

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 3.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.  
Postage: home 1½d. abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, MAY 22, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

## “Render Unto God . . . .”

“And still when mob or monarch lays  
Too rude a hand on English ways,  
To whisper wakes, the shudder plays,  
“Across the reeds at Runnymede,  
And Thames, that knows the moods of kings,  
And crowds and priests and such like things,  
Rolls deep and dreadful as he brings  
Their warning down from Runnymede!”  
(Kipling.)

In another column of this paper is an invitation to the Church. This is the third issue of *Voice* in which it has appeared. Although by now we estimate that this invitation has been brought to the notice of thousands of clergymen, to the best of our knowledge not one has replied.

The invitation states that “we, ourselves, have for long felt that it should not have fallen to laymen to take up a task which obviously belongs to the Spiritual Authority, and we know that in an earlier age it would not have been necessary.”

Because we know this to be true, and because we are so convinced that only an effective intervention by Spiritual Authority can avert a catastrophe which will plunge the world into untold misery and suffering for hundreds of years, we propose to substantiate this statement. It so happened that when the need to substantiate it became apparent to us at just that time the book of the eminent historian, Dr. Arthur Bryant, under the title *The Story of England*, came into our hands. From this book we have taken the liberty to quote extensively.

Twenty years ago we met a doctor, honoured in his profession, and, partly because he was a friend of a Prime Minister, we made a considerable effort to enlighten his darkness on economic matters. We might as well have talked to a stone wall. But the doctor was at pains to convince us that heart and soul he was concerned with the amelioration of human suffering. Well, that doctor is now near the top rung of his profession and the Prime Minister is boss of other Prime Ministers. In the interval between then and meeting the doctor again the other day, human suffering has multiplied, and has every sign of multiplying still more. When we again discussed the world's problems the doctor said that he was quite indifferent to the probability of the world being plunged into a thousand years of misery.

This little incident is recounted because it illustrates a point which goes to the heart of our present problems: that a kind heart, mercy, and humanity are indeed noble attributes of a Christian gentleman, but they are not a substitute for obedience to God's Law, which runs through time: “and the sins of the father shall be visited unto the third and fourth generation.” Bracton said: “The king is under no man, but he is under God and the Law.” But

it is not only kings who are under God *and the Law*.

At the time that the Spiritual Authority of Christ was first manifest in the world, Rome deified despotic power. Christ's message was heard by individuals, but Caesar did not render unto God the things which are God's. In the words of Arthur Bryant:

“Those in authority were not responsible to the moral feeling and wishes of those they governed; their sway, while it lasted, was uncontrolled. An all pervading bureaucracy, increasingly wasteful and petty-minded, represented omnipotence at every level. The cost of that immense army of officials plunged society into ever deeper debt and taxation, and, a millstone round the neck of production and trade, destroyed all private independence and initiative. Little by little it reduced the population of every city in the Empire to a mob.

“Rome had grown out of greatness of individual character. It became a community in which individual character counted for nothing compared with an abstraction which proved, in the hour of testing, capable of nothing. By sacrificing the individual to the State the rulers of the Roman world undermined the real virtues which sustained it. They turned active and self-respecting citizens into inert and selfish ones.”

The consequence of those who exercised Power ignoring Authority in the Universe was six centuries of misery, known as the Dark Ages. But the Christian message survived in the keeping of small groups of men; and it was at the beginning of the Middle Ages that this voice of Authority began to influence society, its behaviour and laws.

Further:—“Appointed in the days of Athelstan to lead the *fyrd* and enforce royal law in a single shire, the ealdorman by the eleventh century, with his accumulation of shires and hereditary claim to office, had grown beyond the control of any ordinary ruler. His was the disintegrating force of power without responsibility. He was neither a chieftain bound by tribal ties nor a consecrated king with obligations to his people. He was merely an inflated landowner with proprietary rights in the human beings who lived on his estates. His rivalries and family feuds cut across the growing sense of nationhood and tore the realm to pieces.

“The future of European society lay with whoever could discipline and ennoble feudalism. The Church took the lead by trying to limit the ravages of private war. It set aside days and seasons for a ‘truce of God’ when war was forbidden on penalty of expulsion from its communion. By the middle of the century it had succeeded in prohibiting private fighting—at least in theory—from Thursday till Monday morning. It sought also, by an appeal to conscience, to present knightly power as a trust. It tried to make knight errantry a Christian pursuit: to turn the aggressive, acquisitive freebooter, armed *cap-à-pie*, into the Christian champion, driving back the heathen, defending Holy Church and punishing iniquity. In chivalry, as it

became called, it offered the military class a code of honour. It devised an elaborate ceremony at which the young knight, before being invested with arms, knelt all night in solitary prayer before the altar and, like the king at his crowning, took the Sacrament, swearing to use the power entrusted to him in righteousness and the defence of the helpless. And, for the sake of society, it invested the oath of fealty with mystery and sanctity. It was an offence against God, the Church taught, for a vassal to be false to his liege-lord.

