

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 11.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

## VOICE

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.

### What Is Truth?

"Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice." When Pilate asked "What is truth?" he did not wait for an answer, convinced that he could not get one. Earlier in His ministry Christ had told his hearers that the great object of truth was *freedom*. So we have here the indisputable evidence of why the Founder of Christianity came. We were reminded of this when a new reader complained that he did "not like the way we mixed religion with politics," and it also came to mind when we read the *Daily Telegraph* leader of August 18, supporting the Hungarian Communist Bishop. It said that Christianity "should never, as Bishop Peter remarked, be bound up with any particular social system."

This evokes the inevitable question: has a social system nothing to do with truth? And has no social system anything to do with freedom? If it has, how can it fail to be bound up with Christianity? The *Daily Telegraph* leader writer and our reader have to answer this question.

There are many who have forsaken the churches (but not necessarily the Church) because they see that these churches have forsaken the truth. Politics without truth is politics without religion; politics without religion is politics without truth. In politics today Caesar is claiming everything; but Christ said "Render unto God the things which are God's." We "mix religion (a binding-back to the truth) with politics" because politics without truth is evil. We are concerned with politics as the crucial area of action because Caesar is claiming, and has nearly obtained, all. We are especially concerned with the churches because we believe that in and around the churches are to be found those who are genuinely concerned with the truth. Whether there are enough "of the truth," who seek the truth in politics, and having found the truth, act on it, we do not know. We deem it our duty to try to find them and help them. If there are not enough, it will not be long before anti-Christ will ascend the worldly throne and reign there.

There is a literature appertaining to eschatology which seeks to present this as an inevitable happening; and in this connection we publish separately below some extracts from

Josef Pieper's *The End of Time*. Whilst we certainly do not impute sinister intentions to all those who write in this manner, we are certain that, like Jehovah's Witnesses and the Pyramidists, these writings are all part of Anti-Christ's preparations to conquer the world.

One of our correspondents has written claiming knowledge of the secret of Freemasonry. He says "the top secret of Freemasonry is the unethical nature of religious characters. The Masonic thesis is that, as God is a mixture of Good and Evil, by supporting either, characteristic Masons are serving God. I think this is the real explanation for the conspiracy of silence." We cannot say whether this is true or not, because we have not been provided with evidence. But there is no doubt that there is a conspiracy of silence among those in high position in all walks of life. Freemasons occupy many high positions in all walks of life, and not one of them uses his influence to advise anyone how to *act* to decentralise power. They give lip service to the principles of Christianity, but their actions belie their words. Consider the classic example of President Woodrow Wilson, who was a Freemason. His name will be forever associated with one of the most ambitious attempts ever made, under cover of high ideals finely expressed, to centralise power in one world government. Yet it was President Wilson who said: "The history of liberty is a history of the limitation of governmental power, not the increase of it. When we resist, therefore, the concentration of power, we are resisting the processes of death, because concentration of power is what always precedes the destruction of human liberties."

We have President Eisenhower and Sir Winston Churchill, both Freemasons and professing Christians, with 'freedom' always on their lips, urging the same concentration of power. We have the Archbishop of Canterbury (also a Freemason) with Christ's own words concerning truth and liberty on his lips, supporting the concentration of power, which is the Welfare State, the nature of which may be compared with the manifesto issued over a hundred years ago by the atheist and communist, Karl Marx, which we publish on another page. Why do these men say one thing and *do* the opposite? Why is there secrecy in Freemasonry?

"For everyone that doeth evil hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reprov'd."

"But he that *doeth* truth cometh to the light, that his *deeds* may be made manifest, that they are wrought in God."

It was Lord Acton who said: "History is not a web woven with innocent hands. Among all the causes which degrade and demoralise men, power is the most constant and the most active." Those people who cannot recognise that the policy which is *effective* in all political parties and all the governments is the centralisation and concentration of power in a few hands, cannot see the truth. Those

people who support any of these policies, even if they hide their support in a secret ballot, "do evil," for they destroy freedom and hence demonstrably act against the truth.

