

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 2. No. 13.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1955.

6d. Fortnightly.

VOICE

A JOURNAL OF STRATEGY FOR PERSONAL,
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

"Freedom consists in the ability 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: ROCKHOUSE
FARM, LOWER FROYLE, ALTON, HANTS. Telephone: Bentley 3182.*

A Prey to False Ideas "The Hungry Sheep"

Opening the Prologue to his book, "The Hungry Sheep,"* Sir David Kelly quotes the late Henry Ford: "history is bunk," and draws the conclusion that Ford meant "that the study of past and present events provided no clear guidance for the future." We have always been under the impression, and we think it much more likely, that Ford had in mind, not true history, but history as it is presented in schools. Concerning what was present history to him, he had first hand experience of presenting it in his *Dearborn Independent* as it is not presented in either the Press or school books, and the painful experience of knowing the great power of the purse of those malign influences, those vested interests which, unseen, and mostly unknown to the public, exercise the decisive control over Press and Government. Mr. Ford was made to recant what he had caused to be printed.

It is with no lack of gratitude to Sir David Kelly for what appears to us to be a masterly presentation of history by a first-class mind, that we shall draw attention to the absence of reference by him to those influences which have been the decisive, if not primary, reason why bad ideas have been enabled to obtain currency and so often to dominate society. It is not a coincidence that the second part of Sir David Kelly's book, which deals with the ideas which produced the events surveyed by his expert eye in the first part, opens with the same thought as the first chapter of a book, *The Brief for the Prosecution*, published ten years earlier, by the late C. H. Douglas who described history as "crystallised policy." "The distrust of general abstract ideas, innate in the British character . . ." says Sir David; and "In the main, the indigenous British do not take kindly to explanations . . . we prefer action or experiment . . ." says Douglas. Both writers, who have the same Christian orientation of thought, philosophy and general policy proceed to discuss the impact of bad ideas. But with this difference: that whereas both Major

Douglas and Sir David Kelly identify the same ideas and their originators, Douglas penetrates further than Sir David. Whereas to Sir David it is sufficient to record the false ideas and the historic names associated in popularised history with their origination and propagation, and apparently a sufficient explanation for their ascendancy over true ideas during long periods of history (which surely provides the most pessimistic grounds for future hope in Christianity), Douglas pointed to the shadowy characters and "benefactors" behind the well-known figures, to the vital financial sinews they provided, and to their unique racial-religious bond preserved in extraordinarily diverse and adverse circumstances, which accounts for the universality and continuity of a single policy. And, to this Douglas added, what is his special unique service to mankind, his analysis of that system, which is the power of that anti-social group, combined with the technical remedy.

Both anti-semitism and the dubbing of any criticism, no matter how objectively and factually sustained, of Jewish persons, groups or cliques as 'anti-semitism,' in the pejorative sense in which that term has come to be universally used, are bad ideas; and are the very bad ideas which have made it so difficult to discuss what is certainly one of the most important factors operating in history: the will to power of the dominating elements in Jewry, their unique identification with the power-of-the-purse and the fact that the Judaic philosophy is antithetical to Christianity.

It is unrealistic to discuss and criticise the ideas of, for instance, Dr. Arnold Toynbee without considering the bearing on the spread of those ideas of the character of the interests which financed the Royal Institute of Financial Affairs over which he presided. If, as we agree with Sir David Kelly, "Our 'Western' civilisation is tending to disintegrate through the gradual rejection of the spiritual values on which it was built" and "the disintegration can only be arrested by our conscious re-acceptance of those ideas," it is a matter merely of practical common sense to ascertain why what is valueless persists to be held with such obstinacy. What is it that has given these valueless ideas such driving force?

"It is significant" says Douglas, "that the Laws of England which are regarded as 'good law' to the present day unless specifically abrogated, date from Edward I." It was Edward I who in 1290 expelled the Jews from England and twenty years later the Knights Templar who were the direct ancestors of Freemasonry. Now Sir David Kelly traces the false ideas which have given rise in our day to National Socialism in Germany, Communism in Russia and elsewhere and "the growth of large cities, with their uprooted anonymous herds of floating individuals without property or tradition" from Luther and Calvin to Hegel, Fichte and Marx; to Rousseau, Voltaire and the French Revolution in France, and to the Reformation, Puritanism, the form of the Industrial Revolution, Darwinism and the

