

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 8.

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

SATURDAY, JULY 31, 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

What is it that makes such men as the Archbishop of York, no matter how honest they may be in intention, falter as servants of God and leaders of Christians?

It is the simple fact that, whether they cannot or will not, they do not distinguish between laws and LAW in the Universe.

Only a crank would dispute that man could not endure life alone as a single individual. He has to live in society. And it is ordained by God that as in every other structure there is LAW in the structure of society. The injunction: "Consider the lilies, *how* they grow. They toil not, neither do they spin . . ." has no meaning unless it has reference to LAW which is *inherent* in the nature of their growth. In the same inherent, organic way, there is LAW in society, and transgression by the laws of society results in disaster.

In regard to society, the postulate of the Christian religion is that in a Christian society the individual personality is paramount and that freedom of choice is essential to its development, so that when we say that society exists for the common good, we mean that it exists to promote the freedom of choice of the individuals who compose it. The Archbishop of York has put this in these words: "Christianity when most true to its Master is the champion of the rights of the individual against systems which would treat him as a mere tool to be used by those politically or economically more powerful than himself."*

It follows that the laws of a Christian society are of such a nature that they increase real freedom, restraining only the evil-doer who would injure the freedom of others.

But during this century the laws of society have multiplied to such an extent that they have become known as the New Despotism, a name given to them by a Lord Chief Justice. The characteristic of these laws is that they all take away the power to choose from individuals and give it to those who operate the laws. They are demonstrably by their nature and have been demonstrated to be un-Christian. They destroy the individual's power to choose. This is just as much the case when a bureaucrat, acting under Departmental regulations and armed with

powers of inspection, comes to my farm to inspect my cowshed and decrees how it shall be altered and added to as when, at the arbitrary decision of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, a tax is imposed on one article of produce to make its selling price five times what its price would be without the tax, while other articles are left untaxed, or are ordered to be sold below cost, their price being subsidised out of general taxation. Reasons can always be adduced to satisfy, or at least to gain the acceptance of a paganised, propagandised and irresponsible mass electorate. It is only the religious man, for ever seeking Law in things, who is not satisfied. And the genuine Christian, having found the Law, will continually strive to bring society into conformity with it.

What is the LAW in society?

On another page we reprint extracts from a memorable speech by the late C. H. Douglas at Liverpool in 1936 under the title "The Tragedy of Human Effort." In this speech he said that "nations are at bottom, merely association for the good of those composing them." Further: "The general principles which govern association for the common good are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building."

It is clearly stated in this speech that the foundation of successful administration is that it shall be subject to the principle of free association and that "if there is no free association, the natural inertia of the human being and the improper manipulation of methods and aims will make an undertaking inefficient." This is only another way of saying that the absolute right of the individual to contract out of one association and contract in to one among others available is the fundamental condition which will ensure that human associations conform to LAW and thus provide for the common good, because only those forms of association which obey this principle will survive. Monopoly, whether it is by direct or indirect control, whether it is of finance or of hairpins, of education or of national governments by a world government breaks the LAW, God's LAW. Those who advocate national or international monopolies are breaking God's LAW. They are advocating the dominion of Anti-Christ. And when a leader of the Church which claims to be Christian, such as the Archbishop of York, and in the name of the Church advocates this breaking of the LAW, the position is intolerable.

We hope that our readers and Christians everywhere will write vigorously, even in the simplest terms, to the Archbishops and Bishops protesting that such advice should be given in the name of Christianity.

We have come dangerously close to the final establishment of the Dominion of Anti-Christ. Only the correct use of power can avert it, and the correct use of power can only come if it is guided by Authority. This is the business of the Church of Christ, and there are large numbers of people, who, if not consciously, are instinctively looking

* "In an Age of Revolution."

for this guidance. It is natural that they should look to the Church which bears the name of Christ. "Modern man craves for authority." This is a statement taken from an article in a popular newspaper this week by a Free Church leader. But the article in no way satisfies the craving. If the vacuum which gives rise to the craving is not filled by the voice of Authority, those who crave will yield, however unwillingly, to the voice of Power, and the Dominion of Anti-Christ will be established. In these last days of hope who is there for the LAW, willing to speak for the LAW and act for the LAW? Declare yourselves. J.M.

Our Next Issue

Within the space available, our next issue will recapitulate and re-present THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM.

The case will be presented as fully and as clearly as possible.

We hope our readers will take advantage of this opportunity to order extra copies in advance.

Discount on quantities will be as follows:—

Orders of $\frac{1}{2}$ Doz. copies @ 2/3.

