

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 15.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER, 17, 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.*

Communism by Instalments

At no time in history have whole nations been engrossed with the noble life and higher things, but it does seem today that full advantage is taken of the unprecedented opportunities for forgetting that life can be noble and that there are any higher things. This is the day of inconsequential things which absorb people's time and attention and keep them from looking too closely at an appalling situation which is enfolding them, a situation which it will be no more possible for them to escape than it was for the beaten rioters of Poznan or Budapest. Most people, in this Age of Full Employment, are in a condition where serious thought after an eight-hour day is a real effort, and action is unthinkable. They would greet with amused incredulity the suggestion that football matches, T.V., paltry entertainment, pools, speed trials, crosswords and the rest may be fostered deliberately as an opiate. It would be inconceivable that persons in a position to influence the pattern of life may be consciously distracting attention, so that every one is too busy applauding mere entertainment to notice that the house is burning down.

Could we have an example of something important which passes unnoticed by the crowds at the soccer matches, some event of dreadful significance which produces not a ripple of interest amongst the coupon-fillers and the cinema-goers? Indeed we could.

Consider an inconspicuous statement in *The Daily Telegraph* of August 7, 1956. There are no banner headlines and no prominent position.

"The Marchioness of Bristol has been allowed £232,000 by the Treasury for handing over her home, Ickworth, near Bury St. Edmunds, together with most of its art treasures and about 600 acres of valuable woodland, in part payment of death duty.

"The property, with 23 cottages and its 1790-acre park, is being passed on by the Government to the National Trust.

"This is the first case in which chattels have been

accepted by the Government in lieu of death duty as provided for under the 1953 Finance Act where the house is also taken as part of the duty. Financing of the deal was by the £50,000,000 National Land Fund.

"The art collection at Ickworth, which goes to the nation, has been valued at about £80,000. Among the choicest works are pictures by Titian, Reynolds, Romney, Gainsborough, Zoffany and Hogarth, Chippendale furniture and Charles II, Queen Anne and George II silverware.

"The overall duty liability on the family assets came out at about £600,000. To help meet it 10,000 acres of agricultural land were sold."

It is only fair to state that *The Daily Telegraph* has here detected a need for comment: "Those who are careless enough to leave up to £5,000 to their heirs are pounced upon, and in the financial year 1953-1954 there were 37,777 of them. If the present social and economic trends continue, there will be a great many more. That is why the Treasury's new system of 'barter' for death duties becomes so significant. . . . A clause in Mr. Harold Macmillan's Finance Act of this year seems to extend the principle. . . . No heir to any large estate, whether the capital is tied up in land or in business interests, can possibly hope to sign an immediate cheque for death duties. He has got to sell something—shares, land, houses or art treasures. He is lucky if the capital which he can realise by these enforced sales is sufficient to satisfy the Treasury's rapacity, and if he can hope to retain a moderate competence.

"But of course the Treasury is not interested in the retention of competences, moderate or otherwise, by those who have been so unfortunate as to inherit anything at all. Its only concern is to lay its hands as expeditiously as possible on 'the dough' or its equivalent. Now it seems that 'chattels' can be accepted in lieu of cash. Lady Bristol has surrendered a house, art treasures and land."

Time was when the justification for taxation was that the Government needed the money, and no doubt a case could be made out for it when money consisted of gold and silver coins. But that stance is now abandoned. The real intention now emerges, bold, naked and unashamed. It is expropriation.

(In this connection it is interesting to recall that in the framing of the American Declaration of Independence Thomas Jefferson altered the phrase, "Every man is entitled to life, liberty and property." He drew his pen through the word "property" and substituted the quite meaningless abstraction "the pursuit of happiness," the form in which it survives today.)

To say that house and land and goods have been passed to the National Trust is to say that the National Trust is the state department for receiving property as it is nationalised. The war on the private ownership of property is of

long standing, but an offensive on a bigger front has now been launched. The approximation to communist conditions is being speeded up. The Russian people own their land collectively, but their interest in it is confined to labouring on it under the supervision of officials for the benefit of officials. In the case of Lady Bristol the officials "negotiated" with the family for two years before the exact confiscations were fixed.

Lenin explained the success of the Russian revolution by attributing it to three factors:—the ignorance of the Russians, the cleverness of the Jews, and Chinese torturers. The introduction of Communism here has been delayed because not all of the population is ignorant and the natives of these islands are second to none in native ability.

The blue-print for the operation is not a secret document as one might expect. Here is the outline as given in 1848 by Karl Marx (real name Mordecai):—

"We have seen that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class. . . .

