

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 9.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 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 Christian Campaign for Freedom

This issue of *VOICE* is exclusively devoted to explaining THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM. During this Century two great wars have been fought ostensibly on this issue, and the present 'Cold War' is said to be concerned with Freedom. We are all today losing freedoms and we are seriously threatened with the loss of all freedom.

It is indeed strange therefore that it is necessary to ask and to answer the questions: What is freedom? How is it threatened? And what can the individual elector do about it? The reader is invited to compare the two statements quoted below:—

(1) BEFORE THE LAST DARK AGE.

"Those in authority were not responsible to the moral feeling and wishes of those they governed; their sway, while it lasted, was uncontrolled. An all pervading bureaucracy, increasingly wasteful and petty minded, represented omnipotence at every level. The cost of that immense army of officials plunged society into ever deeper debt and taxation, and, a milestone round the neck of production and trade, destroyed all private independence and initiative. Little by little it reduced the population of every city in the Empire to a mob.

"Rome had grown out of greatness of individual character. It became a community in which individual character counted for nothing compared with an abstraction which proved, in the hour of testing, capable of nothing. By sacrificing the individual to the State the rulers of the Roman world undermined the real virtues which sustained it. They turned active and self-respecting citizens into inert and selfish ones."

—From *The Story of England* by Sir Arthur Bryant.

The consequence of governmental power being allowed to become unchecked by Authority in the world was six centuries of vile tyranny and misery, known as the Dark Ages. But the Christian message survived in the keeping of small groups of men; and it was the *practical* import and application of this message of Authority which checked and distributed power and shaped the structure of society and its laws.

(2) BEFORE THE NEXT DARK AGE?

"The citizen comes more and more to rely on the State to provide all his needs. Responsibilities to their children which were once 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. . . ."

—From *In an Age of Revolution* by Dr. Cyril Garbett, Archbishop of York.

While many of us could describe the dangers of the present position as well as Dr. Garbett, to counter accusations of bias, we have deliberately quoted him, because despite the evils which he sees it produce Dr. Garbett is still a strong advocate of the socialism which goes by the name of the Welfare State; and even more extraordinary, he advocates the transfer of the last vestige of power and responsibility possessed by the people of this country to an all-powerful World Government. Far from checking Power, the Archbishop advocates a fatal extension of it. Why? One reason may be that the Archbishop was appointed by the instrument of Power in the State, the Prime Minister. Can Power check Power?

What is Power?

That which we ascribe to nobility in man, and that which we ascribe to nobility in man's work has always one outstanding characteristic—service. Those societies which in the past have approximated to a Christian version have always given *practical* expression to three things—Power, Authority and Freedom. They are organically related in a Christian society. In a pagan society they are not and there is neither recognition of Authority nor freedom. What is Power?

In what undoubtedly is and has come to be recognised as an axiom the late Lord Acton said "All power tends to corrupt, absolute power corrupts absolutely." Absolute political power comes when all political power is concentrated. In countries which are acknowledged to be totalitarian, such power is already completely in the hands of a few; in this country we are proceeding by stages to the same state.

The late Lord Chief Justice Hewart wrote twenty-five years ago:

"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."

Writing in *The Daily Telegraph* Mr. W. F. Deedes, M.P., said: "Among the issues illuminated by Sir Andrew Clark's report on the Crichton 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." Magna Carta was largely a recital of the wrongs done to property owners. It redressed those wrongs, and allowed the owner the enjoyment of his property with the freedom to do with it what he liked without interference either by government or anyone else. What was done before the signing of Magna Carta 'in the name of the King' is now done 'in the public interest.'

At the time of Magna Carta ownership of property and the unhindered enjoyment of property rights was the fundamental basis of human liberties. In this modern industrialised era it is still of great importance, but control of spending power (money) has become of greater importance. This is not the place, nor is there the space here to describe the mechanism by which a few people, whose names are rarely mentioned in the Press, have gained almost absolute control of money; and by their control of money are able to secure a decisive influence over the growth and control of any large undertaking, or to hinder the development of enterprises which are unfavourable to the extension of their power. But it is certain that no large undertaking, whether it be industrial, financial, the Press, a political party or a Trades Union, has been allowed to progress, unless its policy was in accordance with the plan of the Money Power and it was staffed by persons considered 'safe' by that Power. It will be sufficient here to quote what has been said by people who have been in a position to know:

"Permit me to issue and control a nation's money and I care not who makes its laws."—Meyer Rothschild (1790).