Orders of 1 Doz. copies @ 4/- per doz.

Orders of 2 Doz. upwards copies @ 3/- per doz.

Orders for additional copies should be made to:—

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.,

Lincoln Chambers,

11, Garfield Street,

Belfast,

N. IRELAND.

and not to London or Liverpool.

Campaign H.Q. still have long lists of clergy whom they have not yet been able to approach. Donations are invited, or lists will be provided for those who are willing to help in the work.

Please apply to: Christian Campaign for Freedom,
Penrhyn Lodge,
Gloucester Gate,
LONDON, N.W.1.

The Tragedy of Human Effort

(Extract from the notes of a speech by the late
C. H. Douglas, at Liverpool in 1936).

PRINCIPLES OF ASSOCIATION.

The first proposition which requires to be brought out into the cold light of the day, and to be kept there remorselessly, at the present time in particular, is that nations are, at bottom merely associations for the good of those composing them. Please note that I say "at bottom." Association is at once the direct cause of our progress and of our threatened destruction. The general principles which govern association for the common good are as capable of exact statement as the principles of bridge building, and departure from them is just as disastrous.

The modern theory, if it can be called modern, of the totalitarian state, for instance, to the effect that the state is everything and the individual nothing, is a departure from those principles, and is a revamping of the theory of the later Roman Empire, which theory, together with the financial

methods by which it was maintained, led to Rome's downfall, not by the conquest of stronger Empires, but by its own internal dissensions. It is a theory involving complete inversion of fact, and is, incidentally fundamentally anti-Christian in that it exalts the mechanism of government into an end rather than a means, and leads to the assumption that individuals exist for the purpose of allowing officials to exercise power over them. It is in the perversion and exaltation of means into ends in themselves, that we shall find the root of our tragedy. . . .

Reverting to the question of culpability for the perversion of human effort which is so plainly evident, there is a strong tendency to suppose that a statement that the financial system is at fault, especially if accompanied by suggestions for its reformation, may be regarded as covering the ground of the problem. So far from this being so, the second proposition that I wish to emphasise to you, with no suggestion of its novelty, but a strong insistence upon the difficulty of obtaining recognition for it, is that action on or through an organisation, involves three ideas—the idea of policy, the idea of administration, and the idea of sanctions, that is to say, power.

Because administration is the most obvious of these ideas, Socialism, so-called, has tended to concentrate upon the glorification of the administration, which, to my mind—because of the increasing pressure of Socialist ideology upon Government action—is a complete explanation of the ever more disastrous results in increased bureaucracy and other undesirable features from which we all suffer. . . .

POLICY, ADMINISTRATION AND SANCTIONS.

Now, while no action involving co-operative effort can take place without the presence of these three factors of policy, administration, and sanctions, and therefore they are all essential, and, in a sense, equally important, the first of them in point of time must be policy. . . .

But at the present time, there is no question that it is in the domain of sanctions that the human race is involved in its great difficulties.

Although the idea may be repulsive to many who have not faced the realities of life, physical force is the ultimate sanction of the physical world. Moral, intellectual, and emotional considerations unquestionably go to the determination of the use and direction of physical force, but, in the last resort, the last squadron of bombing aeroplanes will have its way when all the navies, armies and aerial fleets of the world are destroyed, and in the last event the problem of sanctions is to obtain control of that last squadron.

So far as the present situation is concerned, the regular forces of the realm are the last sanctions of law and order within the realm, and law and order can be identified with the operation of the financial system as it exists at the present time. There is no serious financial reform which can be inaugurated within the framework of the present legal system, except by those in control of the existing financial system. There is no intention whatever on the part of those in control of the existing financial system to change that system to their disadvantage and there is no effective change to the financial system which can be made without depriving its present controllers of their absolute power. I believe the foregoing statements to be axiomatic, and any form of strategy or argument which traverses any of them would

(continued on page 4.)

