

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 2.

SATURDAY, MAY 19, 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.

Sold Down the River

The recognition that they have been sold down the river is not confined to the followers of a French shopkeeper of limited experience.

Mr. W. J. Brown declares in *Everybody's* (April 7, 1956) that "the level of taxation in Britain is higher—much higher—than we can sustain without going broke." About 7/- of each earned pound was taken in taxation last year, and he complains that our tax system discourages enterprise. The fact that "modern politics has become largely a contest in mass bribery" usually silences the tax slasher. But the independent Mr. Brown does not think that we can afford what is spent on armaments or that "we are getting anything like value for money." Nor does he see why he and similar tax-payers should subsidise other people's houses. He would abolish the 'Health Service' and return to the position when in illness "we chose our own doctor and paid his fees." . . . the whole system being "the subject of shameful abuses."

In Education we are not getting value for money either. Mr. Brown can recall no boy of eleven at his elementary school who could not read and write, while among National Service recruits these days "twenty per cent. are educationally backward." Mr. Brown remarks that "'the State' creates no wealth," and its alleged 'benefits' are confined through taxation. He would remorselessly cut the Civil Service, which has nearly trebled since 1910. Somebody, he appeals, must soon deal with the problem of "a level of taxation which is strangling us as a nation."

ABC (Rome, February 16, 1956) reports the Convention of Small Industry in an article called 'Middle Class Protest' and gives this summary of the meeting at Rome: "We say openly that the realisation burst on the Convention of Small Industry of the infidelity and treason of the political class at the particular expense of the middle classes . . . who constitute the connective tissue of the country's economic organism." The same journal (March 16, 1956) reports an independent bloc in France headed by M. Pinay which it calls "a new political not party force." H.S.

Contradictions

I pass an enormous modern building at about 8-25 every morning. It is the home of one of the football pools. Hundreds of girls are employed there, and all the way along the road in both directions they may be seen approaching their work. There is no time for dignity, and most them are belting along as hard as they can run. I conclude that they must clock on before 8-30 or incur a fine, perhaps jeopardise their jobs. Attendance has been delayed until the last possible minute.

Sometimes I pass a world-famous ship-yard at the end of the day. Hundreds of men are pouring out in a great flood-tide of humanity. All are making what speed they can and many are charging along with little or no respect for others. In the stampede for the trains and buses people get injured and trampled. These men are escaping from their work. There can be no doubt that they dislike it. And yet there has lately been a standstill at this particular yard; building has halted for weeks. A wood-workers' union and a metal-workers' union each claimed a monopoly in drilling some holes and were striking to obtain the monopoly for themselves. Disliking their work, they suspended their work in order to secure additional work.

These men and these girls are very occasionally confronted with an election, and those who believe that by making a little cross on a piece of paper once every five years they are in some way controlling the march of events, probably vote "Labour" in the belief that such a label is a guarantee that their interests as labourers will be advanced. The policy of the Labour party is to keep every one continuously employed. The nature of the work is not specified and presumably doesn't matter. It is just employment which is prescribed.

Curiously enough the policy of the rival Conservative party is also to keep everyone continuously employed, so that all those who want to spend a life-time of toil directed by someone else need not trouble to vote: a life of toil is what they are going to get any way. Allegedly rival parties may alternate in the seat of government but the pageant of full employment proceeds unquestioned irrespective of the label of the government of the day.

Just as thousands of people are killed and tens of thousands maimed every year on the roads through infinitesimally small errors in steering or timing, so in our social life are disastrous mistakes made through apparently trivial inexactitudes in the use of words. Just because the receipt of wages has been made to depend completely upon employment, people have come to regard money and employment as inseparable in the nature of things, or synonymous. If you want money you ask for employment.

Life has become a treadmill for the people of these islands because they asked for employment when they wanted money. Production processes have become largely automatic but people clamour for employment all the more because once employment ceases the cessation of income is automatic. So that labour-saving machinery is not allowed to save labour; it merely permits people to do more work. Work is what they have asked for and work they have got, but not enough money. Industrial unrest is evidence of irritation at the discovery that full employment may not be synonymous with adequate purchasing power after all, as well as evidence that full employment has been found to be not everyone's cup of tea either.

The punishment awarded to Adam was that he was sent out into the world to work. His many descendents plead for continuous punishment, perpetual work, full employment. The idea that it served Adam right and would do him good has certainly caught on. What was good for Adam must be good for us.

A vast edifice of misdirection, perversion, maladministration, misrepresentation and chicanery has been built upon the assumption that full employment is the *summum bonum*, the great good thing. It has resulted in disillusionment, frustration, dissatisfaction, civil and international strife, battle, murder and sudden death. No change in the results being produced can be expected unless a different goal is sought.