It was the assembled bishops of the Church of England who in 1948 in the Report of the Lambeth Conference declared that "freedom and justice in the world depend on there being enough men and women who say, 'We must obey God rather than men.'" The measures which are destroying freedom and justice in this country proceed from legislation passed in the House of Commons by men who are there because they have received the support of the electorate. It is clear therefore that Government, legislature and electorate are not obeying God. We have repeatedly asked the Bishops, as representing the Authority of God in the State, to give advice to the electorate on what they should *do* politically in this matter. They have declined to do so. It must be asked therefore, "who are the Bishops obeying?" We shall repeatedly ask them how the electorate should exercise their power in obedience to God to restore and preserve freedom and justice, for when they repeat daily with the Founder of Christianity "For thine is the kingdom, the power and the glory" we assume that they mean what they say. Meanwhile in the absence of a lead from the Bishops—we are asking those clergy who have written agreeing with us to give a lead by issuing a public statement declaring where in respect to freedom and justice laws depart from God's Law, and advising the electorate how to act.

In the spirit of the words "he that doeth truth cometh to the light," we ourselves are obeying God's Law by urging the electorate to do two things:—

(1) Publicly to withdraw their support from all politicians and organisations themselves supporting policies which are destructive of freedom and justice.

(2) Publicly to declare that they will restore this power when they have an effective contract from a politician that he himself will only support policies which restore and preserve freedom.

We agree with Thomas Jefferson that "free government is founded in jealousy, and not in confidence": it is not confidence which prescribes limited constitutions, to bind down those we are obliged to trust with power.

"In questions of power, then, let no more be heard of confidence in man, but bind him down from mischief by the chains of the Constitution."

We say that even that is not enough; that even then constitutions will be subverted unless there exists in the State a body, not armed with power, but dedicated to seek the truth, to watch vigilantly that freedom is secure in the observance of God's Law in society; a body which can with justice claim to be the Mystical Body of Christ, who in His own words "came to bear witness unto the truth."

Christ came in the cause of truth, that men and women might have freedom and justice. We ask the Church to say in the name of Christ concerning Law in society, *what is the truth?* J.M.

### GOD'S LAW and Man-Made Law.

A Conference open to all interested has been arranged to take place at Moor Park College, Farnham, Surrey, from November 23 to 26. (*Preliminary announcement.*)

### On the Road to Communism

Atheistic Communism is concerned with the centralisation of power. What, then, is Christianity concerned with?

Compare the passages published below from *The Communist Manifesto* by Karl Marx and Frederic Engels, with what has happened in Great Britain or in other country, *progressively*, over the past forty years:—

"We have seen that the first step in the revolution by the working class is to raise the proletariat to the position of the ruling class; to win the battle of democracy.

"The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie; to centralise all instruments of production in the hands of the State . . . .

"Of course, in the beginning this cannot be effected except by means of despotic inroads on the rights of property and on the conditions of bourgeois production. . . .

"These measures will, of course, be different in different countries.

"Nevertheless in the most advanced countries the following will be pretty generally applicable:

"1. Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

"2. A heavy progressive or graduated income tax.

"3. Abolition of all right of inheritance.

"4. Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

"5. Centralisation of credit in the hands of the State, by means of a national bank with State capital and an exclusive monopoly.

"6. Centralisation of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the State.

"7. Extension of factories and instruments of production owned by the State; the bringing into cultivation of waste lands, and the improvement of the soil generally in accordance with a general plan.

"8. Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies, especially for agriculture.

"9. Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries; gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country.