"Some of the biggest men in the United States, in the field of commerce and manufacture, know there is a power so organised, so subtle, so watchful, so interlocked, so complete, so pervasive, that they had better not speak above their breath when they speak in condemnation of it."

—President Wilson in *This New Freedom*.

"From the time I took office as Chancellor I began to learn that the State held, in the face of the Bank of England, and the City, an essentially false position as to finance. . . . The Government itself was not to be the substantive power in matters of finance, but was to leave the Money Power supreme and unquestioned."

—W. E. Gladstone quoted in *Morley's Life of Gladstone*.

Without difficulty one could quote a score of such statements from Statesmen, Popes, Bishops, economists and other public men.

Nothing is more significant in the Crichton Down issue than that the two Front Benches in Parliament stood together, and that the real opposition was represented in the Government Back Benches. In the surrender of British power and prestige in the Near East to 'American' influence over the Suez issue, the same situation was reproduced. All political parties are dominated by the same power. The only real potential opposition to this power in Parliament resides in the Back Benches, and this opposition is *at present* deprived of sanctions by the party system. There is nothing new about this, it has been real politics for a long time, as the following quotation from the U.S.A. *Bankers' Magazine* for August 24, 1924 will show:—

"Capital must protect itself in every possible manner by combination and legislation. When through a process of law the Common People lose their homes, they will become more docile and more easily governed through the influence of the strong arm of government applied by a central power of wealth, under control of leading financiers."

"This truth is well known among our principal men now engaged in forming an imperialism of capital to govern the world."

"By dividing the voters through the Political Party system, we can get them to expend their energies in fighting over questions of no importance. Thus by discreet action we can secure for ourselves what has been so well planned, and so successfully accomplished."

If the Money Power has not been the progenitor of Socialism in all its guises, it has certainly been its foster-mother. And it has been so simply because socialism is centralisation of the means of production and distribution. Centralisation of money control had been effected before Socialism became a political issue. It was the vast power which money control gave to its controllers that provided the means for them secretly to push socialism in its various guises as a political programme. It could not do this without having an obedient Press, which would, while appearing to discuss and criticise every issue of public importance, suppress certain vital facts and popularise certain nostrums essential to the plan for complete world political as well as financial control. It was also necessary to train a bureaucracy, and pervert the voice of Authority.

Of all the nostrums that have been implanted in the minds of the public, such as 'Planning' or the 'need for efficiency' as an excuse for destroying small enterprises in order to centralise, and the 'importance of exports' in order to disguise a defect in the financial system, none has been more important and disastrous than the sedulously fostered idea that the object of production is employment and not the production of goods and services.

For training the bureaucracy we have the London School of Economics, founded by the powerful financier, Sir Ernest Cassel, who said "Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State." It has done so effectively, with the aid since 1931 of the Fabian organisation, P.E.P. (Political and Economic Planning), which has blue-printed nearly all the crucial legislation which has found its way onto the statute book since its formation.

All the chief dignitaries of the Church of England are appointed by the State (Power). It would indeed be childish to suppose that Power would appoint to high office men whose attitude of mind in their past careers would dispose them to express Authority in restraint of Power. In fact the philosophy of the present Archbishops is summed up in the expressed philosophy of the late Archbishop Temple: "We need supremely the control of human purpose." This is also the overriding philosophy of Freemasonry, and it is not accidental that many of the present bishops are freemasons. It is in fact Judaism and as the late C. H. Douglas said, this "can easily be confirmed by the little catechism:—'is God Omnipotent?'—'Of course.' 'Then why doesn't God control human purpose?'—'Because that would interfere with free will.' 'Oh, so you know better than God what we need supremely?'" That is the essence of the Talmud.

What is Authority?

"He is an authority on so and so." Frequently one hears some such statement, and the word 'authority' is apprehended by everyone who hears it in such a context. No one supposes that 'he' commands a regiment of soldiers or an army of bureaucrats. He may not wield any *power* but his own. But it is recognised that 'he' has knowledge concerning the nature of 'so and so.' It is commonly recognised that great professions have accumulated, in the minds of their members and in their textbooks, a body of knowledge, appertaining to the nature of the particular subject which is theirs. While experience confirms it, it has 'authority'; and when experience ceases to confirm it it loses authority and is discarded.