Warning

In a document written by the editor of this paper six months before the last war started, entitled *Warning Europe*, it was stated that America and Russia would emerge as the *de facto* victors of the approaching war, and that the ultimate control in Russia was with a Power group which was both resident in America and controlled the Government of that country. The names of most of that group were given including that of Bernard Baruch, whom the present Prime Minister of Great Britain consults every time he visits the U.S.A. The means of their power was also described. The document was widely distributed in influential circles throughout the Empire. One of the visitors to the author's office was a secretary of the then Prime Minister, Mr. Neville Chamberlain, who took away several copies remarking that he agreed with what was said. Events have demonstrated beyond anyone's doubt who are the victors. They may, sooner than many people think, demonstrate that despite the deliberately contrived appearances of the Cold War, one victor is subordinate to the other. How is the seemingly intransigent Soviet Government to be brought to submerge its sovereignty in a World Government? This is a question which many both for and against World Government are asking. What we quote below is from the unusually well-informed American journal *Human Events*. We do not know how much reliance can be placed on this report, but we do believe that when the power-busters consider that the conditioning of the minds of the public is well enough advanced, some such event will occur:—

From HUMAN EVENTS:

Disturbing Speculation: Our London sources report that not all is well behind Russia's Iron Curtain—that something may take shape loaded with dynamite for a world that still doesn't understand the trickiness of the Communists. Suppose a "liberation" was staged inside Russia that is faked. (Such an instance occurred this week in Guatemala, in the case of the short-lived "stooge" Diaz government.) It could then be announced to the world that the Communist regime has been overthrown and the press of the world would quite likely roar its approval. A "peace-loving democracy" installed, Moscow could then make the gesture of renouncing the H-bomb, of proclaiming its willingness to disarm, and to entrust the guardianship of peace to a world government. At any rate the group in England calling itself the "Parliamentary Group for World Government" is becoming unusually vocal and its basic assumption is that Russia must be included in any world government. Once such a government as above described were created, the Communists and Socialists of Europe and Asia could contrive our complete socialisation as a nation and gain control of our resources and productive power. War between the Soviets and the U.S. would no longer be necessary because we would be firmly enmeshed in a political world of socialism. Our London sources say it would be well to be prepared for any dramatic announcements from Russia in the future, announcements that may conceal a plan to snare our sovereignty by the synthetic picture of a Russia professing readiness to beat her swords into ploughshares.

Another writer in the same journal expresses a warning

which also needs to be taken to heart in this country. He says:

"Informed patriots who know the seriousness of the situation are valiantly trying to hold the line. But the fundamental weakness of pro-Americanism is all too apparent. The secret of radicalism's progress has been its ideological and actional unity. The looming failure of pro-Americanism is its ideological and actional disunity—its enormous potential strength frittered away among numerous groups who seem to be more interested in their favourite schemes or persons, ambitions, than in uniting against the enemy."

We should not bother to discuss these matters here if we did not believe that now in the face of the imminent threat of catastrophe there may exist a will to unite where this was not present before. But, for unity there must be agreement, and there is no point in unity if it doesn't result in increased force at the point of action which can alter policy.

It should go without saying that when we talk of unity we are considering only those groups whose programmes, whether tied up with technical methods or restricted to sectional freedom objectives have the underlying motive, as a common factor, of freedom for the individual from unwarrantable interference by this or that form of control.

To gain unity of objective it would seem to be an absolute condition that each group desiring it would have to accept a widened objective which would include the freedom objectives of all the other groups. If in fact they do not do this they are *in effect*, whether they realise it or not, in opposition to each other. Not one of them can hope to defeat the common enemy on that basis.

To gain increased force at the point of action which can alter policy postulates agreement on strategy. On what basis can this come about? For those who are interested we put forward the following points for consideration:

(1) As politicians depend upon electoral power, the *first* thing to do to convince them that you mean business is to pledge yourself to withdraw your power.

(2) That you pledge yourself to return this power to the politician on the sole condition that he enters into a contract, which has an *effective* financial penalty *immediately* operable when the contract is broken. The contract to be that the politician withdraws his power from the Government until the objective is granted.

(3) That in the face of the mass propaganda which the enemy can and does inflict on the public, the only appeal which can move to action that part of the electorate which is capable of hearing is one to Authority. Freedom as an objective is bound back to Authority; political action which has integrity and responsibility is bound back to Authority. Government policy, compromise voting and normal electioneering methods have no basis in Authority at all, and are *in their very nature* bound to produce evil results, in the same way that engineering methods not bound back to Authority would inevitably do. Confronted with Evil on a truly monstrous scale, let us take our stand on the ground God has provided.

We are willing to discuss a *modus vivendi* with any freedom group which is interested.

What They Say

"Entirely agree with all you say in your circular and wish I could have a few back copies of *VOICE*—short snippets for putting in parish magazines might well be issued to the clergy. But they will not take much notice—and the Bishops and officialdom generally even less. They are nearly all administrators, and—with a very few exceptions—have neither the time nor inclination to deal with principles . . ."

