

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 22.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1955.

6d. Fortnightly.

## VOICE

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

"Freedom consists in the ability to choose one thing at a time."

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*

*One year 15/-; Six months 7/6; Three months 3/9.*

*Offices—Business: LINCOLN CHAMBERS, 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST. Telephone: Belfast 27810. Editorial: ROCKHOUSE FARM, LOWER FROYLE, ALTON, HANTS. Telephone: Bentley 3182.*

### A Long Step Forward

Anyone who has read the extracts published in *The Sunday Times* from the Archbishop of York's new book "World Problems of Today" and listened to the two broadcasts on the Third Programme on "Church and State" must recognise that *Voice* and the Christian Campaign for Freedom have already scored at least one big point—at the top they have secured public recognition that the Church must express Authority in politics and the Moral Law. The fact that we are not mentioned is beside the point. These developments have come too late for more extensive comment in this issue. The next important step is to secure a proper recognition of the nature of the Moral Law.

We ask for the maximum support of all our readers.

### Did God Create Reality?

In our experience since we began publishing this paper nothing has been more plainly evidential, or more painful, than the poverty of intellect of the general run of clergymen. A large proportion of the writers of the letters we receive demonstrate an utter lack of comprehension of Reality. The reports we receive of others' experience is the same. Hence the title to this article.

By many accounts, which we have no reason to disbelieve, there is now in Russia a large scale return of the population to worship in Christian Churches, but this does not in any way apply to those who govern the country; the grinding, harsh conditions of totalitarian tyranny are in no way slackened: freedom in any real sense is non-existent. No one in his senses would suggest that the clergy would be allowed to pronounce from their pulpits that Christ came in the cause of truth, the service of which would make us FREE and give us life more abundant; therefore all the legislation and activities of the government are evil. "Remember the first Commandment: Love God with all your heart, with all your soul and all your mind. Obey this Commandment. By supporting this government you cannot be obeying it. . . ." Now the Archbishop of

Canterbury has been writing in his diocesan notes that "Nothing but a true desire to live by the laws of God" will put an end to bombs and strikes, and the laws of God "are directly relevant to every situation, and when all concerned admit their validity and seek to apply them in all their dealings, then only will evil be really overcome and peace be obtainable." Anyone in his senses and with any realistic knowledge of history knows perfectly well that *all* concerned never have been willing, if they could possibly avoid doing so, to obey the Commandments, or God's Law to which they refer. But, notwithstanding this, correct action by those who were willing to be obedient has in the past brought about long periods of peace with a large measure of freedom.

English history would have been very different if Dr. Fisher instead of Stephen Langton had been Archbishop of Canterbury during the reign of King John. And no doubt our pathetic clergy would have bleated that the action which Langton took and the document which he was mainly instrumental in drafting was "not constructive." Sir Arthur Bryant has described every clause in it as being negative, but it remains a fact that Magna Carta and the continuous authority which the Church in subsequent centuries expressed in the same vein, gave rise to the Common Law and that ordered freedom which hitherto have been the pride of England and the envy of others. What the Medieval churchmen realised was that the natural order in which we live our material lives is part of God's Reality and is the essential medium of the spiritual. They realised that this natural order is governed by a Moral Law, to which all man-made associations must conform. Only by remaining within the bounds of this Moral Law can human beings in society be constructive and creative; these are the conditions which generate morale and a spiritual life. Social laws which contravene the Moral Law produce exactly the opposite effects—de-moralisation in everything.

### CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, N.W.1.

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.

The central feature of the Moral Law as it affects order in society and the relation of the individual to the group is that it enjoins freedom of association (not freedom *in* association). It is axiomatic, therefore, that monopolies of any description, just because they are in their nature destructive of freedom of association, are gross infringements of the Moral Law. The Moral Law is part of Reality, which God created. It follows that anyone who breaks the Moral Law is breaking the first Commandment. How can you love God with all your mind if you deliberately break His Law?