"10. Free education of all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production," *etc. etc.*

### Professor Pieper

Following are the extracts from Professor Pieper's book to which reference is made on page 1:—

"The Antichrist is to be conceived as a figure exercising political power over the whole of mankind; as a *world ruler*. Once, and as soon as, world dominion in the full sense has become possible, the Antichrist has become possible. To this corresponds the other, co-ordinate fact that the Christian Gospel must have reached the totality of the people of the earth, who have been rendered accessible to it politically: 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached

in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come' (Matt. 24, 15)—which is not construed by theology to mean that the Christian religion will spread in triumph over the whole earth, but that the decision for or against Christ will become possible (or urgent) over the whole globe. . . . The traditional doctrine of the Antichrist does not include any possibility of knowing the date of the end of time; nor does it state that there can be no world dominion save that of Antichrist! The establishment of a World State, which is today well within the bounds of historical possibility, may quite possibly come to be looked upon as a legitimate goal of political endeavour. What this doctrine does state is that once this step has been taken mankind will find itself in a condition in which the Dominion of Antichrist has become more acutely possible than ever before: 'a world organization might become the most deadly and impregnable of tyrannies, the final establishment of the reign of anti-Christ' (*Era of Atomic Power*, p. 44). . . .

" . . . The Antichrist will realise upon the earth a prodigious increase of power, and that not only *extensively*, but also *intensively*. The World State of Antichrist will be in the extreme sense a *totalitarian* State. This is determined, however, not only by the lust for power and the *superbia* of the Antichrist, but at the same time by the nature of the World State itself. To become overnight a totalitarian state—that is the inner peril, arising directly out of its very structure, that threatens a World Empire, which, *per definitionem*, is devoid of neighbours and thereby unexpectedly conforms to the political islands of the Utopias. Thus the liberal Gibbon said of the *Imperium Romanum* that within it freedom could have been torn up by the roots 'because there was no possibility of flight'; if dominion fell into the hands of one individual, the world became a safe prison for his adversaries.' To this a diary of the last war [G. Nebel, *Bei den nordlichen Hesperiden* (Wuppertal, 1948) p. 258] adds the conclusion that the objection can be raised to the 'unitary organisation of the world,' which is certainly imminent, 'from the standpoint of liberty, that it will leave no place to which one might emigrate.' The Kantian ideal of the abolition of truly 'external' wars, which would be attained in a World State, has its reverse side: the place of external wars would be taken by internal 'police actions,' the character of which would approximate very closely to the extermination of pests.

"This tendency of a world organisation to become 'totalitarian' in consequence of its structure, has been frequently characterised—the evaluation given to it having been just as often positive as negative. There is Lenin's dictum: 'The whole of society will be *one* office and *one* factory, with the same work and the same wages' . . . ; there is an 'organizational socialism' which hails the 'world labour army' as an already imminent phenomenon. There are, on the other hand, the utterances of the aged Jacob Burckhardt to Friedrich von Preen, which speaks of the 'great future authority' which nobody knows and which does not yet know itself, but for which all-levelling radicalism is preparing the way there is the pronouncement of a modern politician (Herman Rauschnig) that 'The world is developing in the direction of an absolute centre of power, a universal absolutism.' And as regards the prospects of the 'resistance of liberty, the conjecture has already been expressed, and it will doubtless find an echo in the sense of the future of many discerning contemporaries: 'Out of every struggle for the preservation of liberty, the substance

of liberty emerges in some measure diminished, because, in order to be able to defend it effectively against all its foes at all, a part of it must be surrendered, and this part is never again recovered.' [Peter de Mendelssohn in *Der Monat*, 2 Jg. (1949), p. 162.]