**The Hungry Sheep* by Sir David Kelly, G.C.M.G., M.C.,
(London: Hollis and Carter, 18/-).

impact of such powerful peddlers of false ideas as Shaw, Wells and Toynbee in England. But it is a failure to note what is at least one of the most significant facts in history not to recognise that Calvin's God was to Puritans what Jehovah is to Jews and that, to quote Hilaire Belloc, it was because the Puritans were "as the *chosen* of that immensity that they retained their zeal. They were the Saints, and those whom they opposed were the reprobate of God. *That* was the driving power, *that* was the steam in the machine." And it is no less remiss not to correlate the spread of Puritanism with such facts as Luther's masonry, Calvin's instrumentality in lifting the ban on usury and the background of the Cromwells. Thomas Cromwell, financial agent to first Wolsey and then Henry VIII, who brought about the looting of the Church and the foundation of the new Moneyed Class, had learnt the money-lending business in the Netherlands. It was the financial backing of the Amsterdam Jewish Rabbi Manasseh Ben Israel which helped Oliver Cromwell to power; and it was the same "Dutch" finance which was instrumental in bringing William of Orange to this country; and "William's tenure of the throne brought about a closer connection between the London and Amsterdam Jewish communities, and thus aided in the transfer of the centre of finance from the Dutch to the English capital" (Essay on "England," in *The Jewish Encyclopaedia*). "He (William) introduced into England the system of Dutch finance . . . its practice in England has been equally injurious." (Disraeli in *Sybil*, Book I.) Jews and Jewish finance came back to England with the same false ideas, which Sir David Kelly so ably exposes, and which Jewish money has been the main instrument in spreading.

It is not accidental that the evil influence behind the conspiracy of the Duc d'Orléans to overthrow the French Monarchy was Hayyim Jacob Falk, described by Savalette de Langes, Royal Treasurer and Grand Officer of the Grand Orient, as "the chief of all the Jews," any more than it is accidental that powerful Jews have been behind the great historical figures who since the French Revolution have been the chief executive agents of these false ideas. Ephraim was to Frederick the Great what Bleichroder was to Bismarck, what Rathenau and Warburg were to Wilhelm II, what the Schiff-Warburg-Kuhn Loeb group was to Wilson, the Rothschilds to modern French governments, and to mention only one of many similar known relationships in Great Britain, what Cassel and Schiff have been to Planning. To refer, as does Sir David Kelly, to the German General Staff as the agency for the transfer of Lenin to Russia is to omit a most significant fact, that his mission was under the financial auspices of the group in New York then headed by Mortimer Schiff. To refer, as he does, merely to the influence of the state of public opinion at the time of the 1919 Conference as decisive, is to ignore the interests which guided the Press in forming that opinion and the significant fact that whereas Max Warburg headed the German delegation his brother, Paul Warburg, head of the Federal Reserve Board, led the American delegation. And to assert, as Sir David does, that "In the first few months after the German attack on Russia 1,500,000 Russian soldiers had surrendered, and military opinion everywhere shared Hitler's belief that the invasion had practically succeeded" and then to attribute the vital change in German policy to prisoners, and its consequences merely to "German race theorists butting in,"

is to plead ignorance (if true, inexcusable in a highly placed official in the Foreign Service), of the fact that these false ideas are the tools of an international Directorate of High Policy, of which Bernard Baruch is the ostensible director in the Western World and his confrère, Leo Aschberg "in secret and effective command of the Eastern bloc."

The point which above all we wish to make is that, while we agree with Sir David Kelly that "it was the values which made Europe" and "their assimilation by any people anywhere has a transforming effect just as their renunciation must in the long run effect a transformation in the contrary sense," the master control of governments, all the chief organs of Press and publicity as well as the control of education is in the hands of a group which throughout recorded history has been inflexibly opposed to Christian values and cannot be converted. The spread and re-acceptance of Christian values has to take place against this entrenched opposition. It is no service to the cause of Christianity to pretend that the main opposition to it does not exist.

It is obvious that a close study of the means by which Anti-Christ holds power is essential for a recognition of how that power may be destroyed, and as it is basically a financial power it should be self-evident that on the level of practical policy it is financial policy which has to be altered.

"The underlying theme of this book," says Sir David, "is that the crisis of our civilisation is primarily a spiritual crisis and that our political and economic difficulties are its surface manifestations." But the fact has to be faced that it is the economic conditions and hell-bent industrialisation which have produced and are producing the uprooted urban masses, and that we have already "the general breakdown of standards of judgment and the undue influence of uninformed mass opinion." It is the uninformed mass opinion which can be and is manipulated by the entrenched power of finance and publicity which are concentric, and to which that entrenched power has allowed, for its own purposes, political and economic power. The masses are uprooted, and it is because they are uprooted from the environment which enabled them to appreciate Christian values that they are a prey to false ideas.

We agree wholeheartedly that the exposure of false ideas and the propagation of Christian values should be vigorously pursued for the proper reforming of the Christian community in a Church which can then become one in the truth. But it will only be a minority. Before the masses can again appreciate Christian values they have to be rooted in the right environment, and their political co-operation to that end will not be obtained unless they see a Church genuinely militant and one in the truth and inviting their support of a policy which has obvious attraction. The policy which breaks the financial power of Anti-Christ, presents the opportunity for the rehabilitation of the population in a Christian environment, and has obvious attractions, is that which we have so often discussed in these pages. It is a policy based on the inherent possibility in modern technological methods of production. It is the true, because natural, result of modern methods of production. It is the policy of freeing people from enslavement to technology and the industrial machine: it is the policy of paid leisure.

