

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 15.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

Conference

The Conference, arranged to take place at Moor Park College, Farnham, has been postponed indefinitely.

What Is Freedom?

If the Christian Campaign For Freedom has done nothing else, it has made plainer than it was, clearer and more intelligible, however deplorable, some features of the prevailing mental 'climate.' It has brought to light direct evidence, for example, that the Clergy (of several 'denominations' at least) live, think and act with complete regard for *the same* mental 'climate' as the laity, and not only the professedly Christian laity, but practically the whole of that section of the population which expresses what it deems to be its opinions at all. We hope that we may still do something to mitigate this effect.

Mr. Malcolm Muggeridge, the distinguished editor of *Punch*, broadcasting from Toronto on August 11 last, said it had given him great satisfaction some eighteen months before to have the opportunity of trying to revive the nineteenth century reputation for untrammelled criticism of "an allegedly humorous weekly magazine." He said: "The result was electric. Angry letters poured in accusing me, among other things, of being a Fascist, a Communist, an atheist, a bigot, an Americanophile, a republican, an anarchist, yes, and even a Bevanite. Even when the possible truth, or at any rate the plausibility, of a particular comment was admitted, it was condemned as being in the worst possible taste. . . ."

Voice is not even an 'allegedly' humorous journal, but we felt sympathetic towards Mr. Muggeridge in his complaint, and still more sympathetic when he went on to say: "Do you see what I am getting at? The exercise of a free, independent judgment is so out of keeping with the contemporary climate that it requires some explanation. Like a tumour or cancerous growth, it can exist at all only as a result of some abnormal condition capable of a simple diagnosis. . . . In this passion for thinking in terms of categories, I detect the clearest and most ominous symptom of the subordination of the individual to the collectivity. A voluntary uniformity, no less than an imposed one, prepares the way for servitude." Mr. Muggeridge thought people were never enslaved unless they had become slaves already. They swam into the mouth of the Great Leviathan: he did not need to chase them.

Despite the great trouble we have taken continuously in these pages to emphasise that true freedom is a product of a *practical* binding-back of social policies to natural Law, and the practice of integrity and responsibility of action, a 'voluntary uniformity' determines apparently that,

even extending to the Bench of Bishops, what we *say*, the real nature of the questions we *ask*, simply does not 'register.' What does it mean that, after two thousand years of Christian teaching, a clergyman, one who has the care of souls, can say: "In this question of freedom I am interested: but I am bewildered"? What can one think of a Bishop who says, in the face of the New Testament itself; "If we all did what we liked, we should have anarchy"? We have not said we should all 'do what we like.' We have said that a State cannot continue to exist which is not bound back to Law. Does the 'climate' of totalitarianism wash out the plain meaning of words?

In any case, we propose again and at length to answer the question: "What is freedom?"

Freedom may be hard to come by (there is an organised, consciously evil force in the world determined to destroy it), but it is, as the late C. H. Douglas said, "really a simple thing; it is the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time." We are talking about what freedom *is*; not what people do with their freedom, that is a separate thing. As the American evangelist, Billy Graham, has written:

"Freedom to choose or reject, freedom to obey God's commands or to go contrary to them, freedom to make himself happy or miserable. For it is not the mere possession of freedom that makes life satisfying—it is what we choose to *do* with our freedom which determines whether or not we shall find peace with God."

The prerequisite of being able to do anything with freedom is to have it. It is with the obtaining and preserving of freedom that we are concerned here, for the simple reason that freedom for the individual person is disappearing and is threatened with extinction. Despite the protestation of one clergyman, who wrote to us that he experienced true freedom shut up in a Japanese prison cell, we assert that the *basis* of a Christian society is destroyed exactly in proportion as individual freedom is destroyed. Any other conception of Christianity than that it is bound up with an expansion of individuality is either pure delusion or conscious perversion. Again, quoting Douglas:

"The 'mass' is unsaveable, just as a mob is insane ('without health'); the object of Anti-Christ is to keep mankind in ever larger mobs, thus defeating the object of Christ, to permit the emergence of self-governing, self-conscious individuals, exercising free will, and choosing good *because* it is good. The energising factor is attraction, inducement."^{*}

As the sacredness of human personality and the need for free expansion of individuality is one of the major premises of Christianity, no true Christian can say that the interests of the individual over the group are not paramount.

^{*}From *The Realistic Position of the Church of England* by C. H. Douglas, price 8d. from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.

This being so, the rights and wishes of minorities, whether they consist of two people or forty-nine *per cent.* of the population are every bit as important in principle as the rights and wishes of majorities. Any person who denies this or abandons it under pressure is denying or abandoning a Christian basis for society. This is an assertion that Christianity recognises the *primacy and formative* nature of ideas, and that this is the primary idea which should shape society; an idea which in fact makes of society an organism and not an organisation.