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie; to concentrate all instruments of production in the hands of the state. . . .

"Of course in the beginning this cannot be effected except by despotic inroads on the rights of property . . . in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:—

"1. The abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance. . . ."

It is not necessary to have a Communist government to implement these plans. All governments are infiltrated these days, and all British governments of recent years have permitted the march of Communism labelled something else. Our present difficulties are complicated by the fact that the Labour Party is in favour of these measures whilst professing to oppose Communism, and the Conservative Government is passing these measures whilst professing to oppose the Labour Party. The advice that a tree should be known by its fruits was good advice.

It is nearly a century from 1848 to 1933 but in that year we had Mr. Israel Moses Sieff saying: "The planned economy which the nation needs to meet the demands of the twentieth century must clearly involve drastic inroads upon the rights of individual ownership of land as at present understood."

It should be noted that whole phrases are borrowed without acknowledgment from the Communist Manifesto, that Mr. Sieff was speaking as Chairman of Political and Economic Planning, an off-shoot of the Fabian Society, and that a large number of government officials were present and subscribed funds.

Then in 1939 we had the war on which it seems Mr. Sieff had relied for real panic atmosphere, and the drastic inroads upon private property swung into action in a big way, all in the public interest of course. Ten thousand farmers were evicted from their farms. One who resisted

with a shot gun was overcome by soldiers. The process of conditioning the population to the idea that expropriation by the state is normal, had begun.

Now in 1956 expropriation is quite usual and the War Agricultural Committees are still here eleven years after the cessation of hostilities, but with a trifling modification in nomenclature. Lady Garbett has just been evicted from her farm and home. I have not heard a single person comment on it.

But there are points about the Lady Bristol expropriations which should be noted. Ten thousand acres of agricultural land had to be sold. These were being farmed satisfactorily or the War Agricultural Committees would have taken action. The crops and harvests must have been delivered to the people of these islands who enjoyed the produce of the land without being conscious of any necessity to own the land. We await a demonstration that we have benefitted in some way from the change of ownership.

Since the Marchioness surrendered her house she presumably ceases to live there, and a certain amount of interest attaches to the identity of the new tenants. Or will the place pass to a Caretaker as the visible representative of the proletariat, and one more home cease to serve the purpose for which it was built, and descend into the museum class so that what belongs to everybody is clearly seen to belong to nobody?

The Marchioness is presented in an unfavourable light in not being poor like the rest of us. One would have thought that she had some claim to distinction in bearing the responsibility for administering so much land, evidently to the satisfaction of the War Agricultural Committees, and could rightly rank as a public servant of more than ordinary merit, but it is the hirelings who have put a period to her service who are paid as public servants officially.

Many persons of the baser sort will be found to support the Treasury's action in pillaging her property. To such persons the fact that it would be easy to provide them with all they require without raiding those who are more fortunately placed, is a fact without interest or significance.

Any moneys confiscated by the Treasury and paid into the Bank of England merely serve to reduce the National Debt of £30,000,000,000 which we are said to owe (to whom?). That is to say that the moneys extracted from the Marchioness benefitted nobody at all but were merely taken out of circulation and destroyed. "Every repayment of a loan to a bank destroys a deposit." There could be no clearer demonstration that our financial system is prostituted to a political end. That political end is the annihilation of private property.

When all the big property-owners have been liquidated the Treasury will have to begin on the smaller ones. It is not imaginable that the Treasury could ever be sated. The National Debt will always conveniently be there waiting to be paid off. Taxation and expropriation have advanced together. How delighted Karl Marx would have been.

If any one should cherish a lurking suspicion that the encroachments of the State upon individual ownership must mean a general opening of doors where before they were closed, let him consider that the RAF, the biggest landowner in the country, will probably make him less welcome than

the previous tenants. Let him call to mind the lands owned by the Forestry Commission, and the "Trespassers will be prosecuted" notices everywhere.

Support for expropriation is obtained most easily from persons who have nothing to lose. Unfortunately there are only too many of them. They couldn't care less. That is a good reason for not subjecting important matters to majority vote. Is it right for large groups to be able to vote themselves the possessions of smaller groups or individuals? Might is right? The purpose for the publication of this paper is the contention that there is a higher authority than Might. It is Right.

In the Russian Revolution mobs of propertyless peasants were skilfully used to expropriate the landed aristocracy whose opposition to communism constituted a very real obstacle, and the land was shared out. Then when the entrenched bureaucracy turned on the little farmers they were winked out of their small-holdings too. Four million kulaks were sent to Siberia in cattle trucks and unloaded onto the frozen tundra where presumably they died.

