

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 12.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

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.

The Sanctions of God

With this issue we mark six months of publication; and we trust it is now evident that we do not labour merely for academic reasons. The problem of how the forces of good in the world are to prevail over the forces of evil is at bottom a problem of sanctions. And we believe it is fundamental to this question that the proof of a liar is not whether he believes what he professes to believe, but what he *does*. Good has sanctions of its own, evil has to invest a lie with sanctions.

Hypocrisy is the tribute which vice pays to truth. Nothing demonstrates more clearly what powerful sanctions truth possesses, than the prevalent practice of cloaking evil actions with aims which belong to truth. Nothing can deprive the hypocrite of his fraudulently acquired sanctions more quickly or more effectively than the constant focus of attention on what he *does* or *does not do*. "... for the tree is known by *his* fruit."

A society working along parallel lines to ourselves believes that right action to make ideas effective will ensue automatically from the acceptance of them; and that it is not necessary to do more than spread the ideas. The events of our times show this conception to be patently wrong. It is based not so much upon a failure to grasp the extent of the power of evil, but upon a failure to grasp the depth of its wickedness. The evil ideas which are at present triumphant in the world are served by many who are merely in error, and are begot mainly by those who are *unable* to see truth; but behind those two groups is a third, unseen by them, which is *consciously* evil. These are the descendants of those of whom it was said:

"Ye are of *your* father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own: for he is a liar and the father of it."

The power of this group is based upon secrecy. Herein is Anti-Christ, and his aim is absolute dominion over the earth through the concentration of all power.

It is not our intention here to add yet another exposure of the nature and personnel of this group, but to point to the fact that when the prince of this world disposes almost exclusively, directly or indirectly, of virtually all earthly rewards he will not be defeated by a sanction which rests merely upon an idea being academically more acceptable or correct than the one which he supports.

Truth is only a sanction superior to untruth in the affairs of this world if it is *recognised* as having an *ultimate* validity which renders judgment in another world *as well as this*. If it were not so the battle for the kingdom of God would have been over long ago, for it is obvious that for clever men there is more material profit in this world in doing evil than in being good.

In our view the reality of the sanctions of God *in this world* in so far as they can induce men to *do* God's will is based upon two statements from the New Testament:

"If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin, but now they have no cloke for their sin."

"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven."

There is no gainsaying that the strongest condemnation in the Gospels is reserved not for the humble sinner, but for the Pharisees, hypocrites who made much of prayer and faith and worship, but whose deeds denied their words.

In the whole history of the human race there has never been a time when decisions affecting the individual person's choice of action were so much the responsibility, legally and constitutionally, of the political actions of large numbers of people. The Gospels are concerned with an elucidation of what conduct God sanctions and what He does not sanction. Is it suggested by the churches that a man's political conduct, whether he is an elector or a politician, is immune from God's sanction? Have the decisions of majorities superceded God's will? If so, then the churches should condemn politics and majority government as un-Christian; but if not, then the churches as "The Body of Christ" have a plain duty to the community to make clear what God sanctions and what He does not sanction, not only in regard to objectives which are chosen, but also in regard to the moral character of the political action taken.

We publish in this issue a letter which was sent with a copy of the last issue of "*Voice*" to every Bishop of the Church of England. Other letters have preceded it, and others will follow it. Many hundreds, if not thousands, of clergy receive copies of every issue of "*Voice*"; and every minister of a Christian Church will be presented by us with a clear-cut choice of supporting or refusing to support Christian objectives and Christian action in politics and of taking appropriate action within their parishes. We shall remove the cloak. When we have finished there will be no doubt: it will be clear for all who can see the truth, whether we have in this land a body of clergy who are Christians or a body of clergy who are Pharisees operating under the very cloak of Christ... "for the tree is known by *his* fruit."

The issues are clear: there can be no Christianity in politics unless God's sanctions are paramount; God's sanctions cannot be paramount unless they are made abundantly clear to the electorate and politicians; God's instrument for making his sanctions known is the Church, and this is

acknowledged both by the Church and by that still large proportion of the public which acknowledges God. For this reason the immense responsibility for taking the initiative clearly rests on the Church. Before God, great indeed must their failure be if they fail to take it, for great indeed are the consequences to humanity.

The key to finding sanctions in politics which can prevail over evil is the Church. It is on the Church, therefore, that we concentrate our attention.

God's Law and Man-made Law

Relation of Power to Authority

CONFERENCE AT MOOR PARK COLLEGE,
(Farnham, Surrey)

In conjunction with THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM a Conference will be held at Moor Park College, Farnham, Surrey from Tuesday, November 23 to Thursday, November 25. Whilst the Conference is open to all, the clergy are especially invited to attend.

