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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 16. SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1954. 6d. Fortnightly.

VOICE

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.

Humility and Humbug

The Meek Shall Inherit The Earth

When we wrote out the Declaration which was first published in this paper on October 9, the Denial, or counter statement, came as an afterthought. It was fully recognised that few would sign the Declaration, but the object of publishing it was to give, as a matter of policy, opportunity for exemplary action. The Denial was the Declaration stated in reverse, but with all its principles separated and stated separately. The object was twofold: to provoke thought about the Declaration and to ascertain why many of the clergy wouldn't sign it. At the time of writing between three and four thousand clergymen have received the invitation. Seven have signed the Declaration. A larger number have written friendly letters of encouragement without signing. A still larger number have written resentfully saying that both Declaration and Denial are nonsensical and offensive. But not one signature has been placed against even one of the principles stated in reverse in the Denial.

When the Declaration and Denial were printed as a separate leaflet with six signatures appended and enclosed with *Voice* on October 23 only one letter was received—a letter of warm approval, saying that it "could not fail to appeal to the great majority of Christian clergymen"—although the paper was sent to twelve hundred of the clergy.

We state these facts because we think that our readers, upon whose support our efforts depend, are entitled to the information.

Well over ninety *per cent.* of the clergy whom we approached have not responded at all. This does not surprise us, for the simple reason that if a large number had signed the Declaration, such evidence of powerful, practical Christianity in the Church would have been manifest before we started and would have rendered our work unnecessary. We are not engaged on harvesting. Before the harvest the seed has to be sown, and before the seed is sown the ground has to be cultivated. It is our opinion, that whereas some ground is ready to receive the seed, a much larger area has to be prepared for it. Weeds flourish in uncultivated soil, whereas good seed does not even germinate. There are plenty of sowers of weed seed in our society, and do they flourish? If there are few sowers of good seed, nevertheless there is not one of them who is not aware of how few seeds germinate. How do you cultivate the human mind, to receive good seed? How many sowers recognise the need? How many have fathomed the meaning of St. John XVI 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 13?

A very great fathomer, in 1948 in reply to a correspondent who asked why the authority of the Church could not be invoked in this all-important matter of the freedom of the individual, replied:

"So far as my own opinion is of value, I am satisfied that, with the possible exception of the Roman Catholics, the Churches in this country have lost touch with the spirit of Christianity, and so far as they express any coherent philosophy, propound the exoteric version of pre-Christian Judaism. The so-called Reformation and the ascendancy of the Puritans have a good deal to do with this, no doubt.

"Advice at the present time is difficult to give. My own standpoint starts with the assumption, which I have come to by long processes, that we are suffering from a very old continuous policy, older than the Christian era. Any idea that such a policy can be instantaneously defeated is clearly absurd, but we must assume that something, of which Christianity is at least a part, has been consciously working over the centuries to deal with it. Our business, then, is to forward what we conceive to be the policy of reality in its main manifestations. I think the full meaning of this statement perhaps comes better by meditation than by explanation."

By meditation.

The object of publishing the Denial with the Declaration is to produce meditation, because meditation prepares the mind for the seeds of truth. But only if the approach is objective and the mind humble.

We were promised a Comforter, "even the Spirit of truth." If the clergy can neither express agreement with the positive statement which we have published as the Declaration, nor with *any part* of its opposite, which we have called the Denial, it is conclusive evidence that they have lost touch with the Spirit of truth. Truth is an absolute; it is the narrow way. As soon as it is compromised it ceases to be truth, and becomes evil—the broad way. If we had no absolute standards of weights and measures, even the physical framework of our society would become as dishonest and corrupt and unstable as is our currency, and as our laws are fast becoming under the New Despotism.

The passionate prayer, which is chapter XVII of the Gospel according to St. John, is concerned with the formation of the Church; and its first members are sanctified

through *truth,* which is declared to be God's word. And it is clearly stated, first that the growth of the Church is dependent upon its members being "sanctified through the truth"; and second that the belief of "the world" in Christ's Church is dependent on its being *one* in the *truth.* It cannot be *one* in anything else.

The façade of "unity" with which those who met at Evanston sought to mask their discord is not oneness. It is deception. It masked as many different ideas as there are colours in a kaleidoscope. Oneness is not to be achieved by seeking unity; it is to be achieved by seeking and discovering truth, for truth is single and absolute. Everybody knows that the churches either within themselves or between themselves are very far from oneness.