But this, like all ideas, is useless if it is not *practically* applied by Christians. Are the clergy going to give, in default of the bishops, a practical authoritative lead in this? If not, our situation is indeed grave. And what are the practical implications of the acceptance of these ideas?

One of our clerical correspondents asks, 'doesn't life in society depend entirely on a voluntary surrender of freedom by the individual?' Yes, of course it depends on a surrender of some measure of freedom. But people don't voluntarily associate in any form of society unless they expect or intend to gain an advantage by doing so, *i.e.*, a greater freedom. They cannot *voluntarily* surrender a freedom unless in the first place they have freedom to contract in or out of the association, *i.e.*, unless they have freedom of association. As Mr. Muggeridge said at Toronto, *habeas corpus* may become itself *habeas cadaver*. When people contract in they accept responsibility to abide by the laws of the association. If they do not retain the power to contract out of the association they have not only lost a freedom—the freedom of association, the freedom to associate or dissociate themselves from an undertaking—they have lost the basic condition on which the power to have freedom rests. It is precisely this basic condition of freedom which people lose, voluntarily or involuntarily, by accepting any form of socialism, *e.g.*, the Welfare State, and international socialism (World Government) through the surrender of the sovereignties and sanctions of single States to one world State. What we have witnessed this century and are still witnessing is a *constant* progression to this final, irretrievable state of loss of liberty—irretrievable, because all power to have freedom is surrendered and is lost.

Freedom is not merely a matter of possessing rights; the possessor of rights needs also the power to exercise them. So that if freedom is something to be possessed by all and not merely by a few it involves inevitably the distribution of power, and not its concentration. "It is not improper to say that Christianity is *inter alia* a technique by which a man, by control of his ideation, may gain such part of the world as in the nature of things appertains to him, and there is no injunction of which I am aware against that. But there is a warning. 'What shall it profit a man, if he gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?'"*

On the other hand Welfare Statism and socialism not only destroy freedom of association, either by destroying private ownership and enterprise or by controlling it, but also impose ideation on the individual by collective methods.

In the Christian conception the ideation proceeds from *each* individual, and is controlled by *each individual* through a knowledge and acceptance of Christian principles, the sole concession to Caesar being a *minimum* of social law and tribute such as is *practically* found necessary to protect individuals in society from the harmful acts of sinful persons

or groups of sinful persons. All education is regarded necessarily as part of religion and is *ultra vires* of the State. There is a recognition of immanent sovereignty "The kingdom of God is within you." Power is constrained, restricted and distributed.

In the Satanic conception, the ideation is imposed on the individual from without, and his obedience is constrained by a *maximum* of social law and tribute. Caesar claims all, and controls all, including information and education. The principle is extraneous sovereignty, the embodiment of which is in an "elect and chosen group," the bondsmen of the Father of Lies. Power is centralised. It is the policy of the religion of Judaism, and the policy is Communism and Socialism—it is the treatment of men as a collectivity. It is the policy, the fulfilment of which we are rapidly approaching in this country.

We have the pathetic, farcical and tragic position today of a large, and certainly the most influential section of the Church, claiming to be trying to 'save souls,' whilst openly siding with the Satanic conception of society. If the Church and society are to be saved from this corruption and ultimate destruction, at least that part of the Church which is now silent has to come out into the open on the side of the Christian conception of society.

We had an approximation to real freedom for a large section of society in the conditions which existed before the first World War. That section of society then had at its service a nearly perfect order system. It has been remarked that when Mr. Brown tendered his golden sovereign: "He set in motion the most marvellous train of self-acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else." It should be self-evident that with the great extension in labour saving devices and machinery allied to the harnessing of solar energy, which has progressively taken place since then, if the power of the golden sovereign (*i.e.*, purchasing power) had also progressively been distributed to the poor, whilst retaining the old order system, they too could progressively have enjoyed freedom with security. But then, as now, the Church remained silent. Unscrupulous Financial Interests were allowed to use the plight of the poverty-stricken industrial masses progressively to destroy that order system and institute the social welfare system in the place of extended freedom. The old order system, through increased taxation, was progressively used by Mr. Pink Geranium on behalf of Mr. Brown; then the order system itself was progressively destroyed, by the debasement of the currency, by the penalisation of private producers, by the institution of subsidies and indirect discriminatory taxation, by controls on producers and by the growth of Trades Union restrictive practices diluting the productivity of labour.

We now have something which with equal accuracy can be called the Welfare State, the Managerial State or the Work State.