The *service* of such authority is available to those who have power, *i.e.*, those who can pay for it. And the service is judged by the results it produces for those who pay for it. Whether the servants of such authority produce results as monstrous and destructive as the hydrogen bomb or as beautiful and serviceable as the Sydney Harbour Bridge depends upon the demands of those who have power.

We are here concerned with Authority in society. The Founder of Christianity said "I came that ye might have life, and have it more abundantly," and He also said "All authority is given unto me." His own prayer says "Thy will be done *in earth.*" It cannot therefore be gainsaid that Christ was concerned with this life. His recorded words prove it. It is also shown by Him that God's purpose is not restricted, controlled, life; but abundant life (*i.e.*, maximum freedom), and that such abundant life was to be obtained by seeking and obeying Authority—"Ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall make you *free.*"

LAW in nature and human society is the discoverable expression of Authority; '*laws*' are enactments of Power. Only when *laws* truly reflect Law, is the 'State' of society healthy.

If a man falls off Beachy Head, willy nilly, he obeys the Law of Gravity, God's Law, and takes the consequences. No law can prevent this. If the people of a country, whether from ignorance or from idleness, allow their power (freedom) to choose to be taken from them by laws, they transgress Law in society, and instead of getting abundant life they get tyranny. Freedom for the individual to choose

for himself, not for someone else to choose for him is the objective of Authority in the Universe; it was Christ's objective for us. The only way for an individual to learn to make a wise choice is by experience of choosing, so that he experiences the *natural* consequences of his choice. So that the first Law in society, to which the enactments of Power (laws) should conform, is that the objective for which people associate together is to gain maximum freedom of choice for the individuals in society. As the enactments of Power (laws) can, and more and more frequently do, run contrary to Law, depriving the individual of freedom to choose, it is axiomatic that Christianity and Christians are very much concerned with politics.

The history of the development of English government and society for several centuries after emergence from the Dark Ages is very largely the history of the influence of Christianity in politics, ensuring that laws conformed with Law. That bulwark of English liberties, the Common Law, grew as a direct result of the continuous intervention of the Church. Sir Arthur Bryant, writing about the intervention of the Church under Archbishop Langton in the events which led up to the signing of Magna Carta says:

"It was not Langton's wish to see the Crown overthrown, the law ignored, the realm divided, the barons petty sovereigns as in the days of Stephen and Godwin. What he wanted was that the King should preserve the law his predecessors had created. And it was to the law that the archbishop appealed, not only of man, but of God. For it was of the essence of medieval Christian philosophy, that God ruled the earth, and that men, and kings above all men, must further His ends by doing justice or it was not in Christian eyes government at all. It was their duty to enforce what Christian men, through long custom, had learned to regard as just. And whenever it became necessary to restate or extend the law, sovereigns, as bearers of the sword of justice, were under an obligation to consult with the leaders and wise men of the realm.

"The first of these were the leaders of the Church, for the Church was the medium through which God's Law was communicated to men. Its political function was to remind kings of what justice was, and to impress on them its importance, and to recall them to it when they strayed from it. 'Will you to your power cause law and justice, in mercy, to be executed in all your judgments?' the Archbishop of Canterbury asked the king at his crowning."

Today the people are abandoned to the rule of Power, unchecked by Authority. Virtually nothing is said about the progressive deprivation of individual liberties by Power. Fear of a head-on collision between the civil Power and the Church silences those who should see that God's Law in society is not broken.

But if society is not to be given over completely to unbridled Power, Authority must be expressed and impressed on electorate and government. For this reason *Voice* and The Christian Campaign For Freedom seek to rally all responsibly-minded electors to set an example by acting politically in accordance with Authority.

We do not believe that enough people will be ready to do this unless they hear the voice of Authority insistently and urgently. For this reason we seek, as of right, what the Church has, as a fundamental duty to society, to provide—just that voice of Authority. In a Church corrupted by

Power it is difficult to find. But we believe that somewhere within the Church the voice of Christian Authority will be made manifest.

Since this Campaign started the Bishop of Chichester has stated publicly:

"While the nation, generally speaking, is content to see the State increasing the scale of benefits to the people, irrespective of party allegiance, there is a real danger lest, in the State's steady incursion into departments of life hitherto uninvaded, there should be a loss both of a spiritual stimulus and of encouragement to individual initiative. The Church has a duty here, the fulfilment of which is of immense importance to the well-being of the people. It has a duty to stand for a measure of independence and to witness to an authority higher than the State."