The world does not believe in the Church; and that is positive evidence that it has departed from the Spirit of truth.

We have pointed out before in these pages that in the one great sphere of human endeavour where marvels have been achieved a policy of reality is *religiously* practised. The scientist seeks the truth about physical reality, and he finds it because his approach is governed by a remarkable objectivity of thought and by a humble refusal to believe that he knows before he has proved his discovery to the hilt. To say that he recognises the absolute importance of accuracy, both of observation and of standards and tools of measurement is to say that *in the particular sphere* in which he is working, his mind, in relation to physical reality, is sanctified by truth.

The world believes in the scientist, so far as he goes.

The Church or the business of the Church is concerned with metaphysical reality. And the world would believe in the Church if it saw in the fruits of its work that it also was sanctified by truth. Where are its present-day fruits?

It is specifically stated in the New Testament (but not in the Old Testament) that the meek shall inherit the earth. How are the meek to inherit the earth? Indifference to power is the essence of meekness. Love of power is the opposite of meekness. It is axiomatic, therefore, that if the meek are to inherit the earth, power in the world will have to be distributed to each of the meek. How many of the clergy consider this as a practical problem?

Let us put the question another way: can the meek inherit the earth if power is centralised and concentrated in the hands of those who love power? The characteristic of the Welfare State, which the churches support, is centralisation of power.

The main object of the United Nations Association is to centralise power in a world government. The leaders of the churches, with one notable exception, are all supporting the United Nations Association. The writer of the front page article in the newspaper which carries the words: "Church of England" in its title said on October 29:

"Politicians prefer a monopoly of petty power to a share of big power, and in this country the main parties are in tacit agreement not to mention federation (for Britain), let alone to advocate it. If we cannot expect a lead from the politicians then it is for us who are not politicians—in particular, I suggest, for the other great association, the Church—to give federation both moral approval and publicity, to trouble politicians' consciences about it, and, more to the point, ultimately to tempt one of the main parties to win an election on it."

The Principal of Moor Park College, Canon R. E. Parsons, preaching at a special service to mark the ninth Anniversary of the formation of the United Nations, whose object is to rob the meek finally and completely of power, said of the "table around which sat the United Nations" that there was "need of a vacant chair" for the "living Christ." We would not take this utterance of a country parson, preaching at a service conducted by a Rural Canon in a small country town, very seriously if we did not know that it represents the attitude of the dominant element in, and possibly the majority attitude of the clergy in England.

World Government is single monopoly government; it is monopoly of power. Its avowed object is the concentration of such absolute power that it can prevent any single national government waging war. If it has power to stop a government waging war by monopoly control of raw materials, monopoly control of armed forces and the establishment of an international police force, it has obviously got power to control *everything* that single national governments and their peoples can or want to do. Has there ever anywhere at any time in history been a single instance of centralised power resulting other than in tyranny for the meek? Why are all the Communist governments supporting World Government and the United Nations? Why is the whole power of International Finance behind World Government? Why is it that so many of those who at present exercise "petty" power are braking on the movement for World Government, if it is not that they recognise that their present power will be submerged, subordinated and completely dependent on a Power against which *all* will be powerless? Does power tend to corrupt? What does absolute power do? "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" What will be the judgment on those who in the name of Christ advocate such absolute power? "My kingdom is not of this world." Have we really reached the stage when a professing Christian can say that a vacant chair is waiting for Christ to reign over such absolute worldly power? If so, what indeed does Anti-Christ, Satan, the adversary of Christ, seek?

The threat of an annihilating war does not come from the common people of any country on earth—that is so obvious that anyone who says the opposite is either incredibly ignorant or perverted. The threat comes from the Communists and the powerful interests in the "Free World" who are stealthily aiding the Communists. The threat comes from those who are in power over the common people. And anyone who is attentive to the facts of the situation can easily ascertain that the threat of annihilating war is being assiduously used to coax the people of the world to accept World Government. The initiative and drive for World Government is coming not from the common people (they are the objects of persuasion), but from people in power over them, aided by a host of propagandists who are idealists with no conception of reality (truth).

Yet, the type of "Christianity" which is being given maximum publicity in the press of the "Free World" is that which asserts that it is the selfishness and sinfulness of the common people which is the main cause of the evils of the world. Why is it that President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill, whose strategy was responsible for Russia's dominant military position in Europe, are backing Dr. Billy Graham? Speaking to an enormous audience at Louisiana last month Dr. Graham is reported to have said in reference to conversations he had had with Eisenhower and Churchill that their views could be summed up in a single phrase: "We don't have long to wait. The storm clouds are gathering in all their maddening fury." Dr. Graham's response to this was to tell his audience of common people: "We don't have long to make up our minds about God.