Full Employment

To better understand what this phrase means and entails let us go back some twenty odd years. There then existed what was and still is called an "unemployment problem." Unemployment is presented by the manipulators of public opinion as the alternative to full employment. The overforties do not require to be reminded of the dreadful conditions of those days. Particularly the victims of being out of "work" will have every reason to remember them. Of the number of workers insured in 1932, for instance, a total of just over twelve and a half millions, nearly three millions were on the dole. This word was commonly used to indicate the unemployment pay. Similar figures were 8,300,000 for the U.S.A. and over 6,000,000 for Germany. As in those days there was no compulsory insurance for all, the figures must be increased by many others, *e.g.*, agricultural and white collar workers who could not find employment. Needless to say the dole was in almost all cases quite inadequate to maintain the accustomed standard of living of the recipients. The rates were 15/3 per week for a man, 8/- for an adult dependent and 2/- for a child. Even taking into account the catastrophic reduction in the value of the pound sterling, let the reader picture to himself how he would like to live on such an income. The government of the day actually appointed a committee to report on the amounts that should be paid to these unfortunates. It was not as one might expect a committee of producers to decide how much the national economy could afford to pay; but one of medical men who had to ascertain the minimum standard to keep an unemployed man alive while leaving no surplus energy in him for his leisure hours, *i.e.*, time not spent at the labour exchange or in a queue seeking some job.

The dole was payable for only a few weeks and after that even greater humiliation lay in store for the victim. He had to go through a means test. There was no relief for him until he had spent the last penny of his savings. Not only his own other income, but that of the rest of his family, was taken into account. The scales of relief were on a par with those of the dole. It must also be remembered that those in work and those depending on investment income were suffering cuts in wages, salaries, interest, dividends, *etc.*, thus aggravating the general situation.

Every politician as part of his stock in trade to frighten and browbeat voters holds out the horrors of those days as the one thing he is firmly determined to prevent, and it is just as well once again to look at the situation at that time from a realistic point of view. It is simply this, that machinery had for well over a century been steadily and rapidly replacing human labour. The productive capacity of industry was such that many men were stood off as redundant while output was still maintained. The banks having restricted credit and so prevented incomes being paid out in the production of capital assets had precipitated the discharge of workers on a large scale. We had on one side a mountain of goods, actual and potential, and on the other side would-be purchasers who hadn't the money to buy all those same goods they needed or wanted. It is obvious that you cannot at one and the same time have a glut of goods and a low standard of living, poverty, *i.e.*, a short-

age of goods, unless the distribution system has broken down. Money is such a system. We are suffering from a taboo, that no money may be issued to an individual unless it be charged into the price of goods, thus making the whole problem steadily worse. Prices rise and rise and incomes cannot keep time with them. So much for the threat of unemployment, held like the sword of Damocles over the greater part of the British people.

No wonder a befuddled electorate looks up to the heroes of the political arena, while the latter tilt at the windmill. They are grateful to have the leisure taken away from them that is in justice their due. The masses accept employment, they have to accept it, whether it entails work beneficial, wasteful, or downright injurious to their fellows or even themselves. Such is the policy of coercion from which we suffer. Money for these purposes is forthcoming but not to finance leisure. We laugh at some of the superstitions of 100 or 2,000 years ago and yet accept a situation that future generations will laugh at and find almost incredible. Except for the few who have studied the realities as distinct from the totems and taboos of financial practice and policy, no one asks the very simple and very obvious question: how is it that leisure is not financed, if waste, and wars, and a slave economy can be financed? From a purely monetary point of view it is quite immaterial for what purpose money is created. If it is available for one thing it is available for another. What is different is the policy behind it all, what result is aimed at by those who control money, those who decide who, for what purpose, is to receive the money. When we bear in mind that at present all money is issued as a privately owned debt, loaded on to the backs of the general public, we can but condemn the whole policy. The proper seat of control should be the general public. It is they who through the money system should be able to engender production of what they want. That want is a "life more abundant." Full employment is a curtailment of life and of liberty and we condemn it as anti-Christian.

H. R. PURCHASE.

Too Many Masters

"The fundamental truth however, remains unshaken, that all masters other than God are subordinate and cannot stand over against Him. The Christian who understands his religion can never ascribe absolute authority to any human institution.

"To live in the world at all, as St. Paul saw, it is necessary to make some allowance and adaptation to the ways of the world. Up to a point, there must be some compromise between the ideal and the possible, but we have to beware lest the spirit of compromise occupies our souls and we find that we are servants of Mammon, of our own comfort and peace, under the disguise of reasonable adjustment to circumstances.