" . . . When long afterwards, the kings of other lands brought the feudal jurisdictions under their control, the authoritarian maxims of Roman civil and canon law, deeply rooted in the minds of continental royal lawyers, often became instruments of despotism. In England where law was founded on popular custom and the open participation of the ordinary man in its processes, it proved a bulwark of public and private liberties."

The Word of Authority had been established in society as something quite separate from Power; and its transcendent importance was so entrenched that when Henry I tried to bring the Church under his control:

"In trying to subject every part of the nation's life to the Law the great Plantagenet fell foul of the one Power which in that age no Prince could safely challenge. By doing so he suffered a defeat that impressed his contemporaries more than all his triumphs. . . .

"*Non nobis, Domine!*" they heard their priests chant, "Not unto us, O Lord, but unto Thee the power and the glory!" They acknowledged a Faith that proclaimed that whoever exalted himself should be humbled, bade the rich to give to the poor and all men be merciful and brothers to one another . . .

"Behind all this superstition lay a conception shared by rich and poor alike, educated and ignorant. It was that the universe, from its greatest to its minutest part, was governed by divine law. Everything that happened in the world—that had happened, was happening, or was going to happen—was part of the same majestic rule, only partly intelligible to man's puny intellect. It was within his power, either at the instigation of the Devil to oppose that law or, with Christ's grace and the guidance and intercession of his Church, to further it. The Church existed to explain it, to help man obey it and, through Christ's love and sacrifice, to obtain forgiveness for him when he broke it.

"And that Church existed for everyone. Alone in a world of inequalities it opened its doors to all. It was not merely for certain families or tribes, for kings and land-owners, for the successful or learned. It was for fools and failures, for the weak and sick, for women and children, for prisoners and paupers, for saints and sinners. Two things bound the whole of Christendom: belief in Christ and membership of his Church.

"It was this universal quality that made its appeal so overwhelming. It gave purpose and significance to every life. . . .

"Wherever in western Europe man turned his eyes, he was confronted with the majesty of the Church. He could not read a book that churchmen had not written and copied by hand; unless he were a churchman trained by churchmen, he almost certainly could not read at all. . . .

"In its heyday in the Twelfth and Thirteenth centuries, it has been reckoned, one out of every thirty adult males in western Europe was cleric of some kind."

Today the figure is estimated at one in a thousand.

#### Education Ultra Vires the State

" . . . And from the cloisters the Christian kings, who were slowly creating England and the other infant states of Europe, drew officers trained in regular habits of routine, business and accountancy, and, still more important, in ideals of public service. The monastic officers were called 'obedienciaries'; they commanded because they obeyed. Nowhere else could those who had to keep order over large areas find men so fit for their business."

And at a later date in history even an archbishop exhibiting such frailties as Thomas à Beckett, when he made a determined stand against the intrusion of Power over Authority, and was murdered:

" . . . it was not the great alone who were shaken. The common people left their rulers in no doubt as to their attitude. . . .

"It was easy for twelfth century kings and lords to ignore the rights of the individual poor. But they could not ignore popular beliefs. In matters of faith neither monarch nor prelate had the last word. Because they were convinced that Beckett was a saint, the pope, who had so often tried to restrain him during his life, was forced within two years of his death to canonise him.

"The martyrdom 'brought the English Church, beyond cavil or doubt, into line with the universal practice of the Roman Catholic Church and the canon law, even though that practice conferred on churchmen a greater independence than had been customary in the Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman state. As a result power in England, as elsewhere in western Europe, continued to be regarded, not as a force to be operated by a single untrammelled will, but as a balance in which rulers were subjected to the check of the organised Christian conscience expressed through the Church. When four centuries later the rulers of England repudiated the authority of Rome, the habit of thought remained—a potent check to tyranny. . . .

" . . . Beckett's martyrdom created an emotional content which for centuries remained of immense significance in English life and helped to form the enduring values of England.

"For all the world's coarse obsessions and stupidity and blindness, the saints and martyrs have the last word. It is their triumph over the frailty of the body that causes man to believe in God."