"It is of the essence of an *Imperium*, which encroaches upon existing kingships and nationhoods, and of the essence of the Caesar (says Erik Peterson) that institutions are burst asunder, that the forms of social life rooted in tradition are dissolved and replaced by freshly erected constructions and forms; this can be gathered from the inner structure of the *Imperium Romanum* (the Jews say, we have no king but Caesar). But because 'in the *Imperium* the basis of all institutions has been abandoned, a situation arises in the religious sphere as well, indeed above all, which is new in principle. The notion of the controversy between Church and State . . . loses its validity in an *Imperium*. There is no longer controversy, but 'conflict': The cult of the old States could afford to be tolerant, the cult of the emperor had necessarily to become intolerant.' This analysis . . . provides a pointer to the internal situation of a World Empire at the end of time, whose prefigurations are by no means unfamiliar to contemporary man. The very structure of the World Empire seems to bring with it, as a kind of negative opportunity, the likelihood that the public position of the Church will change, as by an automatic redirection of current. The possibility of penetrating and moulding public orders from the spiritual sphere will *cease* to exist; but a corrective power at the highest level of intensity, and not restricted by any bonds of tradition, will confront the Church in its role of *ecclesia martyrum*. This danger, which is determined by objective circumstances themselves,—will then—so runs tradition—be kindled to its extreme realisation by the *person of the Antichrist*, who comes in the name of the angel who fell through his *will to power* and in whose 'ego-proclamations the history of human auto-apotheosis reaches its demonic acme.' . . . Precisely *because* of his extreme claim to power Antichrist will be accepted: 'If the other shall come in his own name, him ye will receive.' (St. John 5, 48).—[From *The End of Time* by Josef Pieper. (Tr. by Michael Bullock).]

### "Minimal Government"

" . . . the historical problem of our day is and remains the establishment of *minimal* government—from-above assuring and maintaining personal liberty. This issue cannot be shirked or permanently delayed by preserving the illusory fluidity of democratic institutions which have *final* control of the central government. Sooner or later this flux will congeal into the tyranny or the virtual dictatorship of a mass-party. Little it matters whether such rule is based on repeated elections won through permanent appeals to the lower half of the social pyramid, or whether it rests squarely, as in the 'People's Democracies,' on the efficiency of a ubiquitous police. . . . Since only real *élites* have a genuine psychological and intellectual interest in liberty, it is evident that they must have a position in political life which is more substantial than their numerical share. Needless to say, we do not identify such *élites* with classes or castes; they are the people capable of creative action. And creation as well as creativeness stands in constant need of liberty."

—Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn.

## The History of Liberty

In terms of institutions and legislation, Greece and Rome had an imperfect conception of freedom. They knew how to manipulate power, but not how to achieve liberty. 'The vice of the classic State was that it was both Church and State in one. Morality was undistinguished from religion and politics from morals; and in religion, morality, and politics there was only one legislator and one authority. The citizen was subject to the State as the slave was to his master, and nothing was deemed sacred apart from the public welfare. But where their institutions failed, their philosophy succeeded. At a time when their governments were most absolute, their theories called for a mixed constitution. They saw that any single principle of government standing alone, whether monarchy, aristocracy or democracy, was apt to be carried to excess, and that only in a distribution and balance of powers was liberty secure. All the philosophers of antiquity displayed the same theoretical boldness and practical timidity. Socrates urged men to submit all questions to the judgment of reason and conscience, and to ignore the verdict of authority, majority or custom. Yet he would not sanction resistance. 'He emancipated men for thought, but not for action,' and he fell victim to the old superstition of the State. Plato taught the supremacy of a divine law 'written in the mind of God,' and Aristotle applied it, in the form of the doctrine of a mixed constitution, to practical government. But neither Plato nor Aristotle dared to conceive of liberty as justice rather than expediency. Plato 'perverted' the divine law when he limited it to the citizens of Greece, refusing it to the slave and the stranger. Aristotle perverted it by putting good government higher than liberty. They did not see that liberty was not a means to a higher political end but was itself the highest end, that 'it is not for the sake of a good public administration that it is required, but for security in the pursuit of the highest objects of civil society and of private life.'