If we are honest we have to admit that generally speaking people do not like their work and only do it for the money. The small number of people who do like their work would do it any way, but the labourer is worthy of his hire.

The admission that people do not like their work is of course devastating, and in some quarters we are written off as a wicked and perverse generation. But it may be that we are only wicked and perverted to the extent that we are fully employed. If we were not fully employed we might have time to do a little gardening. One thing is certain: no satisfactory measures can be taken unless they take into account that people are not all in love with their work. *But they want to live.*

Translated into national policy this would mean that **AS LITTLE WORK AS POSSIBLE** should be substituted for **FULL EMPLOYMENT**, and that **DISTRIBUTION OF MONEY** should be substituted for **HIGH TAXATION**.

This is shocking. Moralists will shy away from it as from a stink-bomb. But moralists are concerned with what they think people should be. It is the moralists who support full employment with its train of frustration and insanity and crime. Let us be realists, making our social arrangements in accordance with what people really are. I take it that by democratic government is meant that which gives people what they want. No one would vote for what he didn't want. And how full employment comes to be the collective policy of people who individually only want to be rid of it is a mystery, as is the collective policy of spending people's money for them when individually they all want to spend their own.

As a schoolmaster I often have to tell the children of today about the children of yesterday, the child workers

beaten up in the mills, maimed in the mines, choked in the chimneys and sweated in the work-shops. It occurs to me that Lord Shaftesbury with his Factory Acts was not the complete answer to that sort of thing. The free distribution of a few shillings to the parents would have enabled them to desist from having to sell their children into the horror and bestiality of the full employment of the time. Only the destitute can be exploited. The purpose of modern taxation is to make every one destitute.

John Brummitt.

“Church Cannot be Blind to Rise of Automation”

The Dean of Liverpool (the Very Rev. F. W. Dillistone) said on Monday that the Church could not possibly remain indifferent to the growing progress of automation in Britain's economic life.

The Dean, who was preaching in St. Mary Woolnoth, London, in connection with the 157th anniversary of the Church Missionary Society, pointed out that the dominant symbols of the mid-twentieth century were the automatic electronic device and the all-inclusive economic system. He continued:—

“We are moving into a new era more akin to the Greek in its characteristic emphasis on order and continuity. The automatic factory will be a model of precision and order, with every part delicately balanced and inter-related, and with a smooth movement of operations in constant process day and night.

Receding Man

“The human agent will recede more and more into the background, as the only significant functions calling for human activity come to be those of initial design and major repair. Man will glory in his automatic factory: he will proclaim with pride the increasing efficiency of his economic system.”

The Dean thought that the Church could not contract out from automation or from economic determination. The story of the missionary expansion of the Church bore eloquent testimony to its necessary and inevitable dependence upon the communication-system and the financial-structure which belong to any particular period of history or to any specified area of operation.

“The Church still enters this new era as the Church under the Cross—the Church, that is, which still affirms that robot-man will have sold his birthright as a child of God, and that economic-man will have purchased his this-worldly security at the expense of his heavenly destiny.

“To bear witness to the fact that man is not merely a creature of material needs, that his social existence is not merely that of a guaranteed economic stability, will be no easier within the totalitarian technological system than it has been within the totalitarian political system. So far we in the West have been largely spared the tribulation of the latter kind of witness. There is no certainty that we shall be spared the former in the days which lie ahead.”

[*Church Times*, April 13: We appreciate the precision of the Dean's phraseology.—Ed.]

Rights of Man

"A decision of the Chancery Court at Liverpool proved once more that the law is the only bulwark against the tide of tyranny. Every child learns this as he studies English history. . . . It is just as true in the days of big business and the great trade unions. The Court decided that the expulsion of a docker by his union, merely on the grounds that the Trades Union Council had ordered it, was unlawful. . . . The law of the land is concerned with the rights of the individual. . . . The Chancery Court at Liverpool, in vindicating the right of one individual docker to belong to the union of his choice, has struck a resounding blow against that inhuman modern tyranny, which regards men as pawns and puppets in the game of power."—*Church Times*, March 23, 1956.

We welcome this assumption by the religious press of its responsibilities. Freedom is meaningless unless a man can choose his association and can also contract out. *The Church Times* also rightly notes the combination of "big business and the great trade unions," which has sometimes been called *Mond-Turnerism*, after protagonists of the two groups. The Editor, however, did not follow the example of Jesus Christ, which we recall especially on Palm Sunday, and attack big finance. Jesus Christ cleansed the Temple and suffered for it: President Roosevelt, on taking office, said he would cleanse the Temple, but—as we should expect from a politician—he ventured no such thing.

