit yourself in writing to one single person, I should like to have permission to publish this letter together with your reply in our journal *Voice*, of which I am enclosing a copy containing an article which may interest you.

Yours faithfully,

John Brummitt.

(Christian Campaign for Freedom.)

From the Rt. Hon. Harold Wilson, M.P.,
House of Commons.

11th October, 1956.

Dear Mr. Brummitt,

Thank you for your letter of 16th September. I am sorry that I have not been able to reply to it earlier.

Although the arguments are not unfamiliar to me, they raise very wide issues which I certainly could not deal with in the course of a single letter, even if of inordinate length. I agree with you that over the past century or more, finance has tended to become the master and not the servant of the industrial system. I regret, however, that I cannot agree with your analysis of the process of national debt creation, the futility of taxation and the relation of these subjects to the current problem of inflation.

As you know, I have studied these subjects for very many years and no-one would be happier than I to feel that taxation could be dispensed with. When the financial veil is stripped from the economic system, as I agree with you that it must be if we are to see more clearly, we are still left with the basic problem presented by the volume of national resources and the demands upon them.

In reply to your last paragraph, I would have no objection to your publishing this reply in *Voice*, although as I have said, I find it impossible to deal with the subject in a letter, so presumably you will not find this reply worth publishing from your point of view.

Yours sincerely,

Harold Wilson.

Long Term Policy

(Continued)

Caeteris paribus, it appears to me to be true that any organisation which is working to transfer sovereignty from those who are associated under a national constitution, to those who have secretly concocted an international constitution by the misuse of national resources, whether those persons are working inside or outside the country, are enemies of, and traitors to, believers in the national conception. Their motives may be diverse and obscure; but when you see an enemy soldier, obviously working for your destruction, you do not investigate his motives, you shoot.

There are myriads of organisations which are working to destroy nationality (*not* Stateship) ranging from the highly "respectable" Royal Institute of International Affairs openly financed by cartels (Chatham House, whose Secretary, Dr. Toynbee, said "we are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations") to the hundreds of Communist shop-stewards in industry working like musk-rats to cripple and disrupt local control. And it should be remembered—there is a lucrative career in it. . . .

One of the reasons frequently and reasonably advanced against what is called the world plot theory is that it postulates a degree both of organisation and discipline which is out of all proportion to anything with which we are familiar on the necessary scale.

It would be possible to answer this objection on its own ground, because there are several aspects of religion, secret societies and commerce which are not too greatly disproportionate to such a task. But, in fact, it is highly probable that the proof does not lie along those lines, and that permeation and perversion, the product of education, observation, and patronage, is the technique mainly effective. A little elaboration of this theme may be useful.

If you want to catch mice, you don't specialise in canaries, you keep a cat. If long observation has convinced you that success in politics or industry is impossible unless a certain hierarchy of function is preserved, and you wish to destroy a rival, you don't, at least at first, order him to consult his office boy before making a major decision—you stimulate the formation of a Trades Union, permeate the schools, take great care that words such as policy, administration and ownership are mixed up so that they can mean anything, or nothing, and secure executives in the Trades' Unions who are both ambitious and technically ignorant. In fact, you hypnotise everyone into agreement that the office boy knows it all. If you can ensure that Trades' Union policy is based on the assumption that the object of life is full employment you have an almost omnipotent monopoly

ready made. The leisure class is, you say, living on the worker, and, consumption being a mere by-product of production, the consumer should be given less and less and the production process absorb more and more. You will almost automatically develop a state of affairs which requires supermen to run it. Then abolish all principles of law, morals or politics on some theory such as the divine right of majorities and the omnipotence of Parliament, and you may be confident, that your Materialist State, which requires supermen to run it, will elect for that purpose demagogues ignorant of the elements of the problem with which they are required to deal. Quite naturally, they fail, and still more "sacrifices" are suggested. Quite a small organisation of conscious, trained traitors can bring about this situation. It takes time, and "wars or the threat of wars," but it can be done. It has been done in the British Isles, and the evidence is indisputable.

The defence against it is to expose the strategy, minimise the demand for labour, maximalise the availability of consumer goods, and break up every monopoly whether of goods or labour.

These polices are only possible inside the framework of a Constitution which has an organic relation to reality. For instance, if it is once established, as it is being established, that the primary object of the Constitution is to demolish the rights of the individual ("Parliament is supreme—it could in its wisdom, decree that all blue-eyed babies be destroyed at birth") and so centralise them that they can be transferred out of the country and the nation, which is the exact opposite of the Constitution envisaged and re-inforced by Magna Carta, the measures I have suggested lose all meaning. They would be the last by which to establish the centralised world, which is neither organic nor realistic. It is mechanistic, static, and abstract. There seems to be small doubt that its primary agency has been, and still is, the Financial System which has been increasingly a conscious and lying aberration of a magnificent instrument for good. By its agency, Constitutions, Governments and Peoples have been corrupted. "Ye are of your Father, the devil. He was a liar from the beginning. . . ."

"The Religious Element"

Preaching to Scientists, Dr. D. J. B. Hawkins made the following remarks, quoted in *The Tablet* (September 8, 1956):

"The human mind cannot fulfil itself without seeking truth, and the sciences would be trivial pastimes if they were not at least human approximations to the truth of things as they are. . . . This love of truth for its own sake is precisely the religious element in any kind of intellectual inquiry, just as there can be no worthy religion in practice which is indifferent to the absolute claims of truth."

We should be glad if Dr. Hawkins would turn his searchlight on some of the questions with which we are concerned: notably, why our freedoms should diminish, property be taxed away from the individual, prices rise although process improves and at the same time paid work be apparently indispensable for a living although the improvement of process should eliminate drudgery.