PROGRAMME

Tuesday, November 23

- 7-00 p.m. Supper.
8-30 p.m. Address: "Is There Such a Thing as A Christian Social Order?"
Speaker (to be announced later).

Wednesday, November 24

- 8-00 a.m. Breakfast.
10-00 a.m. Discussion.
1-00 p.m. Lunch.
Afternoon Free.
4-30 p.m. Tea.
5-00 p.m. Address: "The Centralisation of Power."
Speaker: R. B. Gaudin, Esq.
7-00 p.m. Supper.
8-30 p.m. Address: "Freedom and Authority."
Speaker: The Rev. Henry Swabey.

Thursday, November 25

- 10-00 a.m. Discussion.
1-00 p.m. Lunch.
7-00 p.m. Supper.
8-00 p.m. Address: "Christianity in Politics."
Speaker: John Mitchell (Editor of *Voice*).

Conference ends after breakfast on Friday.

Charges: Booking Fee, 5/-.

Board and Lodging per day (single room), 17/6;
Sharing room, 14/6. (These charges are inclusive of booking fee.)

Admission to each address, 1/6.

Non-residents: Tea, 9d.; Lunch, 2/6; Supper, 3/-.

Trains (half-hourly from Waterloo Station) will be met at Farnham Station from 4 p.m., November 23.

From Christian Campaign for Freedom

September, 1954

The Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of

My Lord Bishop,

May we draw your attention to the article, "What is Truth?" in the copy of *Voice* enclosed?

We feel that it is intolerable that while the people of this country are exposed to the danger of lying propaganda "by the mounting forces of power groups of mass direction," to quote the Archbishop of Canterbury at Minneapolis, they are given no guidance by the leaders of the Established Church. It is for this reason that we are determined to do what we can in order that the Church's position in this matter may be made clear to the people. We are encouraged in our work by increasing support from both the clergy and lay members of the Church, one of whom writes, "the Church must not be allowed to stand aside and be idle in the cause of Truth which is Christianity."

Freedom must be defined in concrete terms and responsible action taken to recover it. We believe it to be our privilege to look to our Bishops for advice both in the framing of specific objectives in this context and in the action to be taken.

From the marked passage in the article you will see what advice we are giving to the electorate. We beg to ask if this action is endorsed by you as correct action for a Christian to take in politics. If you do not agree with it we would beg you to tell us in what way you disagree and what advice you would offer us for positive steps to be taken to restore and preserve freedom, which, as the Archbishop of Canterbury said at Minneapolis, is "threatened with extinction."

We feel we should let it be known that we have once again approached our Bishops for support and advice, and we both earnestly and humbly ask for your reply for publication.

I have the honour to be, My Lord, . . .

To Citizens of Character and Courage

The following extracts are taken from a pamphlet entitled *The Right to Resist* published by the Catholic Social Guild, Oxford:—

" . . . When the State makes demands contrary to the law of God and with which it would be a sin to comply, then the principle is completely valid. (Cf. Acts v. 29.) When obedience means a real (formal) co-operation with evil, then obedience is sin and disobedience is duty. . .

" . . . The great difficulty about passive resistance is that it often begins too late. In decisive periods, while the good hesitate and waver, the powers of evil have time and opportunity to deploy themselves and perhaps make themselves irresistible. . .

"Paul the Apostle speaks of it in forcible words. He writes in his epistle (Rom. xiii, I ff): 'Let every soul be subject to higher powers. For there is no power but from God: and those that are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God. And they that resist purchase to themselves damnation.' These weighty words which have been repeated so often through the

(Continued on page 4.)

Responsibility and Society

It is said that when six years ago the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches met there was such disagreement regarding what is truth in social organisation that one section was in favour of freedom of association and enterprise and the other was all against it, believing in central control of everything through socialism. Accordingly, as the appearance of unity was assumed to be of primary importance, the phrase "a responsible society" was adopted to cover totally opposed conceptions of truth. With this in mind the concluding comment of *The Church Times* correspondent's report on the meeting of the second Assembly at Evanston makes rather strange reading: "The Church is not a society for discovering the truth—it is the Body of Christ through which He proclaims the truth—unalterable truth."

The mental nausea which reading the reports of the Evanston meeting caused, was eased by the slight breath of fresh air in the remarks of the Free Church Notes in the *Manchester Guardian* for September 6. The writer, in discussing "the serious business of proving things" in geometry, says: "The wonderful thing about it was the deep interior certainty that followed when one had come to the Q.E.D., which stood like a Euclidean 'Amen' at the end of each theorem . . . Philosophers and theologians have longed to demonstrate the existence and attributes of God in the same kind of way and with the same satisfying certainty."