" . . . I have been interested in reading *VOICE* . . . I agree entirely with the position taken up by the paper regarding the freedom of the individual. That is fundamental. My own religious and philosophical position lays it down as basic and demands of it a true and right political system."

" . . . I am very glad to know that there is such an organ as *VOICE* in existence. All too quickly and under various guises is personality being stamped right out, and every single freedom being lost and destroyed. So far as beneficed clerks are concerned the major blow was in 1936 under the Tithe Confiscation Act, whereby with thousands of others I lost my living. Not even a whisper of protest from the Church Assembly or the episcopate. And now the last shred is our personal liberty and home freedom is to be taken away under 'The parsonages measure.' In my own case £1,560 spent on it out of my meagre stipend . . . Yes, Sir, we also are like the Duke in the forest of Arden: 'leaving me no sign save men's opinion and my precious blood to show I am a gentleman.'

"What would the first Elizabeth have said to all these measures? Or more poignantly: ask anyone why Alfred was called **THE GREAT**? They don't know. The answer is that because his first utterance was to secure freedom for personal property and thereby happiness for the people. Taxation and everything else (including the parsonages measure) are all going one way now . . . and the louder your voice is raised the more hope there is for England's survival."

A Church Commissioner, the Rev. E. G. Courtman, editor of *Parson and Parish*, the organ of the Parochial Clergy Association, published the following as a separate feature, and requested a longer article for the next issue:

"FROM THE EDITOR OF *VOICE*."

"Dear Sir, You have asked me to write 'a short warning' on the question of 'Rules and the curtailment of freedom.' What better than Miss Dorothy Sayers in her masterpiece **THE MIND OF THE MAKER**—'When the laws regulating human society are so framed as to come into collision with the nature of things, and in particular with the fundamental realities of human nature they will end by producing an impossible situation which . . . will issue in such catastrophes as war, pestilence and famine . . .'?"

"There is one fundamental check, and only one, on laws getting out of harmony with **LAW**, God's **LAW**, in the **UNIVERSE**; that is the maintenance of the right for the individual to contract out. It has almost gone, and the Church has condoned its going.

"Unless the Church recognises that laws must be related to **LAW**, that the power of governments must be subjected to the judgment of Authority it will only be a

short time before we enter another Dark Age. It is the business of the Church to reflect Authority, and to do so **EFFECTIVELY** it must come down into the political arena, not to exercise Power, but to voice Authority to those who are supposed to have power with responsibility—the electorate. *Voice* is published to help them to do so.

"Yours faithfully,
"John Mitchell."

From *Barsham and Shipmeadow Parish Paper*:

"One or two of the pungent remarks of the Editor of *Crockford's Clerical Directory* for 1954 are worth noting. He says ' . . . one of the reasons why we regard it as legitimate and necessary to remind people of episcopal inadequacies is that nowadays no one who is not a diocesan bishop can exercise much decisive influence in the Church, however able, experienced and learned he may be . . . ' Disraeli called the bishops of his youth 'mitred nullities.' No doubt he would have allowed exceptions as we do today. The editor goes on to say that 'the Church of England now has an unofficial but not ineffective mechanism for the suppression of the unpopular. There are few who are able or who dare say, with any hope of influence, anything but what the controlling mentality wishes to hear.'"

The burden of **THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM** has so far been carried by approximately two *per cent.* of the readers of this paper, either by active or financial assistance. Nothing can alter the present trend (or is it race?) to communism but political action, and the right kind of political action, action which alters official policy. Writing and speaking are only *aids* to this action.

We are satisfied that sufficient people will not take the right action unless they hear the voice of Authority, insistently and urgently.

We sympathise with some readers who have written to say that after years of attempt they have been unable to find what they can recognise as the authentic stream in the Christian Church, and for this reason have been discouraged from helping us. We believe that such a stream exists, but that it needs to be brought to a focus, and that then it can have, must have, immense influence.

The first phase of the Campaign is nearly at an end. Whether a second phase follows at once or after a pause for consolidation or at all will depend largely upon our readers. We may decide that the best way to demonstrate where the responsibility for the next phase lies will be to suspend publication until that responsibility is shouldered.

The Tragedy of Human Effort—(continued from page 2.)
certainly seem to me to be lacking in realism.

The problem, then, is to obtain a change in the financial system of such a nature that it is bound to be against the will of those controlling the financial system at present; and such a change can be induced only by the possession of the ultimate sanctions of the realm, that is to say, control of the navy, the army, and the airforce, now controlled by these same controllers of finance. The problem, in fact, is a problem of the victory of political democracy, that is to say *democracy of policy*.