We publish in this issue an article by Mr. George Winder on Communism in the Church, in which reference is made to the presence among the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers of the editor of that paper which carries the title of the Church over which Dr. Fisher presides. Only a few months ago Dr. Fisher sent a special message of encouragement to the *Church of England Newspaper*. Writing on January 21, in reference to Mrs. Knight's broadcasts the editor says: "the hysterical fuss was quite uncalled for . . . the B.B.C., the Press and education—in fact all the most influential means of mass communication—are Christian monopolies." So here we have official Church of England "Christianity" at one moment urging the nation to keep the first Commandment and God's Laws while at the same time its spokesmen, including Dr. Fisher, are treating it with contumacy. It is not without significance that on the front page of the same issue of *The Church of England Newspaper* is an article urging freedom *in* association. The article deals with the attitude of Local Authorities to tenants in their Council Houses. For the protection of other tenants in the same block of houses, for the protection of subsequent tenants and for the protection of ratepayers, Local Councils quite understandably have rules. The article is an argument against Councils being allowed to make rules. The true answer to this question is not freedom *in* association, but freedom *of* association: that private builders should have equal facilities with Local Authorities to build houses, so that if a family does not like the form of association in Council Houses there are practical alternative forms of association by which they can rent a house. If the rules of Council House tenancy are really not in conformity with sufficient people's liking they would then soon be amended, because otherwise tenants would go elsewhere.

If the Bishop of Sheffield, from whose lecture we quote, and those connected with *The Church Quarterly Review* (we notice the name of the Bishop of Exeter on the Consultative Committee) are to be successful in bringing about a return to genuine Christianity in this country they will have to build their policy on REALITY—on ascertained truth concerning the natural order of society. The perverted Christianity which is now streaming from the Church of England leads straight to Communism. They might lessen their labours considerably if they took their fellow bishops, as well as the Archbishops, on one side and made an attempt to persuade them that by supporting policies in the name of Christianity which are direct contraventions of God's Law they seem likely to be booking for themselves when they leave this life a particularly warm corner in Hell. It may well be that shock tactics of this kind are now the only hope of getting Christianity predominant in the Church of England. It does seem that ordinary forms of advocacy and

rational argument now no longer affect men's minds. Another journal has referred to the superabundant evidence of the existence of a Law of Compensation, which for the most part inflicts its punishments collectively in this world. You cannot be a Christian or for that matter merely a realist observing that each person is given an individual will of his own, and not believe that somewhere each individual account is squared. The greater the power, the greater the responsibility, the greater the crime—and the greater the purgatory that is coming. Christ did not ask for forgiveness for the High Priests and Pharisees.

### The Bishop of Sheffield and a Christian View of Society

There is published in the *Church Quarterly Review* for January, 1955, the Dean Starr lecture given by the Rt. Rev. L. S. Hunter, Bishop of Sheffield, at Trinity College, Toronto, last September. This address constitutes the first dawning of a realistic appreciation of our plight and the Church's relation to it that we have seen from a dignitary of the Church of England. The address admits the failure of the Church in Christendom, and we are glad to see that the editorial is devoted to the urgency and importance of what the Bishop has to say. This appreciation is indeed late in coming; and we certainly do not agree with the Bishop in thinking that the Church has another thirty years to wake up before it is "God help England!" One has only to consider the immense deterioration over the last thirty years, and the increased momentum of it, to see that if the Church has not brought about a change long before another thirty years are up, the situation will be beyond repair.

"As I read the contemporary situation in England," says Dr. Hunter, "if I may start from there, the issue which the Church of England has to face is whether it can become effectually the Church of the English people, imparting to statesman, industrialist, trade unionist, artist, educationist, scientist and journalist, to V.I.P. and ordinary folk, a working creed, a philosophy of life, a faith that makes the climate of thought and provides the spiritual dynamic without which a democracy cannot function well. If English Churchmen took their heads out of the sand and were willing to make their Church effectually the Church of the English people, they would be empowered by the grace of the Holy Spirit. For we still have the status and hold some of the keys. . . ."

"In England, the alternative to the Church of England becoming the Church of the English people and being, therefore, the spearhead of the revival of an operative and full Christian faith among them, is the spread of scientific humanism and of its political and economic counterpart, namely communism in some form or other. . . ."

"The psychological effects of mass production have become endemic in society; and propaganda and advertising have made people very suggestible. The sensationalism of press, film, and of much recreation have become their normal diet. The triumphs of science and technology—the brilliant achievement of making American deserts blossom as the rose—coupled with modern trends in education make people receptive to scientific humanism and disposed to dismiss historical Christianity as no longer credible. . . ."

"Our anxiety should not be because some people be-

come attached to semi-idealistic fraternities, or to political associations, but because so many, except for their family ties—and these get untied all too easily—are only interested in making money and in the things which modern techniques bring within their purchasing power. A limited life in which the love of God and the sense of social responsibility and moral obligation grow weak.

“All this presents the Christian Church with a baffling problem for which there is no historical precedent. It is not surprising, therefore, that many clergy oscillate between escapism and defeatism according to their gifts, temperament and brand of theology. Neither state of mind produces the hopeful dynamic and the sure strategy of a Church militant.”

