

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 17.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

VOICE

A JOURNAL OF STRATEGY FOR PERSONAL,
POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

"Freedom consists in the ability to choose one thing at a time."

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.

First Fruits

In our first issue we discussed action that was necessary to establish the correct relation between the individual and the group, and we said, "We, ourselves, have for long felt that it should not have fallen to laymen to take up a task which obviously belongs to the Spiritual Authority, and we know that in an earlier age it would not have been necessary. . . . The Spiritual Authority in this land is silent."

In our second issue we said, "If Truth is ever again to be a dominant force in politics it has to be demonstrated as a principle of action."

With our third issue we sent a covering letter to the English Bishops and thousands of the clergy. It said, "The Christian Campaign For Freedom has been inaugurated because a large number of laymen recognise the imperative necessity of referring all legislation to the judgment of Authority."

"The foundations of Christian civilisation in Great Britain—the Common Law, Justiciary, culture, even the separation of powers in its unwritten constitution (which now exists in little more than name)—were due to the growth and firm establishment over against Power, of Authority reflected in the Church."

In subsequent issues we dilated on this subject at length, and many thousands of the clergy of all denominations were continually approached by us from headquarters and by our readers in this country, the Dominions and elsewhere.

We have had a measure of support, mainly passive, from some of the Bishops and clergy of the Church of England and from the Moderator of one of the Free Churches. On November 2, seven months after the start of our activities—the Pope addressed two hundred and fifty Cardinals, Archbishops and Bishops in Rome. We publish below the official English translation of what he said, in its relevant parts, as printed in the *Tablet* for November 13.

Here is the way that governments and society can be bound back to God's Law. Here is the justification and vindication of what we are doing and what we are asking our readers to do. Neither the actions of the electorate, nor the

legislative enactments of the governments of the nations have been brought to the judgment of the Church and tested. This has been obvious for many years, and accounts for the rapid retrogression of all nations towards a pagan and communist society. Only now, when a lay body which has grown out of the publication of this paper takes vigorous action to bring this omission to the attention of the Bishops and clergy, is it given effective recognition. The directive has come from the Pope that the truth regarding the limits of 'temporal authority' (power) and of the right relation of the individual to society must be cried "from the rooftops." So it must be throughout Christendom. Let those among the Church leaders and the clergy who see the light speak now. True Christians will rally to them.

We ask again for a special and continuous effort from all our readers. Write to the local clergy and the Bishops and keep on pressing for action. Question them about the Law, and, if they refuse to express it, challenge them. Our activities at Headquarters are drastically curtailed by lack of funds. We ask that you should give us strength also in that way.

Our Roman Catholic readers are asked especially to continue to bring the Campaign to the notice of their Bishops and Priests.

The Pope's Address

Extracts from the Pope's Address to which reference is made in the foregoing are as follows:—

"But it is not our present purpose, venerable brothers, while We are addressing you, shepherds of your flocks, to sketch again a noble image and perfect pattern from the saintly Pontiff and shepherd [St. Pius X]. We wish rather—as We did with the teaching power and priesthood of Bishops—to mention some points which, especially in Our times, demand the interest, voice and activity of a dedicated shepherd.

"And first, there are some noticeable attitudes and tendencies of mind which presume to check and set limits to the power of Bishops (the Roman Pontiff not excepted), as being strictly the shepherds of the flock entrusted to them. They fix their authority, office and watchfulness within certain bounds, which concern strictly religious matters, the statement of the truths of the faith, the regulation of devotional practices, administration of the Sacraments of the Church, and the carrying out of liturgical ceremonies. They wish to restrain the Church from all undertakings and business which concerns life as it is really conducted—'the realities of life,' as they say. In short, this way of thinking in the official statements of some lay Catholics, even those in high positions, is sometimes shown when they say: 'We are perfectly willing to see, to listen to, and to approach Bishops and priests in their Churches, and regarding matters within their authority; but in places of official and public

business, where matters of this life are dealt with and decided, we have no wish to see them or to listen to what they say. For there, it is we laymen, and not the clergy—no matter of what rank or qualification—who are the legitimate judges.'

