

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 7.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 17, 1954.

6d. Formightly.

## 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.

### Freedom—Will the Church Leaders Speak?

This journal is not published for entertainment; and if it is written for instruction it is for the sole end of getting those who read it to do something about a grave situation. We have been told (not by anyone who is doing anything) that our articles are "too forceful" Our reply is that if we come under sustained criticism from responsibly-minded people that we are not forceful we will make way for someone else.

It has been asked whether our attitude to bishops and the clergy is not presumptuous. Our reply is that we have an *unqualified* respect for only one thing in this world, and that is Authority. We have had great respect for illiterate men, men who were shepherds, not because they were illiterate, but because in their particular calling they had taken trouble to seek the realities of good shepherding; and, having sought and found the realities, mastered an understanding of them; and having mastered an understanding of them, painstakingly practised the principles revealed. Within the limits of their calling, and restraining themselves to those limits, such men sought and reflected Authority.

Bishops have a higher calling and greater capacities. But in so far as they fail to seek and reflect Authority as an active working principle our respect for them is diminished.

Addressing a congregation of fifteen thousand people on West Ham Football ground, the Bishop of Croydon is reported as follows:—

"There are a great number of clueless, apathetic pagans who have no answer to the passionate atheistic materialism of today. . . .

"There were those who said religion and politics ought not to walk hand in hand, and there were those who tried to crowd Christ out of international affairs, with the result that we wobble from crisis to crisis, and from war to war.

"We live in dangerous days, but the real danger to Britain is not merely, or primarily the people with no Faith. Rather it is the people with a limited Faith in a limited Christ. That is the real danger.

"There are people who go so far with religion but not far enough, who are good but not good enough."

Whether we are thought to be presumptuous or not, we shall say that *so far as that statement goes* it is a true statement and an important one; and we say so precisely because there are so few prelates or clergy who publicly say anything like it. But the statement will have little merit unless the Bishop indicates *how* religion should go hand in hand with politics; unless he advises those who constitutionally control policy (the electors) what *is* a Christian policy and what is not, why it is so, and what they should do about it.

In these pages we have quoted the Archbishop of York as saying that in this country "the individual citizen is losing his freedom and responsibility", the Bishop of London as saying "freedom is a fundamental postulate of the Gospels", the Bishop of Chichester as saying that the Church "has a duty to stand for a measure of independence and to witness to an Authority higher than the State". Furthermore we have shown the historical evidence that the bulwarks of individual freedom which were painstakingly established in the Constitution and the Common Law of this land were the result of the Church bringing Christianity into politics and expressing Authority, and consequently being recognised by government and people alike as representatives of Authority. We now have the Bishop of Croydon saying that religion should go hand in hand with politics. The conclusion is inescapable that the Church should guide the people in supporting or rejecting policies according to whether they increase or destroy freedom.

What is the Church going to do about it? We look to the Church. And we urge our readers to look to the Church, and to keep on asking the Bishops and clergy why it is that they are willing publicly to admit the evils that are resulting from present policies, and yet, while admitting that religion should go hand in hand with politics and that the Church should witness to a higher Authority, they in fact do nothing to advise the electors who constitutionally control policy what they should do in this situation.

We do not share the view of some people that we have plenty of time. If our work needs to be done with care, there is still no time to waste. The power-lusters of this world are using not only the pagans, but the would-be-Christians, that numerous band of men and women who cannot relate Christianity to Reality. The final steps for setting up an all-powerful World Government, from which there will be no retreat, and from the dictates of which there will be no appeal, may be taken very quickly, and the plans are well advanced. The Archbishop of York, denying in practice that service which is perfect freedom, this week in his Diocesan Letter urges that rather than face the Devil's threat of total extinction by hydrogen bombs we should abandon national freedom, sovereignty, to safeguard which

so many millions of gallant lives have been sacrificed in our lifetime. We have a working model of an all-powerful world government in Russia. It is vested with such sanctions that the wishes of neither national governments nor peoples can prevail against it. It is a usurper, a usurper of the individual's freedom to choose, which is one of the fundamental postulates of the Christian Faith.

It might seem vain indeed to think that against this combination of evil forces there is any hope. The hope lies in the words of the Bishop of Croydon at West Ham: "I believe God will save this land through the few."

Expressing what he stated to be a minority opinion, the new Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, Dr. Knowles, is reported as saying in his opening address: "If he understood them aright, many churchmen were more interested in and hopeful of what Sir Winston Churchill had described as the creation of an authoritative all-powerful world order . . . the ultimate aim towards which we must strive. That ultimate aim had been the most placarded of political remedies, yet it had not quickened hope or lessened the feeling of frustration. Evidently it was not the plain man's Utopia nor his ultimate aim. To force the unwanted on men did not cure frustration but increased it. It would be difficult, even for the Church, to convince men that the supremacy of the sword was the ultimate aim of the Gospel.