The first chapter in World Revolution had been the French Revolution, of which Lord Acton said that the most surprising thing was not the smoke and tumult but the design. The design was the work of a secret society, the Illuminati. Anacharsis Clootz, an Illuminatus, claimed to be the personal enemy of Jesus Christ.

The design in the Russian Revolution is even more unmistakable. At the turn of the century there was brought from Russia a plan for the enslavement of the peoples of the whole world. It was lodged in the British Museum. The historian, Nesta Webster, whose work on World Revolution is a model of painstaking exactitude and documentation, says that this plan is now being put into operation everywhere. "The only opinion to which I have committed myself is that, whether genuine or not, the Protocols do represent the programme of World Revolution, and that in view of their prophetic nature and of their extraordinary resemblance to the protocols of certain secret societies in the past, they were either the work of some such society or of someone profoundly versed in the lore of secret societies who was able to reproduce their ideas and phraseology." This excerpt from the plan was quoted by C. H. Douglas:—

"The aristocracy . . . as a political force is dead—we need not take it into account; but as landed proprietors they can still be harmful to us from the fact that they are self-sufficing in the resources upon which they live. It is essential to us at whatever cost to deprive them of their land. This object will be best obtained by increasing the burdens on landed property—in loading land with debts."

To which I should like to add a further extract:

"In order that the masses themselves may not guess what they are about we further distract them with amusements, games, pastimes, passions, people's palaces. Soon we shall begin through the press to propose competitions in art, in sport of all kinds; these interests will finally distract their minds from questions in which we should find ourselves compelled to oppose them. Growing more and more unaccustomed to reflect and form any opinions of their own. . ."

So, you see, things don't just happen. Everything is planned, down to the smallest detail. John Brummitt.

Addendum

No sooner had the foregoing been posted off to the Editor than a further announcement in *The Daily Telegraph*, October 27, 1956, seemed to underline the main points of the argument even more dramatically:—

"Lowther Castle, the Lonsdale family seat, where kings and emperors stayed in the heyday of the fifth Earl of Lonsdale, is to have its roof removed and the whole of its interior stripped and sold next year. This step is being taken because no use can be found for the property, which has about 270 rooms.

"It is part of a drastic pruning of family interests which has been going on for some years *because of heavy estate duty*. Two deaths within nine years provided a duty liability which will be settled soon at nearly £2,000,000.

"Lord Lonsdale told me that he had made every effort to save the castle. He had offered it to county councils and many other authorities, but no one wanted it . . ." "I never want to live in such an edifice, but it is nevertheless a reminder of a distinctive and romantic period in our social history."

"All that will remain will be the outside walls round an empty and roofless centre. . . The family holding, and thus the rent roll, has already been drastically reduced to *meet death duties*."

We would welcome a statement from Mr. Harold Macmillan, Chancellor of the Exchequer, as to whether this really is the kind of thing he hoped would come about as a result of his management of financial policy, and whether it fits in with the plans for which he was responsible when he was Minister of Housing. We would all very much like to know what useful purpose is served by compelling owners to destroy their own property. We do not believe that nobody would like to own such a magnificent place, or to live in it, or in a part of it. We do believe that the cost of doing so is the main deterrent. The avowed purpose of Mr. Macmillan's credit squeeze is to prevent consumption by making costs prohibitive.

The case of Lord Lonsdale's Lowther Castle is worse than Lady Bristol's Ickworth. Lowther is to be *destroyed*. Major Douglas has drawn attention to the attempt which is being made to obliterate the evidence of a better day and generation. Kings and emperors have stayed at Lowther but our public servants have now made it impossible for anyone to think of it and have provided the prefab and Horsa hut instead.

The extent to which this malignant cancer has crept may be judged from the advertising in the United States by the British Travel Association: ". . . And that lovely area in England known as the Dukeries. (For 35 cents you can visit any of 200 stately homes.)" This is the light in which Britain is presented to the world by her officials—Britain, once-Great. John Brummitt.

By Degrees

We may the better understand the trend of events if we borrow the masonic idea of degrees, and then we should see that the world is experiencing communism (communiza-

tion or decomposition) by degrees. Stalin we should consider a 33rd degree communist, B. and K, 32nd degree, Tito and his like of the 31st degree, the politicians of the 29th or 30th degree. The assumptions of all politicians about man—that he should primarily be a worker at the beck and call of finance without roots or individuality, mass educated and mass amused—resemble each other so closely as to suggest a common origin. Most of these ideas are to be found in the writings of Marx.