"Is there a point where we will make a stand? Are we prepared, when the occasion comes, to stand up and say, 'No, I will not do this, for I must obey God rather than men?' In a word which threatens to become one of mass-minded 'Yes men' we need more of God's 'No men.'" —Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's, in the *Daily Telegraph*, September 14, 1955.

The Privileged Position of the Banks

Anyone who has taken the trouble to learn the facts about banking and finance without the handicap of the peculiar kind of blinkers imposed by such institutions as the London School of Economics knows that the governments and peoples of the world are in bondage to the international hierarchy which controls the higher policy of banks. People sometimes wonder how the banks conceal from the general public the profits which accrue to them from the enormous and ever mounting indebtedness to them of governments and industries. Some light is thrown on this subject by the "London Letter" published in the *Belfast News-Letter* of August 9. We quote:

"The layman does not always know much, or even anything, about the financial affairs of the bank with which he deals, but an article in the current issue of *The Bank Officer*, the journal of the National Union of Bank Employees, may help him a little. The writer says that the gross profits of eleven London clearing banks—the Big Five, Martins, the District and four smaller companies—are estimated at £129,995,000 last year, compared with £49,431,000 in 1938. The writer adds: 'Bank men and women can now see for themselves how the economic events of the past 16 years have affected banking! Under the Companies' Act banks are allowed to state their profit figures after the allocation of unstated amounts to contingencies and other internal reserves.' The journal states that the estimated figures of gross profits were reached after a careful perusal of figures published by the banks themselves and augmented by the intimate knowledge of men who have spent a lifetime in banking."

Relevant to this same question is a fact realised by very few people: that by Section 24 of the Income Tax Act, 1842, the Bank of England was empowered to assess and tax itself with no other person in control.

Subsequent authority for this is contained in the Consolidation Act, the Income Tax Act, 1918, Section 68, from which we quote:

"For the purpose of assessing and charging Income Tax and in the cases mentioned in this section the following persons shall be commissioners, and shall have the powers of the general commissioners for that purpose, and shall make assessments under and subject to the provisions and rules of this Act, that is to say:

- (1) "The Governor and directors of the Bank of England and Bank of Ireland respectively, in respect of interest, annuities, dividends and shares of annuities, and the profits attached to same, payable to either bank out of the public revenue of the United Kingdom;
- (2) "The Governor and directors of the Bank of England and of the Bank of Ireland respectively, in respect of:
 - (a) interest, annuities, dividends and shares of annuities, entrusted to either bank for payment;
 - (b) profits or gains of either bank chargeable under Schedule D;
 - (c) all other interest, annuities and dividends, and

salaries or pensions payable by either bank; and

- (d) all other interests or profits chargeable with tax arising within any office or department under management or control of either bank."

Church and State

From the Allocution of Pope Pius XII to the Tenth International Congress of Historical Sciences, as published in *The Tablet* for September 24, 1955.

"... Political authority has never had a supporter more worthy of confidence than the Church, for the Catholic Church bases the authority of the State on the will of the Creator, on the Commandment of God. Assuredly, it is because the Church attributes a religious value to political authority that she has opposed the arbitrariness of the State, and tyranny in all its forms. . . .

"We come thus to treat two problems that deserve very particular attention: the relations between the Church and the State, and between the Church and culture.

"In the pre-Christian era the State was competent both in profane matters and in the religious domain. The Catholic Church realises that her Divine Founder has transmitted to her the domain of religion, the religious and moral direction of men in all its fulness independently of the power of the State. Since this has been so there has existed a history of relations between Church and State, and that history has strongly captivated the attention of research workers.

"Leo XIII has, so to speak, condensed the specific nature of those relations in one formula, of which he has given brilliant illustrations in his Encyclical Letters *Diuturnum illud* (1881), *Immortale Dei* (1885) and *Sapientiae Christianae* (1890). The two powers, the Church and the State, are sovereign. Their nature, and the aims they pursue, define the limits within which they rule *jure proprio*. Like the State, so the Church, too, also possesses a sovereign right to all that she needs to attain her objective, and this also includes material things:

'Whatever, therefore, in human things is in any way sacred, whatever pertains to the salvation of souls or the worship of God, whether by its nature or whether such is understood on account of the cause to which it refers, all this is in the power and the discretion of the Church.' (*Immortale Dei*.)

"The Church and the State are independent powers, but they must not for that reason ignore one another, still less be in conflict with one another. It is much more in conformity with nature and the divine will that they collaborate in mutual understanding, since the action of both is applied to the same subject; that is to say, to the Catholic citizen. Cases of conflict certainly remain possible; and when the laws of the State violate the divine law, the Church has the moral obligation to oppose them."