"I beg of you to give your life for Christ tonight. There are thousands of people on the church rolls who will never make it, because they have never truly surrendered their wills to God." We don't doubt that Dr. Graham has remarkable persuasive powers over the common people. But we have yet to discover any trace of or encouragement to demagoguery in the Gospels. When asked to choose, the mob chose Barabbas. What is the interest of these two agents of World Government, Eisenhower and Churchill, in Graham? Why is he being boosted as "a world figure of statesmanlike qualities . . . no longer regarded as just another evangelist"? Can it be that what Dr. Graham is popularising is not Christianity, but Judaism?

Why is it that not one clergyman, not even among those who support World Government, will sign point 8 of the Denial: "The removal of power from individual members of society and its centralisation in a few hands is not destructive of freedom?" World Government is absolute centralisation of power.

Christ did not ask for, and never attempted to get, blind obedience through emotionalism. He asked that those He chose to found His Church should be "sanctified through thy truth: thy word is the truth." This was the condition stated on which *His* Church could grow; and the condition on which the world would believe in *His* Church was that its members should be "made perfect in one." The clergy are so obviously not perfect in one. Their imperfections are so clearly being played upon to use them as public relations officers to Caesar. To seek the truth we need humility, not humbug. To seek the truth we need a questioning frame of mind. "*Seek* and ye shall find. *Ask* and ye shall receive. *Knock* and it shall be opened unto you." We are trying to induce a questioning frame of mind in others. All the readers of this paper have the power to question. We ask them to question the Bishops and clergy on these vital matters, and to go on questioning them. We at Campaign Headquarters will continue on as large a scale as we are empowered by our readers. What support the Campaign has had so far would not pay Billy Graham's salary for two weeks.

Christ did not come into the world that Caesar should have absolute power. We should not be Christians if we did not believe that the *only* way to salvation in this world or the next is through *His* Church, not the Synagogue of Satan.

The New Despotism

On October 27, the House of Lords debated Compulsory Purchased and Requisitioned Land on a motion by Lord Teviot, who spoke of the many grave injustices being caused to individual property owners by the action of Government Departments. "In fact, so far as I can see," said Lord Teviot, "we are now living almost in a sort of Soviet State: under the sort of conditions that we should expect to find there." The fact that many injustices have been and are being committed all over the country was not disputed by any speaker on either side of the House. But, despite this obvious moral basis of the Debate, no Bishop took part in it. When a Bishop was asked recently why the Church did not express the Moral Law in relation to the issues involved in the Crichel Down affair he betrayed his ignorance of the well-known fact that the lack of moral principle evidenced at Crichel Down is widespread in similar instances all over the country. He said that the Crichel Down matter was something which only concerned the Bishop of Salisbury.

We will now quote extracts from some of the speeches. As will be seen it was only Lord Teviot who broached the heart of the matter: that the apparatus of tyranny needs removing, not merely ameliorating.

Lord Teviot: " . . . In my view, we must return to our people the right to lead their own lives, so that merit and thrift shall be rewarded in all walks of life. . . . The Common Law used to protect the ordinary citizen of the country, but, so far as I can make out, that is not so any more: Orders in Council simply override any protection which the Common Law used to give us. On one occasion I ventured to put down a Prayer to annul an Order in Council. But supposing that we were successful in getting an Order in Council annulled, how would that benefit us? As I understand it an Order lays on the Table of both Houses for forty days, and then, within a day or two of its being annulled, another Order in Council is laid which says practically the same thing. So we get nowhere by annulling such an Order.

"It is outrageous that the citizens of a free country should suffer from these conditions. So far as I can see, there are far too many tribunals, commissions, boards and committee exercising far-reaching powers over the lives of our men and women."

Lord Hardinge of Penshurst: " . . . All this leads to a very big question, which is the relation between the individual and the State. I do not switch on the Third Programme as often as, no doubt, I ought to, but I made a point of listening a little time ago to an address given by Professor Hamson, of Cambridge University, on the Crichel Down Inquiry. In his address he drew attention (and here, if I may, I will quote the words) to the

"'desperate state in which the normal subject, the ordinary citizen, you and I, find ourselves today in England when confronted with the powers vested in a Minister, powers which legally are exercised by the delegate of a delegate of a delegate, or by a collective anonymity which has as little soul as it has human face.'