The Stoics pushed the theory of liberty one step forward with the doctrine of a law of Nature that was superior to the law of nations and the will of the people. 'The great question,' they taught, 'is to discover, not what governments prescribe, but what they ought to prescribe; for no prescription is valid against the conscience of mankind and the conscience of mankind knows no distinctions between Greek and barbarian, rich or poor, slave and master. Men are equal in rights as in duties, and human legislation can neither detract from the one nor add to the other. Thus the Stoics re-deemed democracy from the narrowness, the want of principle and of sympathy, which are its reproach among the Greeks. Augustine testified to their wisdom when he remarked, after quoting Seneca, 'What more could a Christian say than this Pagan has said?'

The Christian had, indeed, little more to say. There was hardly a truth in politics or ethics that had not already been enunciated before the new dispensation was revealed. It was left for Christianity, however, to animate the old truths, to make real the metaphysical barrier which philosophy had erected in the way of absolutism. The only thing Socrates could do in the way of a protest against tyranny was to die for his convictions. The Stoics could only advise the wise man to hold aloof from politics and keep faith with the unwritten law in his heart. But when Christ said, 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's,' he gave to the State a legitimacy it had never before enjoyed, and set

bounds to it that it had never yet acknowledged. And he not only delivered the precept but he also forged the instrument to execute it. To limit the power of the State ceased to be the hope of patient, ineffectual philosophers and became the perpetual charge of a universal Church.

The strange thing was that for long Christianity itself was unaware of its real mission. It hoped to avoid conflict with the State by remaining aloof from political disputes, and in the first centuries the doctrine of passive obedience and the temper of political quietism prevailed. When Constantine the Great converted the Empire to Christianity, he thought to strengthen his throne without relinquishing any of his authority. He and his successors used all the resources of Roman civilisation, the reasonableness and subtlety of Roman law, and the heritage of pagan authority to make the Church serve as a 'gilded crutch of absolutism.' What enlightenment there was in the philosophy of Socrates, in the wisdom of the Stoics or in the faith of Christianity could not withstand the incorrigible practices of antiquity. A tradition of self-government was lacking, and that tradition finally came into the West with the barbarian invasions.

The growth of liberty, the great achievement of the Middle Ages, came not from the forests of Germany, as one theory had it, nor from the Church itself, but from the conflict between the two: 'To that conflict of 400 years we owe the rise of civil liberty. If the Church had continued to buttress the thrones of the kings whom it anointed, or if the struggle had terminated speedily in an undivided victory, all Europe would have sunk under a Byzantine or Muscovite despotism. For the aim of both contesting parties was absolute authority. But although liberty was not the end for which they strove, it was the means by which the temporal and the spiritual power called the nations to their aid. . . .

The treasure stored up by the Middle Ages was dissipated by the Renaissance, when religion declined in influence and the State reasserted the sovereignty it had possessed in antiquity. Machiavelli's principle, that the end justifies the means, became the archstone of politics. Statecraft, it was discovered, was too perilous an undertaking to be hampered by the precepts of the copy-book. Even men of goodwill were persuaded by the logic of Machiavelli: 'They saw that in critical times good men have seldom strength for their goodness, and yield to those who have grasped the meaning of the maxim that you cannot make an omelette if you are afraid to break the eggs. They saw that public morality differs from private, because no government can turn the other cheek, or can admit that mercy is better than justice. And they could not define the difference, or draw the limits of exception; or tell what other standards for a nation's acts there is than the judgment which Heaven pronounces in this world by success.'

Kings embraced this doctrine with so much zeal that it was no longer possible to distinguish between good and bad. Not by isolated crimes, but by a studied philosophy of evil and a thorough perversion of the moral sense was absolute monarchy inaugurated. The Church made no attempt to resist the current of absolutism. Constitutionalism was in disrepute there as it was in the State, and Popes feared it no less than kings. Reverting to the Byzantine pattern, the ecclesiastical hierarchy entered into an association with Royalty which soon became a subjection to it. . . . (From *Lord Acton* by Gertrude Himmelfarb.)