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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 5. Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper. Postage: home 1½d. abroad 1d. SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1954. 6d. Fortnightly.

VOICE

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

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 Archbishop of York and Communism

It was said by one whom we should consider one of the greatest teachers of this Age and possibly the greatest contemporary with our own lives that Christianity is either part of the warp and woof of the Universe or it is just another set of interesting opinions. We think it probable that when William Temple said that Christianity is "the most materialistic religion in the world" he had the same idea in mind. He did not, of course, refer to materialism in the Communist sense. He could only have referred to the Christian conceptions of Spirit and Word. The modern Christian is always ready to concede, and to proclaim that our corporeal existence on earth is, however imperfect an incarnation, a materialisation of the Spirit. But when it comes to the Word, *its* materialisation seems to be beyond his understanding, and even beyond his attention.

This is all the more surprising because he has constantly before his eyes the marvels which have ensued from the work of practical men who have given their attention with humility to the study of purely material things, discovering therein Law. In doing so they have revealed God's bounty.

When, therefore, the would-be-Christian daily offers up the prayer: "Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven" it is surprising that he cannot discover the humility to seek Law in other realms than the material. Why is this so?

Protestantism, said the Archbishop of York last year, "asserts the doctrine that justification is by faith and not by works". We are not concerned with *what it is* that "asserts" the source of justification. A "protestant" archbishop is speaking and he at once proceeds to assert that the Church of England is at once Catholic *and* Protestant. We do not charge the Church of England with lack of faith, but we do so emphatically of a lack of works. No one can accuse the Communists of a lack of works, however evil these works may be. The Communists in this country and their much more numerous fellow-travellers are busy implementing their principles in the political and economic fields.*

In his book published two years ago under the title *In An Age Of Revolution* the Archbishop of York says: "It is possible for a man to be both a Communist and a Christian." This extraordinary statement, coming from such an eminent source, reveals in few words the tragic, and quite possibly disastrous, attitude of mind of nearly every incumbent of the Established Church. It is tantamount to saying that there is no Law inherent in social relationships, in economic arrangements or in the manner in which people associate for any purpose whatever. Any society is free to invent its own principles and rules, whatever harm may result. So long as you believe in God and "act as a Christian" you are obeying God and are a Christian. If evil results *from the nature* of the structure, although you supported the policy which resulted in the structure, or even were one of the architects yourself, you are not sinning. This attitude is a denial of Law in the Universe, or vital part of the Universe; it is a denial of Authority. It is the attitude of mind of all but a small minority of the clergy of the Church of England today. It is even the attitude of mind of those groups in the Church of England which have deliberately formed groups to study and counteract Communism. These are unable to equate Divine Law with Natural Law in the Universe which St. Thomas Aquinas saw as "the mind and will of God." They have departed from acknowledgment of that Reality which is God's Universe; and in doing so have laid society open to the menace of unbridled Power—Power unchecked by Authority.

How comes it that men who deny Reality, whence comes Authority, in the form of Law are archbishops, men whose sincerity of belief no one doubts?

It is an extraordinary thing that in a pamphlet issued by the Press and Publications Board of The Church Assembly on *The Meaning Of Establishment* there is no mention that Church dignitaries are appointed by the State. From the time of the famous King of the English who wrote "to his faithful monks of the Church of Winchester, greeting: I order you to hold a free election, but nevertheless I forbid you to elect anyone except Richard my clerk, the arch-

* "If our quotation from the words of the Archbishop reflects the intention of dissociating Faith and Works to the extent of excusing all that men may do in the state of society, we shall not be alone in pointing out that while there may be something distinctively 'protestant' about the literalism habitual in some quarters touching the doctrine involved, this favourite phrase of St. Paul, "through faith", belongs to a metaphysics (or theology) common to the whole Catholic Church, reformed or otherwise. But it concerns not by any means absolution for any sin of omission, but is a reiterated assertion that it is the Faith that *'worketh'*. Even the 'Protestant' "Cruden's Concordance" emphasises the generally accepted meaning as referring *not* to anything formal "as if it were . . . . the meritorious cause of our justification", but as something "instrumental". It is the Faith *through* which, as well as *by* which, things are *done*, life lived. To *all* who hold this common faith we look for help.