" . . . He went on to say

"'We'—that is, the subjects—

"'require the redress of such grievances as may by

impartial inquiry be found to be just. We demand the possibility of justice even against a Government Department acting within the ambit of its powers. It is of the bare possibility of this justice that there is in England today the gravest default.' "

Lord Broughshane said: " . . . To my mind the most remarkable feature of the Crichel Down Inquiry was that the Inquiry ever took place at all. Such Inquiries, as your Lordships know, are extremely rare. So that, to me, the lesson of the Crichel Down Affair is its demonstration of the powerlessness and defencelessness of the ordinary citizen against the despotic and arbitrary powers which are wielded by Departments of State. There is nothing in the Crichel Down Report to suggest that what transpired was not in the normal course of business, and there is no reason whatever to suppose that the Report does not give a perfectly fair picture of the manner in which matters of this kind are ordinarily handled in Government Departments.

" I shall be reminded that the public interest must be paramount. I agree. But surely the public interest is concerned also with preserving the freedom of the subject under the rule of law. I shall be told of the many difficulties and impracticabilities of making it possible for a private citizen judicially to challenge the legitmate actions of the Executive; but as the noble Lord, Lord Penshurst, reminded us, in France a citizen can do that very thing. And I believe it to be no less than the urgent requirement of the day that in this country we should evolve some equivalent machinery for deciding disputes between Government Departments and individual citizens. If we do not, the liberty of the subject under the rule of law, hardly won through past centuries, if it does not disappear will be certainly and strangely diminished."

We recommend our readers to press this matter on the Bishops and clergy. And we also commend to them the action of the Alton and District Chamber of Commerce, which we cite below. We hope that they will recommend the action to their local Chamber of Commerce for emulation. The resolution was forwarded to the Alton Urban and Rural District Councils, to the Hampshire County Council, The Ministry of Town and Country Planning, and in a revised form, to the National Chamber of Commerce: —

" This Chamber of Commerce has read with dismay and alarm the report of the suicide of Mr. Pilgrim in particular, and also of other cases of extreme hardship caused by the operation by various Government departments and Local Government bodies of the compulsory purchase clauses of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1947, or orders giving similar powers.

" While realising there are two sides to every question and that there may be occasions when the compulsory purchase of land or property may be necessary in the public interest, the Chamber nevertheless express the hope that the Council will not invoke the compulsory purchase clauses of this or any other similar Act, and if possible will not proceed with any cases causing hardship until the Act or Acts of Parliament concerned are amended to ensure fair compensation and traditional British justice to the owners concerned.

" The Chamber would also like to feel that, while the Council quite properly safeguards and protects the interests of the ratepayers, that at the same time the property or land owner (being also a ratepayer) is fully advised by the appropriate Council officials of his full and legal rights in the matter before a compulsory purchase order is made."

THE END OR THE REVIVAL OF FREEDOM?

Putting forward this resolution, Mr. Vokes said he felt it was something of tremendous importance. It seemed to him, he said, that July 20, the day the Crichel Down case came up in Parliament, was either this country's last day of freedom or the beginning of a hope to regain the large amount of freedom which had been lost as the result of two great wars. To win on each occasion, the people of this country had given up everything they had to the governments of the day, and in the process of doing that, Parliament, whatever the party in office, had been niggardly in giving back that freedom.

Various Acts of Parliament, in his view, were being interpreted by various bodies to suit themselves, and if anyone challenged that interpretation, the action certain bodies had taken stayed put, and that was all there was to it. Other authorities followed suit and the position became gradually worse.

Mr. Vokes went on to speak in detail of recent cases which had come to public notice.

" To me," he added, " it is frightful that owners of private property could be smashed in this utterly ruthless manner." He had gone into detail of the various cases that had come to his notice, he said, deliberately, to prove that it was possible to get authorities taking action that was utterly and thoroughly unjust and in nine cases out of ten they could get away with it.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. H. S. Alexander, who said: —

" One just does not know where one is." The number of orders in existence permitting the compulsory purchase of property he thought was astonishingly large, and to avoid the sort of thing happening which created the cases mentioned by Mr. Vokes, they could not as individuals do less than to make it known that the public were aware this sort of thing was going on, that they were most disturbed by it and, if necessary, that they just would not have it.

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.

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.