We think it might have occurred to the writer that Euclid, like Newton, Faraday, Rutherford and others who came later, by demonstrating attributes of God's creation in material things was in fact demonstrating attributes of God. We also think that if some of the begaitered personnel of the Church, instead of being so sure that they are in any genuine sense part of the "Body of Christ," who "came in the cause of truth," and in the humility of the genuine scientists spent some time obeying Christ's injunction to "seek" the truth in metaphysical things, the Church, and society, might have found themselves served instead of cursed by materialism.

What is "a responsible society"? Is there such a thing as "a responsible society"? Why have the members of the World Council of Churches never attempted to define it?

The word 'responsible' is derived from the Latin *respondere*: to answer. It is defined as "legally or morally answerable, personally accountable, for action, performance of a duty, fulfilment of an obligation . . ." It involves a capacity, mental and moral, in those who assume responsibility.

Society is a community of individuals who associate for certain purposes, such is a nation state. As C. H. Douglas said, "Society is primarily metaphysical." This aspect of it was defined by the Bishops at the Lambeth Conference as: ". . . Man is more than a function of his society, more than a producer or a citizen. His claims as Man are dependent not on any concession by an earthly state but upon divine endowment and prerogative which no human authority gave, or can take from him. If man is heir to everlasting life, then the State exists for man, not man for it."

Douglas pointed out that there are three cardinal factors

in any form of association: Policy, Administration and Sanctions. Administration is by its very character hierarchical, decisions proceed from the top down. But if the State exists for man, it is obvious that the administration must be subordinate to the people for policy, and that this cannot be so unless they possess effective sanctions to enforce it.

As man is more than a function of society, we, as Christians, and the Church leaders in particular, have to find out how man outside his function in society can be served by society, not enslaved by it. Likewise a 'responsible society' has no meaning unless it is a society of responsible individuals. Furthermore if the Church is not to be pharisaical it has to adjure all members of society to cease to support policies and practices which defeat these Christian conceptions of society; it has to go further than this: it has to be positive, it must adjure Christians to say that they *will* support persons *legally accountable* to them who will *only* forward Christian policies in regard to society in the legislature. The Church has a duty laid upon it by its Founder, whose Body it claims to be, to do just this, to seek out and express and forward the truth in society. It doesn't do this.

What is needed is a clear and detailed statement of what are the practices and policies which are defeating Christian purpose in society; and even that is nothing like enough. Such a statement has to be the basis merely of a country-wide, constant effort, in every parish, to bring the citizen in his function as an elector in line with it and in support of it. That will be bringing Christianity into the very life of the people; it will become real to them. Until the Church does this it is a Church of Pharisees.

The Welfare State, Planning, socialism—these ugly children who will grow into the monster, Communism—are taking Christianity out of society.

"Let he who is greatest among you be your servant." How can this be effective in any monopoly, with its destruction of the right and power to contract out of one association and contract into one of a number of others? The sanctions of the *individual* consumer are nullified, so that he cannot control policy, and are given to the Administration; so are the sanctions of the *individual* employee to choose his conditions of work. What has monopoly of credit, the lifeblood of all producers and businesses, done to destroy the independence of employers? What has it to do with a Christian order of society?

What has the vast system of discriminating taxation done to freedom of choice? Who does the choosing?

What has the Chancellor of the Exchequer's annual Budget, with its violation of the fundamental principle practised by custom and law, by every business and producer in the presentation of accounts, to do with honest accountancy?

What has the policy of Full Employment to do with the immense possibilities of creative leisure brought by modern production methods? What hideous and demoralising practices has it produced in Trade Unionism? What potent, though hidden, pressure does it put behind rearmament, behind the waste, extravagance and ugliness of advertising, behind the senseless drive of all nations to export more than they import; and not least behind the robot, soul destroying methods of modern factory production? Does this contribute to peaceful purposes?

What has the chicanery and deceit of modern electioneering, and the cowardly method of the secret ballot, with its total absence of any enforcement of responsibility between those who voted for the government in power and those who voted against, got to do with "a responsible society"?

Will individual clergymen go down on their knees before the altar and declare to Christ who came in the cause of truth, that in regard to truth in these vital matters in society they are not pharisaical? Will they?

The Christian Campaign For Freedom is *action* to restore truth, freedom and justice to society. In all the important quarters of publicity there is a conspiracy of silence in regard to it. Is the Church part of this conspiracy to ignore truth?

"Sir Wilfrid Garrett, formerly chief inspector of factories, speaking at the Modern Churchman's Union conference in London yesterday, referred to 'rank materialism' in industrial areas. . . .