We must insist that we have no part in theological controversy but are holding up for inspection the effect of the—faith?—works?—as it may be!—of contemporary Churchmen.

deacon of Poitiers", Power has always sought to have a hand on the representatives of Authority. Since the Establishment this has been put on a legal footing, with ample sanctions. Bishops are now appointed by the State. As a correspondent writes: "In theory they are elected by the Chapter of the Cathedral where the See is vacant, but the members of the Chapter are expected to elect the one named in the letter missive from the Crown. If that nominee of the Crown is not elected, the law provides for what happens to the members of the Chapter who voted against him. Each one is to be seized by the Officers of the State, and all his goods are forfeit, he is imprisoned for life and his right hand is cut off." In other words the bishops are appointed coercively with the Prime Minister, although it is a form of power which no representative of the State should be able to wield.

The only way that power can be used in this world without corruption or harm is in accordance with Law. As Lord Acton said, all power tends to corrupt. If Power is not to corrupt society irremediably as well as those who wield it, there must exist in society an *independent* body, seeking, not power, but authority; not exercising power, but *seeking* authority and free to express it when they find it.

That was the conception underlying the Christian Church, the Mystical Body of Christ. When such a body seeks to obtain and exercise power it attracts to itself members, who, consciously or unconsciously, also seek power, and will quite naturally gravitate to the top. It must be asked: what is the purpose of a body seeking to discover and to express Authority if it is not to check the use of Power in accordance with Authority? Is it the idea that the State, the Power, in selecting the chief ministers of the Church does not turn away from such members of the Church, however able, as have shown a disposition to express Authority in such a way that it would seriously restrain Power? Could any notion be more childish?

How are those whose duty it is to express Authority to check, restrain and guide the use of power so that it is not contrary to Authority? It can only do so effectively by advising those who have power and a responsibility to use it, to use it in a way which is in accordance with Authority. We have been accused by someone who has had ample opportunity to know better that we are attempting "to concentrate and centralise power in the form of a political sanction."

The Christian Campaign For Freedom is an extension of the function of *VOICE* and is guided by *VOICE*. One major function of *VOICE* is to induce recognition of the fundamental distinction between Power and Authority, and the major function of the Campaign is to place an instrument in the hands of each individual elector, who has both power and a responsibility to use it, an instrument which, if he uses it, enables him to use *his* power, not to give his power to those organising the Campaign who do not seek it, but to use it in a way which is in accordance with Law. Far from being centralisation of power, that is decentralised use of power by each individual elector in accordance with *his* policy.

While archbishops and deans are mortal, the Church is permanent and we look forward to a time when Christianity does not contend *inside* the Church with Communism and Freemasonry but can resume its militant mission.

It may be asked what has all this to do with the Archbishop of York? The answer is that the Archbishop, while supporting socialism under the name of the Welfare State, is yet able to see clearly the evils which result from it and is much to the fore in saying so publicly. We shall quote from the Archbishop's book, *The Church of England Today,* published in 1953:

"It (the Welfare State) is one of the greatest, and we hope one of the most beneficial, social experiments ever made in the history of the human race. But it has brought with it moral dangers. The citizen comes more and more to rely on the State to provide all his needs. Responsibilities to their children which once were the duty of the parents are now taken over by the State. The boon of social security has been gained by the decay of social obligation.

"The weakening of personal responsibility has been hastened by central planning and industrial organisation. . . .

"In our own country the value of the individual is held by all, but there is a danger that it may be lost in practice. Gradually, and at times almost imperceptibly, the individual citizen is losing his freedom and responsibility . . . it is a bye-product of the Welfare State and over-centralised planning. . . .