"There was a large and steadily increasing number of men who profess and call themselves Christians, whose brief creed, of faith without works, was 'my religion is all done.' With them a Christian was a man who accepted their creed but need not have any interest or concern with the petition 'Thy will be done on earth.' Their Christian hope was that they would be taken to safety out of this world, not that they might be kept from, or be victorious over, the evil that was in the world. For helping forward the purpose of Him who came to save the world these had no message. . .

"So long as Christians were to be camp-followers, God could not find in us the people through whom He could establish His Kingdom. That Kingdom was in the hearts and minds of men but would become visible in the social conditions His men would make, as Christ in us became visible in the life we lived.

"These widely divergent interpretations of the Gospel message and the Christian way of life were the reason for the complaint that the Church had no effectual word of guidance for this frustrated generation. If the trumpet gave uncertain or contradictory sounds who could know what he should do?

"God has declared His way of life in plainest terms, has lived it among us in human flesh" said Dr. Knowles, "He has given us freedom to choose, but has also shut us in with the consequences of our choice. . . .

"It is my faith that God has not shut us in that He may destroy us, but that He may have mercy upon us if

thereby He can turn everyone of us away from our iniquities. The choice is still with us."

The choice is still with us. But we have to *make* the choice. We are losing freedoms; we can easily lose all freedom. It is of the nature of choice in the real world of which Dr. Knowles talks that it can only be made of specific things by the exercise of the power and responsibility that is ours. We invite Dr. Knowles to give a lead in these *practical* decisions. J.M.

### Harking Back (Only in Years)

"How many people in the country [U.S.A.] are in poverty? Is the number yearly growing larger? Are there each year more and more of the unskilled classes pursuing hopelessly the elusive phantom of self-support and independence? Are they, as in a dream, working faster, only the more swiftly to move backwards? Are there each year more and more hungry children and more and more fathers whose utmost effort may not bring into the home as much energy in food as it takes out in industry? These are not fanciful questions, nor are they sentimental ones. I have not the slightest doubt that there are in the United States ten million persons in precisely these conditions of poverty, but I am largely guessing, and there may be as many as fifteen or twenty millions!"

—Robert Hunter, "Poverty"; *circ.* 1900.

### HARKING BACK (ONLY IN YEARS)

"These things prove, beyond all dispute, that England was, in Catholic times, a real wealthy country; that wealth was generally diffused; that every part of the country abounded in men of solid property; and that, of course, there were always great resources at hand in case of emergency. . . In short, everything shows that England was then a country abounding in men of real wealth."

—William Cobbett, "History of the Protestant Reformation".

### HARKING BACK (ONLY IN YEARS)

"The King of England cannot alter the laws, or make new ones, without the express consent of the whole kingdom in Parliament assembled. Every inhabitant is at his liberty fully to use and enjoy whatever his farm produceth, the fruits of the earth, the increase of his flock and the like—all the improvements he makes, whether by his own proper industry or by those he retains in his service, are his own, to use and enjoy, without the let, interruption or denial of any. If he be in any wise injured or oppressed, he shall have his amends and satisfactions against the party offending. Hence it is that the inhabitants are rich in gold, silver and in all the necessaries and conveniences of life. They drink no water unless at certain times, upon a religious score, and by way of doing penance. They are fed in great abundance, with all sorts of flesh and fish, of which they have plenty everywhere; they are clothed throughout in good woollens, their bedding and other furniture in the house are of wool, and that in great store. They are also well provided with all sorts of household goods and necessary implements for husbandry. Everyone, according to his rank, hath all things which conduce to make mind and life easy and happy."

—Sir John Fortescue (Lord High Chancellor under Henry VI).

### CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

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

Funds for the Campaign are urgently needed.

## An Integrity Force

We quote below parts of some of the many outspoken comments which have been made in the Press on the scandal of Crichel Down.

In our view the outspokenness of these comments testifies to the existence in this country of at least a small, but influential body of people who are not willing to tolerate this sort of thing, otherwise the comments would not have been published. But in all the comments we have read we have not seen one mention of a practical remedy.

The Loyalty Pledge published by this paper does not cover the rights and liberties of the landowner, but we shall be very willing to insert a clause covering the freedom of this section of the community, as we will do for any other section.