THAT IS A CAUTIOUS STATEMENT; BUT IT IS AN ADVANCE ON WHAT, UNFORTUNATELY, HAS BEEN THE RECENT ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH. FOUR OTHER BISHOPS HAVE WRITTEN TO US SAYING MORE OR LESS THE SAME THING. THEY HAVE ALL BEEN INVITED TO SAY IN PRACTICAL TERMS WHAT THEY MEAN BY 'FREEDOM' AND 'INDEPENDENCE,' AND TO ADVISE ON THE ACTION WHICH IS BEING TAKEN BY THE CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM. THEY HAVE SO FAR DECLINED TO DO THIS.

If the Bishops will not speak, we have already evidence that lower down in the hierarchy of the Church Christian Authority is with us.

What is Freedom?

No Christian would deny that freedom for the individual person is a fundamental postulate of the Christian religion. But that is a long way from saying that many so-called Christians practice in their political actions what they preach. Very few do so. Let us be clear first of all then what Christian theology means, in theory, by freedom. We shall therefore quote the present head of the Department of Theology in the University of the South West, Dr. S. C. Carpenter, D.D., until recently Dean of Exeter. Taking issue with the idea that Christianity has nothing to do with secular things, he says: "As if God were interested in Matins but not in the market, in Evensong but not in the election!

"It could almost be put in one single word—Freedom. Real Christianity believes in complete freedom for everyone, a freedom for everyone to take his place in a free society, a freedom which brings the utmost possible happiness to everyone, on the single condition that his happiness shall not mean the unhappiness of others, and moreover, freedom to choose whether he will do this or that. There must be no compulsion, not even any social pressure. If I could convert a man to my way of thinking by pressing a button in his waistcoat, I ought not to do it."^{*}

In the light of this clear definition of what is meant in Christian Theology by Freedom, Christians have to make up their minds whether they are going to yield supinely to the ever-flowing propaganda of Power, that the Welfare State, Planning, Socialism has come to stay, or whether they are going to oppose and reverse the evil purposes of Power.

It is axiomatic that there can be no freedom of association if the individual cannot, without penalty of any kind

other than the error of his own choice, contract out of one association into another. For this reason it is obvious that every form of monopoly, whether it be privately controlled, State controlled or internationally controlled (e.g., World Government) is destructive of individual liberty. Those who support by political action or propaganda any monopoly are breaking God's Law; by their actions they deny Christ. There is no shirking this issue.

The Christian Campaign For Freedom provides a means whereby Christians and all freedom-lovers may associate to forward Christian objectives in politics. Its means are not those of irresponsible power, so manifest today; its means are bound back to Authority, to the principles of integrity and responsibility of action:

Firstly, the Christian pledges himself openly to withdraw his power as a voter from all parties, the policies of all parties today being demonstrably un-Christian.

Secondly, the Christian pledges himself openly to return his power to the politician on condition that he enters into a contract, which has an *effective* financial guarantee, immediately operable when the contract is broken. The contract suggested is that the politician withdraws his support (power) from the Government until the objective is granted.

What is the objective?—That is for the individual elector to decide with his own conscience as a Christian. There can be no doubt where the genuine hundred-per-cent. Christian stands. He will insist on the restoration of freedom of association in everything; he will insist on the unpenalised right to contract out of all such measures as the National Health Service, National Insurance and the provisions of food legislation which add medicines to bread and water. He will have nothing to do with indirect taxation which, at the behest of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, rockets the price of one article of produce and lowers another. Above all he will have nothing to do with policies which would transfer any part of our national sovereignty to international agencies, least of all to a World Government, still more inaccessible than those which already exist.

Any individual can formulate his objectives for himself and write and tell his M.P. where he stands.* We suggest that if there is real Christian determination in any organisation, whether it be property owners or housewives, they will formulate the freedom objective which they are *especially* concerned with and invite other organisations to adopt them while agreeing to adopt those of other bodies.

The Christian Campaign For Freedom will provide Pledge Forms which can be altered or added to by any recipient, and used. And it invites any organisation or person to formulate its freedom objective and to forward it for inclusion on the Pledge, if it is not already there.

Thus can a sanction be provided to enable Back Bench M.P.s who would resist any form of tyranny to do so; and to compel others to do so or lose office. THE GOVERNMENT AND MANY M.P.S DEPEND UPON VERY SMALL MAJORITIES.

*At the same time letting the local Campaign organisation know, so that local strength for freedom is known, and joint representation can be made to the M.P. at the suitable time.

*Christianity. Penguin Books.