"The main reason seems to be the numbness of mind imposed by this life of work. These conditions exist chiefly in very large towns, where people are cut off entirely from nature and the discipline of a small community.

"This percentage of the population who do so think and live are not confined to one class and the cancer appears to be spreading. We are living on our religious capital, and if the deterioration continues we may lose our freedom and the physical well-being that has grown up with our idea of Christian democracy."—Report from *The Daily Telegraph*.

TO CITIZENS—

(Continued from page 2.)

centuries, appear to decide our question without ambiguity and without fear of contradiction. But it is an appearance and no more.

"Anyone reading this text of St. Paul in its context understands at once that he is supposing completely normal conditions and that he is speaking of a government which is working for the common good, protecting well-doers and frightening evil-doers. Not a word suggests that he has in mind those difficult problems of conscience that can arise in relation to a criminal government unmindful of its duty. That is the unanimous opinion of all commentators, Catholic and Protestant alike.

"Pope Pius XI writes in his encyclical *Firmissimam Constantiam* (March 28th, 1937) to the Mexican Bishops . . . 'You have affirmed that if the case arose where the civil power should so trample on justice and truth as to destroy even the very foundations of authority, there would appear no reason to condemn citizens for uniting to defend the nation and themselves by lawful and appropriate means against those who make use of the power of the State to drag the nation to ruin.' . . .

"In times like these, situations can arise in which it is not enough for Christians to pray and suffer; it falls to them as a solemn duty to drive back force with force, protecting and shielding themselves, their family and their nation from untold misery and injustice and the gravest danger to faith and morals. *They must beware lest through the weakness and cowardice of the good the power of the wicked should gain the upper hand in the world.* . . .

" . . . The concept of natural law which is here unfolded coincides with the old German concept; there is a high moral idea at the base of each. It is the idea that

above the ruler and subject there stands law. Even the right of resistance recalls the truth that the authority of rulers can endure only through the law and in the law. . . .

" . . . Recent history has provided us with the clearest proofs of how easily a people can lose their freedom and how difficult it is to recover liberty once the tyrants have taken strong hold by Terror. Thus it amounts to this: the setting up of a tyranny must be prevented and the wrong ways that lead to it must be known in advance and avoided. Eternal vigilance is therefore demanded, for the forces which make it necessary usually proceed secretly and gradually; they render themselves invisible and count on the good nature of peaceful citizens so as to surprise them with a sudden blow at the decisive moment in order to enslave them. . . .

"Every free constitution stands or falls on the convictions of the people who support it; it stands or falls on the courage or cowardice of those who are called upon to defend it. In its very self the idea that all authority to rule is confined within limits and that the people are not handed over without any rights to an arbitrary government, carries with it necessarily the notion that those limits must be observed. . . .

" . . . To hammer into them that orders are orders and that the individual counts for nothing but the community is everything, is to breed the blind obedience of slaves and to smooth the way for a dictatorship, which of course considers the individual person as of no account. . . .

" . . . Further, all Government measures should be checked with a watchful vigilance—indeed with a watchful distrust—so that the Government while it is in power may serve the nation and not injure it. The true democrat trusts no government, least of all his own. . . .

"It is a modern achievement of doubtful value that all the instruments of power and propaganda can be united in the hands of a few and work through a limited number of control-points. If, therefore, vigilance and the readiness to intervene are subjected to trickery, distracted or impeded, it is possible to set up in no time a system of tyranny against which even a huge majority can no longer do anything. The people then have the feeling of being caught in a trap which they entered easily but from which they can never escape. The letter of the constitution is by no means ever sufficient. If the people fail in their duty, that is, if through complacency, stupidity, indifference or spinelessness they give a free hand to foolish and evil men, then even the best constitution will not save them from the misuse of the power of the State.

" . . . The nation that does not want to lose its freedom must therefore be clear how and whence the threat to its liberties approaches and what are its first signs.

"FREEDOM IS NOT A GIFT TO BE EFFORTLESSLY ENJOYED; IT HAS TO BE EARNED BY BOTH MODERATION IN ITS USE AND COURAGE IN ITS DEFENCE. THE FREE MAN IS NOT THE UNRESTRAINED MAN; HE IS THE MAN WHO WATCHES OVER HIS RIGHTS WITH COURAGE AND OBSERVES STRICTLY THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS. . . .

"But it is just as certain that a nation will retain its freedom only so long as there are enough citizens of character and courage who do not give way at every pressure from above nor evade difficult and delicate questions, but who are accustomed to fight back against the 'insolence of officials' and to take their stand for truth and justice."