If, instead of aiding and abetting the official Full Employment policy, the Church had aided the community to see that the true object of production is consumption, and that the displacement of human labour by the machine could be a blessing in the provision of creative leisure, in the place of mass production, mass opinion and mass amusement, we could have had individual choice, craftsmanship

*C. H. Douglas, *opus cit.*

and quality. May the bishops and clergy even now, at this late hour, say with Miss Dorothy Sayers: "if we conclude that creative mind is in fact the very grain of the universe. . . . We shall have to ask ourselves whether the same pattern is not also exhibited in the spiritual structure of every man and woman. And, if it is, whether, by confining the average man and woman to uncreative activities and an uncreative outlook, we are not doing violence to the very structure of our being."

We come back, therefore, to our definition of what freedom is: "the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time." This postulates at least: (1) That the *products* (not the administration) of the production system are controlled by the consumer, which can only happen if there are *independent* producers competing to cater for his needs. These producers must be free of government interference with either their administrative arrangements or the pricing of their products.

(2) That the employee is able to ensure reasonable conditions of work by having the freedom to move from one employer to another, no monopolies, State or otherwise.

(3) A recognition that the proper object of technological advance and labour-saving machinery is to release men and women from labour. Full Employment as a policy is false. In its place there should be a steady pursuit of a policy of paid leisure, endowment, with an education system adapted to prepare people for creative leisure—an education system free from State interference.

(4) A recognition that the power derived from the monopoly of credit creation and the misuse of that power has been the chief source of the evils from which we suffer; that this power must be broken together with the debt system which it has fostered, and made subservient to the needs of producers and consumers as exhibited in a national balance sheet, prepared by long established and well-tried principles practised by all business accountancy.

(5) A recognition that "The business of the Church in politics is to be the Authority of the Mills of God, which are, of course, *inter alia*, Political Principles which can be checked like and other genuine Laws, by their observed operation *over a sufficient period of time*."*

(6) A recognition that secret, anonymous balloting by an ignorant, propagandised and irresponsible electorate is no basis on which to found responsible government; and that in its place a system of responsible voting must be substituted.

(7) All property taxes, including estate duty, to be abolished; and any taxation that is necessary to be levied directly on income.

(8) All the professions and productive enterprises to be freed from Governmental control and interference.

Other measures are necessary, but the above will serve to indicate the *direction* in which we must go.

In our issue of October 9, we stated the Declaration which is enclosed with this issue in reverse in the form of eleven separate points; and we invited several thousand clergymen, if they disagreed with the Declaration, to put their signature against each point with which they disagreed. Not one of the clergy would deny the truth of even one of these points.

*C. H. Douglas, *opus cit.*

Point No. 10 of the Denial said:

A Christian is acting responsibly if he gives his electoral power to a politician, without binding him not to support any policy which destroys freedom to choose, other than specially provided for, *e.g.*, Defence of the Realm.

Although none of the clergy would sign this point, several of them wrote to say that at the next election they would vote for what they considered the better of the parties, notwithstanding whether their policies produced evil results and loss of freedom.

Among these were some who expressed agreement with everything else in the Declaration except this question of exemplary action. In the words of one of them it constituted "the evasion of responsibility and the consent by agreement to the least desirable candidates in an election being given the mandate." These correspondents have not taken account of the positive aspect of the exemplary action recommended. By giving support to "the lesser evil," but nevertheless evil policy, you are making yourself responsible for evil. By going to Hell at walking pace, instead of running, you are nonetheless going, and encouraging others, to go to Hell. It is the direction in which you are going which is all important. By publicly withdrawing your support and at the same time giving an undertaking that you will return it when you have an absolute assurance that your support will only be used to form policy which goes in the right direction, you are not evading responsibility, but agreeing to be responsible only for a Christian policy. Thus do you provide sanctions for the politician who wants to rebel against evil policies. There is really much more significance to the action than that: To quote the Dean of St. Paul's, "It may be that the final testing question for the Church is this: Does it through its members so manifest Christ that the sign of Jona is there for all to see?" It is exemplary action in politics which is required.

Point 3 said: It is *not* the responsibility of the Church to declare the truth in regard to policies which affect the power of the individual to choose.

We have to ask, if the clergy are not prepared to make this denial, then what are they going to do about it?