Defending the idea of a national and established Church the bishop said: “the relationship, as I have already said, both expresses the partnership, the two-way traffic, the interplay between sacred and secular, spiritual and matter, and also strengthens it. ‘The natural is the basis and instrument of the supernatural,’ a recent writer in *The Times* has said, ‘and in experience the two do not subsist apart. Men have thought of the natural as the enemy of the supernatural when it is only its essential medium; anything in the natural that is in fact hostile to the supernatural is but a perversion of the supernatural itself.’ Anglican theology and liturgy have expressed the truth of that inter-action well, and more realistically than any of the reformed churches, and more spiritually than the Roman Church whose witness is corrupted by its unrepentant desire for political power. It also provides the key to the right relationship of Church and State and finds the prototype for this in their relationship in Israel.

“The truth, I would suggest, is that Christians have to hold in tension, or to find a more complete synthesis between, the two citizenships of Caesar and of Christ. Both are of divine ordering. Both have their function in the will of God for the whole salvation of man. If they are not complementary and co-operative a man’s life becomes schizophrenic. . . . Churchmen ought to resist every pressure which would limit the work of the Church to preparing men for a narrowly spiritual life in this world and the next, whether the pressure is exercised by communism, capitalism, pietism or the omniscient state.

“From outside there are dangerous political pressures today, operating on both sides of the Iron Curtain, which would make men afraid openly to speak the truth on the broad issues of social life for fear of being misrepresented and reviled. This is a growing threat both to democracy and culture and to the Church. The Church is more strongly and securely placed to resist it than any secular body, for it is empowered to denounce the temptation to quench freedom of thought and of prophesying as a sin against the Spirit of Truth and Love.”

## Communism in the Church of England

by GEORGE WINDER.

The Annual Conference of the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers was held some time ago at the Friends’ Meeting House, Euston Road, London. This Society is not affiliated to the Labour Party, and must not be confused with the affiliated Socialist Christian League.

Among those who took part in the Conference were the Rev. C. O. Rhodes, Editor of *The Church of England Newspaper*, and the Rev. John Drewitt, of the Church Missionary Society’s headquarters. It is possible that these gentlemen do not know the real aims of the organisation they addressed. A study of its literature should, however, enlighten them.

The history of the Society is as follows. At the beginning of the last war a group of Clergymen, the majority of whom were members of the Church of England, organised themselves into a body named The Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership.

The true nature of this organisation is revealed in a number of booklets it issued under the title of “Magnificat Publications.” One of these—*Christians in the Class Struggle*—is particularly significant. It does not openly deny the existence of God, but it plainly attempts to indoctrinate the materialistic conception of history, which it describes as the “scientific interpretation.”

It also states: “Is it not obvious that, if we are to have Socialism,—real and permanent Socialism,—all the fundamental opposition must be liquidated, (*i.e.*, rendered politically inactive by disfranchisement and, if necessary, imprisonment)?” It furthermore tells us: “In the period of transition, when the workers are striving to establish common ownership, they must be led and organised by a single party which tolerates the existence of no other party fundamentally opposed to it.”

Whatever the Council of Clergy and Ministers stands for it can be seen from this that it was certainly not Christianity. This pamphlet contains a foreword by the then Bishop of Bradford.

Since the war ended, this Council for Common Ownership has been reorganised, and has changed its name to the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers, and the Bishop of Bradford seems to be no longer associated with it. This has not, however, affected the publication of “Magnificat” booklets, and their nature has in no way changed. Last year, a neat booklet, bearing a portrait of Stalin on its cover, reproduced an address given by the Rev. Stanley Evans, M.A. The Rev. Stanley Evans, who is described as a “licensed preacher, Church of England,” spoke at a Memorial Service for the Communist leader, held at the Church of St. George, Queen Square, London.

This booklet is nothing but a fulsome eulogy of Stalin and Russia. The following is a typical quotation:

“Working people who have seen in him the leader of their historic struggle for emancipation; Asiatic people who have seen in him their greatest and most powerful friend; colonial peoples who have seen in him the lode-star of their liberation; honest men and women of every class and every philosophy who have seen in him an outstanding leader in the struggle for world peace in which we are now engaged,—these, too, have mourned.”

It also quotes the “Report of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility” as follows: “The importance of Russia lies not merely in the vast population and resources governed by the Soviet, but also in the fact that, under the forms and methods of Communism, a regime has been created in which the rights and needs of the common man are prior to the rights of property. The extent of this achievement, not only in the economic

but also in the social and cultural spheres, can hardly be exaggerated."