Review

George Santayana's Letters, reviewed by H. Briscoe.

It would be an exaggeration to say that Santayana's overall view of life is satisfactory, but he never, as far as the present reviewer makes out, kidded himself. The simplest way to review his letters is by quotations in chronological order, never assuming that what he said in 1889 or in any other intermediate year will be his final position nor, I think, expecting any absolute breaks in the sequence or lack of unity in the temperament.

To H. A. Abbot ('89. I shall date the letters by year only to save cost in printing): "Hebrew religion and its twin offspring, and more than all the hebraizing sects of Christianity, represent a false moral interpretation of life."

To Wm. James (1900): "The Babel in which we live has nothing in it so respectable as to put on the defensive the highest traditions of the human mind."

To Wm. James (1905): "I am deliberately minded . . . not to have any share in the conspiracy of mock respect by which intellectual ignominy and moral stagnation are kept up in our society." (That sentence is perhaps the clearest expression of a fact on which permanent respect for Santayana is based.)

1910, to Earl Russell: "The Catholic Church is intolerant on principle, and the expression of this intolerance is limited only by the influence she is able to exercise over the civil power."

(*Church* and *religion* are, the reviewer believes, two distinct concepts for G.S.)

" . . . every civilisation is essentially unstable . . ."

1913, to B. A. G. Fuller: "Bertrand Russell, on the whole, is not a very trustworthy thinker."

1916, to Robert Bridges: ". . . our philosophies move in the region of rhetorical symbols."

1917, to L. P. Smith: "Subjective . . . should never be confused with natural or historical facts."

Several of these quotations are intended, as are the admirable suggestions in Cory's Introduction, to guide the hurried reader to ripe passages in the book which are too long to quote in this review. This is one of them, full of truth and of eloquence. "The Greek side of Christian theology isolated and made pure."

From Rome, January 16, 1924, to Ward Abbot: "The political atmosphere here is good also."

To Fuller, May, 1931, too long to quote, but on the theme of letter to Lamont in May, '32 which may be summarised as: "Go to originals, not to derivatives and commentators."

To Mrs. Bush: As to (P.L.) Couchoud's book (*Jésus, le Dieu fait homme*) "I read it with the greatest interest, devoured it, and felt more *reconstruction* going on in my mind than any book on this subject had ever caused before. I think he must be right *essentially*; I mean, in respect to everything that matters in Christianity. He sees it from the inside, in its true traditional imaginative growth."

1938: "The truth of itself does not spiritualize the heart, but truth, or even error, is spiritualized when the heart is pure and the mind absorbed in intuition."

1939, re/Whitehead's view that: "ideas, though superficial when clear, when confused are the very heart and substance of the universe. . . . No physics can be adequate."

Santayana's saying he is not interested in antecedents may account for some vagueness in his approach to the term "puritain" in reference to Haller's book on their "Rise." Without having immediate access to Haller one wonders if the puritans start at any fixed date, or if they started, at some fixed date before the Miltonic horror, to practice the ferocity already to be found textually, if not intended for actual practice, by 1300 in Robert of Brunne.

1941: "The man who thinks concepts can be substituted for things, and that by defining concepts he sees things is . . . a fool."

If one were not seeking exact measurements it might be carping to measure a passing phrase in a letter to one of the rather deplorable specimens included among those honoured by having drawn answers from our subject, against a concept of Dante's especially a line in which Dante is at his best, and conceding that Dante knew more about the soul than G.S. "Yet it is precisely as a separate art, not as an accompaniment to anything practical, that music is at its best, purest and most elaborate."

To R. C. Lyon: "In *Paradise Lost* it is not the absence of philosophy but the evident *sub-presence* of a sort of mummified Old Testament philosophy that fills his sails. . . . And he doesn't understand at all the position of a real angel rebelling against a monarchical God."

And, to be registered in letters of adamant on "the frozen actuality of phenomena," the opening sentence of an October letter, 1950: "I find to my cost and amusement

that no reporter ever reports my own words but substitutes his own lingo for my scrupulously chosen phrases."

There is what appears a grave lacuna in Santayana's historical factuality, or else a very loose phrasing or extension of the term "French Revolution" unless in saying "wind of the French Revolution" he means a stiff breeze that hit the English Colonies several decades before Paris or Marseilles had any suspicion that it was stirring. The relative dates 1776 and 1789, would have corrected his perspective. But he is writing informally in a private letter. The French Revolution was in great part sewage from earlier events on the Western side of the Atlantic, plus the sewage from Louis le Grand Monarque. The December letter to Lamont needs to be taken in connection with "Dominations and Powers" otherwise quotation of single heteroclitic sentences would be misleading. It contains the query: "Isn't morality the proper hygiene for a reasoning animal?"