" . . . the total effect, the unintended result, is to take responsibility and incentive from individuals who soon feel that they are impotent in a mass-organised society which provides for their livelihood, arranges their work, and caters for their amusement. . . . The result is dangerous, for the individual loses the power of independent judgment. .

"We are drifting towards the formation of a mass society in which the individual becomes merged. We have no reason to hope that we shall escape from the fate of the nations which have come under totalitarian rule, because we reject and denounce it. We have no reason to believe that our Statesmen will save us from this fate, for they also are in the grip of a powerful machine which they have set in motion and find that they are no longer able to control it. We shall only be saved from the degradation of totalitarianism if man's faith in himself and his sense of responsibility are restored. . . "

We should like to say to the Archbishop that natural faculties which are God given, atrophy if they are not used. If the individual's power and freedom are taken from him his faith in himself atrophies; if his responsibility is taken from him his sense of responsibilty atrophies from lack of use, as also does his judgment.

The Archbishop's answer to all this is that these virtues and faculties can be restored by "Christianity", which "can do this by renewing in man the knowledge of his true nature and making him realise his responsibilities both to God and his fellow men." He will not be quickly or certainly brought to such a realisation by misapplication of the doctrine of justification by faith! The Archbishop is leading millions of human beings who place trust in him, to forsake those works, which through faith, can lead to their salvation.

"Men", says the Archbishop, "like Charles Gore, Scott-Holland and William Temple have taught churchmen to be more alive to social and political responsibilities, and to repudiate the monstrous claim that politics and economics are exempt from judgment by Christian standards.

"But the Church has a more important task to fulfil. . . ." Has it?

The judgment of legislation by Christian standards is urgently needed. He has received a letter which opens: "The Christian Campaign For Freedom has been inaugurated because a large number of laymen recognise the imperative necessity of referring all legislation to the judgment of Authority." We ask him to think about it.

He will find in the Pledge form issued by the Campaign liberties concretely formulated all of which were virtually legally in the possession of citizens of this country at the beginning of this century. They have disappeared one by one, and the process by which they have gone will remove others unless something is done to reverse the process. To reverse any process, power has to be used, but it has to be used correctly—in accordance with Authority. It is the business of the Church to reflect Authority; and by Church we mean not sectarian religion, but The Church which by common consent *exists* even in the absence of common agreement concerning its identification. We are presenting the electorate with a means for the correct use of their power. It is for the Church, either independently or in collaboration with the Campaign to indicate to the electorate what the correct use of that power is. Authority which does not guide the use of Power is ineffective Authority.

The Archbishop of York says that: "a church is largely judged by the way in which it pronounces judgment on popular sins." The sin which is begetting most of the evils of our time is irresponsible voting encouraged by mass and lying propaganda. Let the Church denounce *this* sin.

J.M.

"It Must be Quietly Done"

Some Grounds for the Demand for Freedom From State Education

by Tudor Jones, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

On March 5, 1907, the then Prime Minister, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, "the last 'Gentleman' in British politics", received a deputation introduced by a Mr. Lehmann from The Royal Anthropological Institute, The Sociological Society, The Royal College of Surgeons of England, The Royal Society of Edinburgh, The British Science Guild and the Royal Statistical Society asking for a National Anthropometric Survey at an estimated cost to the taxpayer of £4,000 to £5,000.

The Institute's Journal contains a verbatim report of the speeches made by the learned gentlemen in support of their plea and the Prime Minister in reply to them.

He said this:—

"When you undertake to apply this sort of examination to adults and to the children of parents, you have to carry both the adults and the parents with you; and if you are supposed to be going too fast, or interfering too much, I can conceive that this thing would be rather set back than set forward. . . We must walk somewhat warily, because the least idea getting about that we are taking advantage of the children of the public schools to be made a plaything or an experiment upon, would be very fatal. Therefore it must be quietly done."