Democracy

The following further passage from *Liberty or Equality* by Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, edited by John P. Hughes (London—Hollis & Carter, 1952) concludes the extracts prepared (*Voice*, October 23):—

SHADOWS OF TYRANNY

The antinomy between the bitter reality of "politics" and the constitutional tradition are not the only factors in creating a certain cynicism and a general poisoning of the atmosphere in a democracy. Even more dangerous is the enforcement of the "common framework of reference"—the *bloc d'idées incontestables*, the "fund of indisputable ideas" as Leibholz calls it. This particular task of a democratic society is not only without spiritual perils, but it produces also a uniformity which can have adverse effects on the intellectual scene. The result is a lack of

"distance" between the person and society, which in this case is strongly annexationist; a secret police is conspicuously absent, but there are ostracism and boycott, the typical forms of persecution sanctioned by democratic society and directed against the non-conformist. Consider the numerous colloquial ("slang") expressions denoting a non-conformist prevalent in democratic civilisations: "Outsider" is still literary, but we have also such terms as "stuck-up," "stuffed shirt," "highbrow," "crackpot," "high-hat," and so on—as opposed to "ordinary, decent chap," "regular fellow," "regular guy," "square shooter," . . . The real ruler becomes "everybody," "they say so," "John Q. Public," "Mr. Average Man."

There is something essentially inhuman and even un-Christian in the masses and in the "this-worldly" aspects of society, which we do not necessarily find in the individual. Especially if a society harbours paganising tendencies and strays collectively from the path of truth and virtue, the vigilance of the person easily becomes paralyzed. Christopher Dawson writes:

It is the very function of the Christian to be moving against the world, and to be protesting against the majority of voices. And though a doctrine such as this may be perverted into a contempt of authority, a neglect of the Church and an arrogant reliance of self, yet there is a sense in which it is true, as every part of Scripture teaches. "Thou shalt not follow a multitude to do evil," is its uniform injunction. [Note: *The Tablet*, August 18, 1945.]

Everywhere we can here the exclamation: "There's nothing wrong about it; everybody does it!" And since the omnipotent society rules through the public praise of labels and shibboleths, we see as a result all heresies, mischievous actions, immoral propositions making their conquests under an elaborate camouflage, in order not to challenge openly the powerful forces of the social Behemoth which can be far more potent than the state Leviathan. Thus we see communism in the democratic orbit proclaiming itself, not as messianic atheist proletarianism but as "streamlined democracy" or as "Twentieth-Century Americanism" and Huey Long very penetratingly said that when fascism came to the United States it would call itself democracy. The lack of frankness and courage, as well as the powerful sway of collective myths, drains the essence from most notions. . . . We have likened the parliaments with their elections to race-courses in which finally, after many indecisive rounds, a real winner will appear. But the achievement of a real majority by one single party usually signals the very end of the constitutional process; in all likelihood a determined effort will be made to "freeze" this happy situation and to cancel the struggle for supremacy once and for all by constitutional amendments. Thus J. C. Bluntschli was right in pointing out two dangers of democratic republics: a. demagoguery and demagogues, b. *parties who are not curbed by any superior power.* . . .

It is not surprising that the "liberal heresy" is a much better foundation or lubricant for the smooth functioning of a democratic republic than a theology or philosophy insisting on absolutes. In the religious field the liberal heresy, in turn, harmonises best with *modern, liberal* Protestantism. Once we reject either the existence of absolute truth or its human attainability—and this is the essence, not of liberalism but of the "liberal heresy"—there can be no virtue attached to a stubborn defence of convictions of verities.

"Strait Gate and Narrow Way"

"The Sermon on the Mount in St. Matthew ends with a series of warnings against several kinds of self-deception (Matt. VII, 13-27). The first of these is the famous contrast between the two ways—to life or to destruction.

"We are to enter in through a narrow gate and walk along a contracted path, in contrast to the many who go along the wide way. There is certainly nothing in the Gospels to support the idea that the majority is likely to be right, or that public opinion is a safe guide for conduct." —(Dr. W. R. Matthews, Dean of St. Paul's, in *The Daily Telegraph*, October 16.)

The Moral Law

In reference to the case of the late Mr. Edward Pilgrim, who committed suicide after a plot of his land was compulsorily acquired on October 13, the Annual Assembly of the East Devon Congregational Union passed a resolution condemning the expropriation.

It said: "This man was compelled to sell his property, honestly acquired, under conditions which left him with heavy debt and robbed him of his assets. The Assembly believes this to be against the natural, moral and Divine law with which national law should be made to accord."

Full Employment Policy

Sir—A recent visit to Devonport led me to recall how in the nineties I served as "mate" to an elderly shipwright. Then I learned that a warship was simply built by the two of us, plus a labour squad with drillers, riveters and caulkers and with the use of simple machines.

Later in life my work for merchant ships helped me to realise that some 34 trades were engaged, and that to prevent "poaching" a large book of rules, needing a lifetime of study, was laid down as rigidly as the Iron Curtain. This "demarcation," meant to keep certain jobs for certain men, adds approximately 50 per cent. to the cost of a ship. —From a letter by Sir Westcott Abel in *The Daily Telegraph*.

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.

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