And so when it happened that a great criminal occupied the English Throne in the person of King John, that which brought him to heel and prevented a return to the Dark Ages, was a deep respect running right through society, not for an alternative Power, but for Authority, crystallised in the Common Law and exemplified in the Church, particularly in the person of Stephen Langton, Archbishop of Canterbury:

"It was not Langton's wish to see the Crown overthrown, the law ignored, the realm divided, the barons petty sovereigns as in the days of Stephen and Godwin. What he wanted was that the king should preserve the law his predecessors had created. And it was to the law that the archbishop appealed, not only of man, but of God. For it was of the essence of medieval Christian philosophy that God ruled the earth, and that men, and kings above all men, must further His ends by doing justice or it was not in

Christian eyes government at all. It was their duty to enforce what Christian men, through long custom, had learned to regard as just. And whenever it became necessary to restate or extend the law, sovereigns, as bearers of the sword of justice, were under an obligation to consult with the leaders and wise men of the realm.

"The first of these were the leaders of the Church, for the Church was the medium through which God's law was communicated to men. Its political function was to remind kings of what justice was, and to impress on them its importance, and recall them to it when they strayed from it. 'Will you to your power cause law and justice, in mercy, to be executed in all your judgments?' the archbishop of Canterbury asked the king at his crowning."

"In all this the Charter, which consisted of more than sixty clauses, was a recital of the wrongs suffered by Englishmen under a tyrannical king. And as men of property—and above all, landed property—were the only subjects with legally enforceable rights, it confined itself in the main to setting out particulars of the redress granted them. It was a charter of 'liberties,' and to the medieval mind a liberty was a right to the enjoyment of a specific property. It was a freedom to do something with one's own without interference by the king or any other man.

"The charter enunciated no theories; it was nothing if not specific and practical. . . .

"Magna Carta was a substitute for deposition; a legal expedient to enforce customary law that left the king on the throne and the sword of civil war undrawn. Government in England, though exercised by the king, was to be rooted in justice and based on law, or it was not to be accepted as government at all. This was Langton's supreme achievement, and England's. Magna Carta was the first great political act in the history of the nation-state—itsself an institution of which the English had been pioneers."

We ask our readers to turn to the Pledge which we enclose in leaflet form in this issue. They will find there, too, that 'no theories' are enunciated; it is 'nothing if not specific and practical'—a charter of liberties. We ask them to go back to the Church, to all the clergy, to all Christians and to challenge them to do their duty by God—to render unto God the things that are God's, and not unto Caesar; or else they purchase unto themselves damnation.

## CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

Chairman: Dr. BASIL L. STEELE,  
Penrhyn Lodge,  
Gloucester Gate,  
London, N.W.1.

Honorary Secretary: Mr. C. R. PRESTON.

Honorary Treasurer: Mrs. J. HYATT.

Funds for the Campaign are urgently needed.

## Mass Medication

The insolence of the Bureaucracy and the contempt which they have for the electorate is well illustrated in their plans for fluoridating the nation's water supply. The populations of three towns, Kilmarnock, Watford and Norwich, without consultation, have been chosen as guinea pigs for experiments in mass medication of their water with fluorides.

As Lord Douglas of Barloch said in reference to this matter: "The passion to regulate the lives of others is deep-seated and hard to root out. It is most dangerous and insidious when it arises not from motives of personal gain but the desire to inflict benefit upon others." If there has been any public demand for fluoridated water, we have not seen one tittle of evidence of it. And, if there had been, that would not have been a shadow of an excuse for denying the rights of a minority who strongly object to it.

We should like to have an explanation, the true one, why it has suddenly occurred to several governments, including Canada, New Zealand and Australia, to carry out this proposal. We understand that the sudden death of three sailors in New Zealand as a result of accidentally drinking fluoridated water, has awakened the vigilant part of the population of that country to the dangers involved in this proposal.

We have pleasure in publishing below a letter which has been sent to the Prime Minister by the Scottish Housewives' Association.

(Copy.)

The Rt. Hon. Sir Winston Churchill, M.P.,  
Prime Minister,  
10, Downing Street, London.

Dear Sir,

The Central Committee of the Scottish Housewives' Association ask for the removal of The Right Hon. Jas Stuart, M.P., as Secretary of State for Scotland, on the following grounds:

The Minister in asking Kilmarnock Town Council to participate in an experiment "to test" the effect of adding fluorine to drinking water is subjecting the inhabitants to Mass Medication, the results of which he must be in doubt.

Further, he is inciting the Council to flout the law, inasmuch as he promises that

*"Should the legality of the action of the Council be challenged, he will be prepared to indemnify them for the cost of any legal proceedings alleging a breach of their obligations in which they might become involved."*

We question very much as to whether the Minister has such powers but such high-handed administration is totally against Scottish principles and we therefore ask that The Right Hon. Jas. Stuart be relieved of his office as Secretary of State for Scotland.

Yours truly,

Signed Elizabeth M. Pattullo,  
Secretary,

Scottish Housewives' Association.