But perhaps these Clergy and Ministers can be forgiven a certain amount of blind emotionalism at the death of Stalin. What is less understandable is the following resolution, which they passed during the Korean War:

"The Executive Committee of the Society of Socialist Clergy and Ministers, having heard first-hand evidence of the use of bacterial methods of warfare in China and Korea by the American Air Force, acting in the name of the United Nations, expresses its strongest possible condemnation and utter abhorrence of such bestial practices, which are an affront to Christianity. It demands that the British Government denounces this activity forthwith, and initiates action within the United Nations to dissociate the member States from this crime, and for the punishment of the war criminals responsible."

As no Christian believes the accusations contained in this resolution, I think it is a fair inference that it was passed either by Communists or philo-Communists. Or were they only dupes?

I have copied this resolution from a small newspaper named *Religion and the People*, of which the aforementioned Rev. Stanley Evans is the manager. In the name of Christianity it disseminates the Communist party line. Mr. Evans is a Vice-President of the Society. One can almost guess from the foregoing who the President is. Yes, it is the Very Reverend Hewlett Johnson, Dean of Canterbury.

How large the Society is I do not know, but the Conference at the Friends' Meeting House suggests that its influence is of no mean order. Sometimes dry rot can spread before the edifice collapses.

Dr. Bell, the Bishop of Chichester, speaking of Canterbury Cathedral once said: "The Dean and Chapter are the guardians not only of the Cathedral but of the Faith from which the Cathedral sprang."

Were it not well for the Church of England to take its guardianship seriously?

### Correspondence

FROM A CLERGYMAN.

Dear Sir,

I received your circular letter and a copy of *Voice* in the middle of last year, since when it has been much studied and thought over.

Independently I have for many years been championing Christian Freedom, and like John the Baptist been a voice crying in the wilderness. Having been outspoken on many topics and not frightened of proclaiming the truth, but what has been the response—a frigid silence.

I have been conscious for many years that the world is in a horrible mess, and no attempts are being made to clear up the chaos. On the very highest level there appears to be nothing but talk—talk—talk, but no concerted action. The words of the Psalmist come to mind: "Why do the Heathen so furiously rage together, and why do the people imagine a vain thing." There is also the truth in the Old Testament: "there is no peace for the wicked."

The unauthentic story is told of the newly ordained young curate who was called upon to take a service in a

lunatic asylum. In the middle of his sermon he threw out his arms and asked the vital question, "Why are we all here?" A member of the congregation gave him the wise answer, "Because we are not all there." As many a true word is spoken in jest, I would ask the question, "when is the world going to be certified?" The present lunacy in international politics and our own "democratic" government is deplorable.

The Church is not blind to the situation but especially the Anglican Church is too much in legal bonds, and Her Authority belittled. If there is to be any solution it must be by reformed and revolutionised government.

I know that working to a logical conclusion the answer to both international and national government is not any form of improved democratism, but a theocracy.

However, I am with you in your aims, and striving towards the same goal, but even more so—an increasing integrity force recognising The Power and Authority alone of God.

Yours sincerely,

### FROM THE REPLY.

"... a frigid silence": as fellow sufferers for many years we sympathise. Our own view is that the solution is to be found in chapter XVII of St. John—see *Voice*, No. 16, "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 general public is unable to *understand*; but it is impressed by unity, and can judge by results. This is one explanation of a frigid silence to a *single* voice. But the public sees the Church on important matters speak with a babel of voices. Instinctively it knows that it cannot be authoritative. It follows conclusively to our minds that the primary and prior objective is to get the main body of the Church to speak insistently with *one* voice on Authority in society.

"We are quite certain that theocratic government is not the answer, simply because, no matter how genuine may be the original intentions, where one 'body' claims to be the "authority" and at the same time exercises the power, the *tendency*, which over a period of time is always present and operative, of power to corrupt is unchecked—there is no independent body dedicated, not to exercise power, but to express the truth to check it. Furthermore even the dualistic concept is incorrect—Power will come to ignore Authority unless there is a third division of society. The Christian conception of society is trinitarian, where (1) the Executive and Administration governs by consent of (2) the electorate, which is empowered to withhold supply, and both Administration and electorate, by belief *and* experience, recognise in (3) the Church the voice of Authority on the Moral Law. When the Church fails to express Authority, the Administration, through party caucuses, propaganda and control of education is able to gain almost complete mental and psychological mastery of the electorate. In our day this has happened through the machinations of a power, hidden from the understanding of the public, a power behind and above governments, the Power of Centralised Finance with an absolute monopoly of credit creation."