Given Santayana's insistence on calling himself a materialist, recognising the thinness of his interest in history as such, until almost the end of his life, one regrets the decline in biological criticism, that is to say Darwin and Huxley would have been annoyed and, I take it, disgusted by the lack of analysis, in current criticism, of temperament due to biological causes, and curiosity about inherited racial characteristics, or analogies that may or may not be due to the same: Montaigne and Spinoza marking different frontiers of Marranic rather than Iberian disposition. Is Unamuno's aridity akin to Spinoza's? Is it distinctly Spanish? Is Santayana spiritually akin to any Spanish author one knows? Is his objectivity in regard to members of his family who continued to live in Spain, mainly due to his South Pacific and American background and his Bostonian experience flavoured by family reminiscence of the more human Pacific isle?

One regrets the absence of letters to Northrop, from whatever cause. Perhaps Cory is taking mercy on the Professor? The impertinence of a man tackling philosophy, presumably subsidised, without Greek and Latin should send up the reader's blood pressure (letter to Lyon, 1951): let us auspicate a future when it will. G.S. at least warns his correspondent that that English philosophy is "only literary psychology or autobiography, and the German, moralistic mythology."

Still Preaching

Broadcast Sermon from St. Matthew's Church, Auckland, N.Z., by the Rev. Canon E. Blackwood Moore on Sunday, April 15, 1956.

"And the people sat down to eat and to drink, and rose up to play." Exodus 32: part of verse 6.

These words describe the sequel to the rejection of God on the part of the Israelites, when they turned out of the way which God commanded. The passage occurs in one of the lessons for today, and although the event described is ancient history, the words are just as full of meaning for our generation as they were then. Indeed it is doubtful whether we could find better words to describe the circumstances of the majority of our people today. They sit

down to eat and to drink, and rise up to play. The question uppermost in the minds of most is not "what is happening in the world around us?" but "is it going to be fine at the week-end?" Small wonder that the key of their understanding will not fit the intricate lock of world affairs. As they eat and drink and play in their sheltered and secluded vale, the more excellent things, for which many of their brothers and fathers fought and died, are quietly and surreptitiously taken away. The battle is almost lost on a bloodless field as the many bathe in the full-tide of their ignorance. Tacitus draws a terrible picture of the *taedium vitae* which descended upon the Romans

"He made a feast, drank fierce and fast,
And crowned his head with flowers—
No easier, nor no quicker pass'd
The impracticable hours."

Imperial Rome died from *within*—and thus do we. And while we eat and sleep and drink, the forces of anti-God march on. Our case is different from that of the Romans in one respect. *We* have *anaesthetics*. We are told with monotonous frequency that we are flourishing and prosperous. Electric power is scarce of course, but we are manfully tackling that problem by adding more and more new consumers. The potato harvest has failed, but what a rich harvest is gleaned by those, who, like Alfonso the Wise of Spain, could have suggested *improvements* in the Universe, had the Creator only consulted them. I refer to Unesco. Within the last few weeks the *New Zealand Herald* has published two leaders in criticism of what it calls "Beebyism" in our education.

But there is no mention of what "Beebyism" is. What is it? It is Unesco. Professor Julian Huxley and Dr. Beeby were co-directors of Unesco, and it found favour in the sight of many well-intentioned people because it purported to relieve international tensions by means of education, science, and culture. But to know what Unesco really is you cannot do better than listen to what the Professor himself has to say about it. He says this, in an article entitled "Unesco, its purpose and Philosophy." Remember the title. "Unesco, its *purpose and philosophy*." "Unesco cannot base its outlook on one of the competing religions of the world as against the others, whether Islam, Roman Catholicism, Protestant Christianity, Buddhism, Jewry, or Hinduism. Accordingly its outlook must, it seems, be based on some form of humanism. Thus the general philosophy of Unesco should be a scientific world humanism, global in extent, and evolutionary in background. The moral for Unesco is clear. Its task of promoting peace and security can never be wholly realised through the means assigned to it, education, science, and culture. It must envisage some form of political unity, whether through a single world government or otherwise, as the only certain means of avoiding war." There you have the purpose and philosophy of Unesco, not from a critic, but from one of the Co-Directors. Now do you see what "Beebyism" is? Jesus Christ said "He that is not for Me is against Me" and scientific humanism is certainly not for Jesus Christ. Professor Huxley has written that the modern science of psychology had disposed of Christianity!

(To be continued.)