A copy of the above letter was handed to the press at a Meeting in Perth and the contents broadcast over the 6 p.m. Scottish News.

### Why Half-Measures?

"... But it would be idle to pretend that all is well. The first danger arises from the fact that the institution of the National Health Service has come, already, very near to the creation of a State monopoly in medicine. It is questionable whether a State monopoly is ever right, in any department of life. It is quite certainly wrong in any field where spiritual factors are involved, such as medicine or education. State control, by its very nature, involves a constant threat to the possibilities of individual initiative. But initiative and independence are of the very life blood of medical science.

"Private medical practice does still exist. Statistics suggest that between one and two million members of the public still prefer to consult the private practitioner. But it is not easy, in days of penal taxation, for most people to afford to pay their doctor and their surgeon and their chemist, however much they may wish to do so. Private medical practice deserves, and urgently needs, more encouragement. A natural form for such encouragement would be the remission of some part of the National Insurance stamp for people who prefer to commit themselves to private medicine, for at least a specified term.

"Another encouragement would be to alter the present regulations by which those who pay their doctor are prevented from obtaining medicines free of charge. Private medical practice is important as a bulwark against the risk of a complete State control of the medical profession. It also encourages a more responsible and intimate relationship between doctor and patient. Competition between State medicine and private medicine is of very great advantage to both.

"One bad result of the present system of the National Health Service is the decline in the status of the general practitioner. He used to be regarded by many of his patients as guide, philosopher and friend. Thanks to the present system (which is firmly based, not on the family doctor, but on the hospital), there is a growing danger of the public regarding the general practitioner as little more than a useful person who will sign forms."—(From *The Church Times*, April 30, 1954.)

### Collective Farming Next?

Sir,—I have just read the latest pamphlet issued by the N.F.U., entitled "Regulating the Marketing of Fatstock." I am concerned that the N.F.U. should attempt to try to persuade any government in office to pass legislation of this drastic nature. We may just as well go a stage further and have collective farming.

The only task left to the farmer is that of rearing his animals and filling in forms. He could no longer sell his stock freely, nor could he demand a price. He must be registered as a producer with the Marketing Board and as such he must conform to a series of strict rules. A disciplinary committee is to be formed to deal with the offenders (para. 77).

He must sell his livestock through the Board when directed or he is liable to a fine of £100, plus one-half the price of the stock wrongly sold. Naturally, the Board would  
(Continued in Column 2.)

### THIS COLUMN

In discussing our title, *Voice*, in our first number, we said: "it should not have fallen to laymen to take up a task which obviously belongs to the Spiritual Authority, and we know that in an earlier age it would not have been necessary."

We said: "We believe that it is of the greatest importance that the Bishops and clergy, individually, should come out into the open and give expression to the Christian attitude to liberty, not only as a matter of principle, but as a matter of application. This column is thrown open to them to express their view of what we have said."

WE ASK OUR READERS TO APPROACH THEIR DIOCESAN LEADERS AND THE LOCAL CLERGY AND INVITE THEM TO STATE THEIR ATTITUDE.

So that we may report on the position we ask all those who do so to write us a *brief* letter giving particulars of all those asked to do this and the response that was forthcoming.

**OUR EFFORT:** To meet the grave situation which confronts all of us we have taken a new initiative in publishing this paper, placing special emphasis on an approach we believe could bring important results.

**YOUR EFFORT:** We ask each of you to get us one new subscriber, or alternatively to pay a trial subscription for half a year (7/6) for one of your acquaintances who might become a regular reader.

### COLLECTIVE FARMING NEXT?

—(Continued from Column 1.)

fix the price of the animals (para. 67). It appears that the Board's aim is to destroy all contact between the producer and the consumer, and place his business entirely in the hands of a controlling body.

However, the farmer is not to be trusted, for the Board would give authority to chosen persons to enter and inspect the producer's land and premises at any time (para. 73). If we obstructed or interfered with these "snoopers" in any way, we are liable to a fine of £50 (para. 77).

Any profit which may be made by this scheme would be disposed of at a date not yet arranged (para. 76). Any loss is to be met by the producers in the form of a compulsory loan, amounting up to the sum of £2 plus one *per cent.* of the price of the stock sold by the producer throughout that year (para. 74).

For other offences the producer is liable to fines of £100 and/or sentence of up to three months' imprisonment.

These are merely a few of the controls to be imposed by the Board. Such a scheme would need a small army of clerks, graders, inspectors, *etc.*, all of whom would add to expenses.

J. BROWN.

Brownhill Farm,  
Birkenshaw, Bradford.

—(From *The Farmers' Weekly*).