To ensure as little recalcitrance as possible, man is being brought up to behave as a good Marxian, generally speaking, and his nature is assumed to correspond with these ideological assumptions, which totally contradict the Christian idea of a free personality or the common law doctrine that man has inalienable freedoms. The American Declaration of Rights is a pale imitation of the common law.

The Hungarian revolt has shown that men object to being denatured, and this may be the most lasting significance of all the suffering. But concern for these matters is widespread, as some paragraphs from a new Washington D.C. fortnightly, *Christianity Today*, demonstrate. Writing in the issue of October 15, 1956, Carl F. H. Henry complains in an article, *The Fragility of Freedom in the West*, that “The tenets of the West and of the East cannot be reduced to two wholly hostile positions—a fact that should give the West no cause for gratitude. They cannot be so reduced because of the ambiguity over freedom in the West—an ambiguity that extends to the conception of the nature, the sanctions, and the sources of freedom. The West has not worked out a philosophy of human freedom that provides a satisfactory antithesis to the totalitarian world’s philosophy of the enslavement of the individual spirit.”

The writer continues in a section entitled “Freedom in Fuzzy Outline” as follows, “The West’s lack of a positive philosophy of freedom is increasingly acknowledged to be a major Free World weakness. The communist philosophy is categoric and precise; the West’s concept of freedom is indefinite and fuzzy. With the destiny of the world hanging in the balances, an ambiguous programme holds little prospect of converting the impressionable masses permanently to its side.”

Mr. Henry stresses the imperative need for a positive “philosophy of freedom,” and we appeal yet again to those in authority to busy themselves with this need. We know that Nasser or the Israelis or Eden have thrown a spanner into the works, but we still need thought and direction. Readers are asked to consider the following passage from the *Memoirs of Madame de Remusat* dealing with the Napoleonic wars, which a friend has kindly sent, quoting from the translation of 1880, page 478. “The English government was obliged, in order to act with the same rapidity as the enemy, to encroach little by little on the rights of the people. The people made no opposition because they felt the necessity of resistance (to Napoleon’s continental policy). Parliament, less jealous of its liberties, would not venture on any opposition; and by degrees the English were becoming a military people. The national debt was increased . . . the executive was becoming accustomed to encroachments which had been tolerated in the beginning, and it would willingly have maintained them as an acquired right . . . the strained situation was changing

the constitution of Great Britain.”

Our friend points out that it was Talleyrand who continued to warn Europe against destroying the English constitution, which again is one of the items not stressed in current “history.”

Or we might refer to a recent letter in the *Daily Telegraph* which suggested that there was some difference between communism and socialism, despite what Mr. Macmillan said, for communism killed outright while socialism bled to death. What the writer failed to understand was the difference between socialism and “conservatism,” which was peculiarly adept at socialism’s speciality.

Perhaps *The Old Age Pensioner* expresses the suffering under the present dispensation more poignantly than other journals. At a Selby rally the speaker declared, “There are 5,000,000 pensioners in this country crying out for food in a land of plenty.” But the paper does not leave it at that, for the October issue carries an article called “Up and Down” wherein it is said that deputations to the Ministry are invariably told, “We have no money.” The writer continues,

“We only ask for money because it is the only means of exchange the financial system allows to operate. Is the Minister unable to solve this money problem? It is time he gave serious thought to the history of our present financial system. A man named William Patterson, born in Scotland in 1658, drew up a plan out of which the so-called Bank of England grew. His scheme at the time said that the bank hath benefit of interest on all money which it creates out of nothing. In 1694 Patterson’s plan became law, and a Dutchman, Sir John Houblon, whose father is said to have been Flemish, became its first Governor, so the financial difficulties of the Dutchman, William III, were solved. He also placed round the neck of England the national debt, which has grown heavier every year.

“Coming to more recent times, on September 6, 1921, we had an outburst in *The Financial Times* because a Cabinet Minister was reported to have said, ‘Half a dozen men, controlling the big five banks, can make or ruin the country.’ The Right Hon. Reginald McKenna, addressing the shareholders of the Midland Bank as chairman said, in September, 1924, ‘I am afraid the ordinary citizen will not like to be told that banks can and do create money, and they who control the credit of a nation direct the policy of Governments, and hold in the hollow of their hand the destiny of the people.’”

The writer concludes with an appeal to the Government to see to it that purchasing power is created sufficient to enable the old people to live in peace and comfort. We would suggest that the *policy* of a country is the affair of its citizens, and that people of any religious conviction, if indeed they believe in a policy of freedom and reality rather than one of communistic enslavement, should come to the difficult realisation that *their* hands and minds are needed to bring about such a policy, and, again with effort and by the Grace of God, to the *decision* that their fearless voices shall be heard.