One wonders what the cautious Prime Minister might have said if Mr. Lehmann had asked not for a paltry £5,000 but for enough, however much that may be, to finance a modern scheme of mass inquisition. One wonders what the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's reaction might have been had he been told that the school children and university students of the country were to be mass-radiographed, that those who declined to submit themselves to this examination would be docked of their grants from the public exchequer, and that those who were shown to be a bad 'risk' economically would be denied entrance upon courses on the ground either that they were unlikely to complete a course of higher education or that, if they did, they would not live long enough to yield the standard rate of profit to the State on the outlay expended. A single mass-radiology 'unit' costs approximately £3,500 for electrical equipment which is additional to the cost of the motor vehicle housing it. This is a specially constructed quality production. There are between seventy and eighty units at work in the country. Each consumes film for 50,000 pictures a year and engages a permanent staff of one Director, one Radiologist, one Assistant Radiologist, one dark-room technician and four clerks.

These figures are not official, and the apportionment of service between educational institutions and factories is not represented at all. Official figures, as presented to the taxpayer, are not so constructed as to assist him greatly in assessing what he pays for specific 'services.' And, indeed, the point I am making is not that a financial outlay refused in 1907 is sanctioned many times over in 1954, but that the wariness of politicians a generation ago envisaged a resistance to 'experiment', 'interfering too much' with parental rights, and being made into 'playthings' in the face of which it would have been dangerous to fly; that what 'must be quietly done' has been quietly done, and so successfully that not one in a thousand even knows what it is.

There is no evidence that the objective has changed, and in regard to that there is only one word in the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman's admirable disclosure that needs correction—there is nothing *playful* about the procedure. The child is envisaged not in any sense as anything which lives, or can live, to the glory of God, but as something which *may* live to satisfy the needs of legislators, as 'capital' capable of yielding a carefully regulated profit, as a form of property, not, certainly, the property of parents, still less the property of himself, but property, mass property, of an abstraction called 'the State'. There are sturdy sentimentalists (if a sentimentalist can be called sturdy) who say: "Oh, not the State—the Community!" They deceive themselves and often others as well. The 'Community', alas, is still another abstraction, far more remote and quite powerless. It is in 'the State' that power is vested, not in the Community. The Community merely suffers what is done to it by the State, *i.e.*, by the Government; but this it suffers, not in its abstraction but in the actual persons of the individuals composing it. Once it is grasped that 'State' Education is education conducted by the Government for the Government, in furtherance of governmental policy, whatever that policy may be, a reorientation of the mind is effected which establishes the conditions necessary to gain some understanding of what modern education means and is. This is a beginning. The late Sir D'Arcy Thompson, a man of wide range and vast experience of teaching, said shortly before he died that "Democracy does not understand education".

"Democracy", in the sense it is there used, is the creature of education, created by education and sustained in such convictions as it possesses by education. By education, the creature becomes as nearly as possible, and in every generation more nearly, what its creator desires, a servant whose aims and purposes ever more closely approximate to those of the creator, until, in an ideal condition, master and servant become of one mind concerning all matters touching the interests of the master. It is only so that the illusion has been created that the State, the Government, and the community, the people, have a common objective, that they work together for a common end, that the Government, the State, is a mere mechanism by which each in Society obtains all that is possible that he desires having regard to the variability and conflict of individual needs. Palpably it is not so. The Government, the State *rules*, and the community, the people, *are ruled*.

It is not to be wondered at that the arrangement works so well for 'the State' and so badly, and progressively so, for the people. What more diabolical ingenuity could there be than such as can contrive that the preparation of the subject should be wholly in the hands of the ruler. It is as though the race of mice should consider themselves fortunate that they are reared exclusively by cats, who even rendered themselves invisible as a modest part of the 'service.' Certainly, democracy does not understand education!