There is only one remedy for this state of affairs, and that is by political action, not the political action of mobs or majorities (the powerlusters have not enfranchised the mob without a deliberate purpose). In the desperate position to which this country has been brought there is only one hope, and that is that a political minority can be bound back to Authority in their political actions, a minority which in the first place owns the claim of Authority by making freedom its objective. This is the postulate of Authority. But it is not enough that the *objective* should have authority, the action which is taken to secure it must also be bound back to Authority. This means the practice of the two principles of Integrity and Responsibility. Integrity—an absolute refusal to support any person, party or government until you have a legally binding contract that your objective will be implemented. Responsibility—that you will exercise your power as an elector when your integrity condition is met, and that you will make this public.

IT IS NOT ACCIDENTAL THAT THOSE WHO ACT POLITICALLY WITHOUT INTEGRITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TAKE AWAY FROM ANY BACK BENCH GROUP OF M.P.S, THE ONLY SANCTION THEY CAN HOLD AGAINST THE PARTY MACHINE AND GOVERNMENT. LARGE NUMBERS OF CONSTITUENCIES ARE HELD BY SMALL MAJORITIES. THE PRESENT GOVERNMENT IS DEPENDENT UPON A SMALL MINORITY IN PARLIAMENT. A SMALL MINORITY OF ELECTORS DETERMINED TO ACT ONLY WITH INTEGRITY AND RESPONSIBILITY; REFUSING ABSOLUTELY TO RESORT TO COMPROMISE OR EXPEDIENCY; DETERMINED TO UPHOLD AUTHORITY BECAUSE THEY PLACE GOD BEFORE EVIL CAN PUT SUCH POWER BEHIND A SMALL NUMBER OF M.P.'S THAT THEY CAN UPSET GOVERNMENT MAJORITIES; AND JUST BECAUSE THEY DO STAND FOR AUTHORITY, FOR AN IRREFUTABLY CORRECT PRINCIPLE, CAN BY THEIR ACTION BRING ABOUT AN IMMENSE EFFECT ON PUBLIC OPINION IN THIS COUNTRY.

Those who merely abstain from voting from apathy and indifference have no effect upon the position, neither do those who grumble, complain and protest but continue to vote for their party. Front Bench and Back Bench M.P.'s know that these people will do the same thing whatever they do. On the other hand the politician always thinks that he can sway the 'floating vote' by bribes and promises and propaganda without giving way on his main plan. The result is that rebellious Back Benchers who want to stop the rot have no sanction to fall back upon—their Party leaders

will always turn round and say "When the Election comes all these grumblers will support us in any case". A small Integrity Force, inflexibly bound back to Authority, composed of all the freedom minority groups in the country and resolutely backed by the remnant of true Christian leaders of the Churches can alter all this.

AT THE TIME OF NATIONAL PERIL WE ASK ALL THOSE WE CAN REACH TO CONSIDER CAREFULLY WHAT WE HAVE SAID AND TO STAND TOGETHER ON THE SOLID FOUNDATION THAT GOD HAS PROVIDED FOR US.

To those who believe in freedom we say: in the face of the diabolical threats of 'Atom War if you do not give up your national freedom' or of 'Communism-via-Socialism if you do not support the Conservatives', STAND FIRM, do not lose your nerve, keep your faith in God. And you can only do that by being true to Him in your actions:—

### Crichel Down

"Among the issues illuminated by Sir Andrew Clark's report on the Crichel Down scandal none has shocked some people more than the grip of the State on the private landowner.

"Stealthily, ruthlessly—and in the past fifteen years very rapidly—the State has equipped itself over this vast field with power so formidable that few with property now care to challenge their legality. At the same time few without property now trouble to question their morality.

"Late as it is, there seems a chance for Conservatives, once so prodigal with their charters, now to provide one more—reestablishing the fundamental rights of an Englishman on his land.

"It testifies to the hypnotic powers of our new masters that many intelligent people believe the public enquiry on land use is some guarantee that justice will be done. It is nothing of the kind. It is a caricature of justice—a hearing of objections at which the departments, having composed their differences in private, appear on the same side.

"They are not required to state or defend their case for taking the land, nor to answer objections. The inspector in charge of the enquiry is actually appointed by the Minister who will take the final decision.

"These departments have established a judicial system of their own, through tribunal and public enquiry with rules of their own and principles alien to our ideas of justice.

"Judicial decisions which can decide a man's future or fortune, and against which there is no appeal, are made in the Minister's name by officials with no judicial experience. Access to the courts is denied, and if gained, 'Crown Privilege' is claimed for withholding evidence.

"For the public who will shrug all this off on the Ministers and civil servants there are two lessons to be learned. One is that tyranny is just as wicked against those with property as against those without. The second is that it flourishes on sleeping consciences."

(Extracts from an article "State Tyranny Over The Landowner" by W. F. Deedes M.P. in *The Daily Telegraph*, June 30.)

"Mr. Attlee observed that "the civil servant is quite accustomed to being abused, and had to depend upon his Minister to defend him." But it is no part of a Minister's duty to defend the indefensible."

—*The Church Times*, June 25.

"Crichel Down is surely a test case for parliamentary government. There are those who argue that in these days of international tension and economic stress there is really no function for Parliament to perform—that if intolerable inconvenience is to be avoided, it is inevitable that continuity should be preserved by allowing the bureaucrats to take the real decisions, and that parliamentary control not only is but must be reduced to a formality. Others say that it is an exaggerated and pessimistic view. Crichel Down seems an almost perfect test case—exactly the case where, for a number of reasons, Parliament ought to make its voice heard if ever it is going to make its voice heard about anything. If it fails now there are many throughout the country who will conclude that Parliament has had its final day, and will never again consider it a serious influence in the affairs of the nation.

"Secondly, are civil servants to be allowed to be wholly irresponsible? There is indeed a traditional doctrine that the political head of the department takes all the responsibility for his civil servants' actions. . . . In these days of the automatic, regimented vote such a theory of responsibility clearly means little. . . .

"The simple-minded might expect that, when the Government have so wholly mismanaged their case, the Opposition would be the first to attack them. It is not so at all. The parliament situation is one that exactly reproduces the satire of a Chesterbelloc novel. The first, and indeed, as far as we can see, the only person in England to rush to Sir Thomas Dugdale's defence was Mr. Tom Williams, the Minister of Agriculture in the Socialist Government. He knows well the advantages which he gained from getting on well with civil servants in the past, and looks forward, doubtless, to gaining similar advantages in the future. Neither the Conservatives nor the Socialists are willing to advocate the nationalisation of the land *sans phrase* before the electorate. But both the Government machines find it convenient to establish, without public avowal, a principle by which no land that has ever passed out of private hands ever passes back into them again. The civil servants even pretend to ignorance, in spite of the plain words of an Act of Parliament, whether they have power to return such land to private hands. The issue is as interesting as it is important, because the clash is not between the two parties but between the back benches and the two united front benches. An issue is joined on which, to the general surprise, the Government front bench has the support of no one except the Opposition front bench."

—(*The Tablet*, June 26)

"Twenty-five years ago the late Lord Chief Justice Hewart in his book "The New Despotism" drew attention to the dangers and evils of legislation which gave to Government Departments powers which were outside the jurisdiction of the Law Courts and practically speaking, beyond the

sovereignty of Parliament. In his introductory chapter Lord Hewart wrote:

"The old despotism, which was defeated, offered Parliament a challenge. The new despotism, which is not yet defeated, gives Parliament an anaesthetic. The strategy is different, but the goal is the same. It is to subordinate Parliament, to evade the courts, and to render the will or the caprice of the Executive unfettered and supreme."

"If the Conservative Party wish to 'set the people free' these are the matters to which they should bend their attention."

(From a letter from Lord Broughshane, published in *The Daily Telegraph*).

### Mass Medication

In our issue of May 22 we reported that the three towns of Norwich, Watford and Kilmarnock had been chosen for the Government experiment of adding fluorides to the water supplies. The populations of these towns, without consultation, were to be used as guinea pigs. The Town Councils of Watford and Kilmarnock agreed to the proposal, but Norwich City Council rejected it by 32 votes to 23.

So far as we are aware, apart from the local paper, which published a letter, only three papers in the country published objections to the proposal—*Voice*, *Candour* and *Housewives Today*—A copy of this paper was sent to all the clergy and councillors in Norwich, and several members of The British Housewives League did admirable work in putting the case against fluoridation to members of the Council and a section of the public. If this had not been done there is little doubt that the population of Norwich would have been used as guinea pigs without their consent and mainly without their knowledge.

We are glad to see that Councillor Dean who led the opposition took up the position that "the ethical objections were far more important" than the medical. "Some people who had approached him on this matter were deeply concerned that the State should rape their personalities and compel them to accept mass medication."

The amoral attitude of the Government in this matter was shown when the Town Clerk said that the Ministry of Health had announced that "they would indemnify the Council against any legal action that might be brought."

The people of Norwich had every right to expect the voice of Authority and a Christian attitude but were told that the Bishop of Norwich would not agree that the measure would infringe individual liberty. The Bishop is a Knight Templar in Freemasonry.

### Patriotism

A nation is made great and strong not by shouting and waving flags or by hysterical emotion, but by those who look beyond the nation as it is to the nation as it might be, by those who defend it not only against external enemies, but against moral corruption and illusions which sap its vigour from within. The true patriot is the man who loves his country and helps to make it worthy to be loved.—Dr. W. R. Mathews, Dean of St. Paul's in the *Daily Telegraph*.