One of the 'victories' upon which democracy congratulates itself is in the substitution of 'useful' knowledge in the curriculum for the 'useless rubbish' of past generations. Certainly, the acquisition of knowledge is difficult at all times, and occupies much energy and time. It is well that what we can learn should be useful. But, we would ask, Useful to whom? In the old days there was what was called 'liberal' education, which was *not* 'useful', and so it has been largely discarded after serving as propaganda for an extension of the Power of the State. The notion goes back very far in history; the *word* (which borrows nothing from the now defunct 'Liberal' Party) goes back at least to Cicero, who used it to describe what he deemed the training proper to a Roman citizen. He said such a citizen was 'free', a freeman, not a slave, and that it was becoming that he should be reared in youth in a manner according to his status as a freeman, not as a slave, or, as he said, *liberaliter*, liberally, in preparation for the life of freedom and responsibility he would live as an adult. We need not waste time discussing to what extent the Roman citizen was free and responsible: the point lies in the intention. The intention now is different, indeed opposite.

But good traditions of the kind mentioned die hard. How long the tradition of 'liberal' education (true education) lived in England it would not be easy to say. Unquestionably it began to die long before the dawn of the nineteenth century, possibly because of some of the more obscure effects of the Reformation and the rise of Puritanism. More certainly, something of its spirit was still living in the much maligned great 'Public' schools of this country at the time of the passing of the last Education Act (the 'Butler Act', a Socialist measure passed by a "National" House of Commons, in which there was a "Conservative" majority. It put the last touches to totalitarianism in education). The 'subject' which is considered to be most adaptable to perversion by Statists is History. This is again an illusion. But take History. Five years ago a Public School boy might still reveal some understanding of history as 'crystallised policy.' We were amazed to hear what one had to say, conversationally, about Sulla, after listening with impatience to the political propaganda regurgitated as 'history' by some scholarship boys from lesser schools. "What would your History Master have to say about that remark?" "It was he who made it. He says a lot of good things from time to time." There you have it: freedom *and* judgment—and a certain free and spontaneous exploration under the surface of things. Present day examiners don't like it. They give low marks for it. The State pays them, the State directly or indirectly selects them, the State knows why it does so.

To see the beginnings of the iniquitous system, the first lessons in the fraud, you have to go back to the elementary schools. By spreading a scraping of jam on various samples, the little fellow is by an unconscious process induced to recognise different kinds of bread. To learn the different kinds of bread would be too dull—and, besides, the little fellow would know then what he was doing, and would ask why he was doing it. Suddenly a test, an examination, is sprung upon him. Much to his surprise, he can answer most of the questions. He has 'done very well in Bread'. Later, of course, he is told why Bread is important—the manufacture of bread provides work for the bakers. We import a lot of wheat to give to bakers to make bread, and so we have to export a lot of baking machinery, *etc., etc.*

The phrase *Alma mater* applied to colleges is out of date. It means properly, nourishing-mother (foster-mother). *Nourishment* is for the individual himself. It is he who is nourished. Mothers who eat their offspring are reprobated. Thus the world of technological functionalism is demonstrated to him—in everything but its meaning and its motives. An Englishman, always touchy on the subject, still does not believe in the ascription of motives. Motives are nevertheless what move things, and it would not do for even the big fellow, let alone the little fellow, to see that what moves the claws is THE CAT. Year by year, the candidates multiply. The certificates multiply. The jobs multiply, each only obtainable if the 'right' certificate is forthcoming. And invisibly, but perfectly understood by the hierarchy of functionaries concerned (who are playing the game), on every certificate are the words: "This boy (man) knows sufficiently what *you* require him to know, for your purposes, but not for his own; and every precaution has been taken to secure that he does not know this, and that he would not believe you if you told him that it was so."

The State, it has been said, has neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned. Men have both. The kicking and the damnation can, if at all, be prevented by access to Truth. That access to Truth is some system of education. To function at all, such a system must be out of reach of the State to pervert or corrupt: out of reach of Power to corrupt: out of reach of the State to turn to its own uses, of the Government to turn to its own uses: *ultra vires, i.e.* beyond Power. The right to contract out of a system of training (conditioning) corrupted from the start by political Power may not go far to liberating men from a rule already supported by every device imaginable. It is, nevertheless a right, and it is right that men should claim it.

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