"We must take an open and firm stand against errors of this kind. The power of the Church is not bound by the limits of 'matters strictly religious,' as they say, but the whole matter of the natural law, its foundation, its interpretation, its application, so far as their moral aspects extend, are within the Church's power. For the keeping of the Natural Law, by God's appointment, has reference to the road by which man has to approach his supernatural end. But, on this road, the Church is man's guide and guardian in what concerns his supreme end. The Apostles observed this in times past, and afterwards, from the earliest centuries, the Church has kept to this manner of acting, and keeps it today, not indeed like some private guide or adviser, but by virtue of the Lord's command and authority. Therefore, when it is a question of instructions and propositions which the properly constituted shepherds (*i.e.* the Roman Pontiff for the whole Church, and the Bishops for the faithful entrusted to them) publish on matters within the natural law, the faithful must not invoke that saying (which is wont to be employed with respect to opinions of individuals): 'the strength of the authority is no more than the strength of the arguments.' Hence, even though to someone, certain declarations of the Church may not seem proved by the arguments put forward, his obligation to obey still remains. This was the mind, and these are the words of St. Pius X in his Encyclical Letter *Singulari Quadam* of September 24, 1912 (AAS, vol. 4, 1912, p. 658): 'Whatever a Christian man may do, even in affairs of this world, he may not ignore the supernatural, nay, he must direct all to the highest good as to his last end, in accordance with the dictates of Christian wisdom; but all his actions, in so far as they are morally good or evil, that is, agree with, or are in opposition to, divine and natural law, are subject to the judgment and authority of the Church.' And he immediately transfers this principle to the social sphere: 'The social question and the controversies underlying that question . . . are not merely of an economic nature, and consequently such as can be settled while the Church's authority is ignored, since, on the contrary, it is most certain that it (the social question) is primarily a moral and religious one, and on that account must be settled chiefly in accordance with the moral law and judgment based on religion.' (*ibid.*, pp. 658, 659).

"Many and serious are the problems in the social field—whether they be merely social or socio-political, they pertain to the moral order, are of concern to conscience and the salvation of men; thus they cannot be declared outside the authority and care of the Church. Indeed, there are problems outside the social field, not strictly 'religious,' political problems, of concern either to individual nations, or to all nations, which belong to the moral order, weigh on the conscience and can, and very often do, hinder the attainment of man's last end. Such are: the purpose and limits of temporal authority; the relations between the individual and society, the so-called 'totalitarian state,' whatever be the principle it is based on; the 'complete laicization of the State' and of public life; the complete laicization of the schools; war, its morality, liceity or non-liceity when waged as it is today, and whether a conscientious person

may give or withhold his co-operation in it; the moral relationships which bind and rule the various nations.

"Common sense, and truth as well, are contradicted by whoever asserts that these and like problems are outside the field of morals, and hence are, or at least can be, beyond the influence of that authority established by God to see to a just order and to direct the consciences and actions of men along the path to their true and final destiny. This she is certainly to do not only 'in secret,' within the walls of the Church and sacristy, but also in the open, crying 'from the rooftops' (to use the Lord's words, Matt. 10, 27), in the front line, in the midst of the struggle that rages between truth and error, virtue and vice, between the 'world' and the kingdom of God, between the prince of this world and Christ its Saviour."

The Visionary Glean

In the Autumn issue of *The Periodical*, the organ of the Oxford University Press for announcing new publications, Dr. Arnold Toynbee has a short essay entitled "On finishing a Study of History."

He tells us that this work has taken him 33 years and 10 months—longer than it takes to bring up a family or to saw through a redwood tree without the help of wedges. And he isn't finished yet: he has a 'History of Greek Civilization' and a 'History of Religion' to come.

When he started to write "A Study of History," he says that he had little use for traditional Christianity or for any religion at all. But now he finds that "every one of us has a religion all the time." What, he asks, is "even the whole of any single human being's life-work but one tiny contribution to mankind's vast work for God's glory?"

His own contribution is designed to help his contemporaries to see history in the light of a revolutionary change. The whole habitable surface of our planet, he says, has shrunk together into "one world" and for the first time "the whole of history can be seen synoptically as a unity."

In support of this, in principle, he quotes St. Paul (Acts XVII, 26), "God hath made of one blood [the Revised Version omits the word "blood"] all nations of men for to dwell in all the face of the Earth and hath determined the times before appointed [R.V. "having determined their appointed seasons"] and the bounds of their habitations"; and he thinks that St. Paul's Athenian contemporaries might have taken more notice of this because "both he and they were living in one of those oecumenical empires that have been anticipations of the future world state"—the "visionary glean" which Dr. Toynbee says he is following and intends to follow so long as he remains *compos mentis*.

Apart from the fact that the world has not shrunk—we merely have quicker communication and transport and this has nothing to do with real unity—it seems that if Dr. Toynbee had quoted his text with its context he might have avoided an error.

St. Paul began by saying, "God that made the world and all things therein, seeing that he is the Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is he worshipped [R.V. 'served'] with men's hands as though he needeth anything, seeing that he giveth to all life

(Continued on page 3.)

Question and Answer

We have repeatedly asked, and we again ask every reader of this paper to enter into correspondence with the Bishops, Deans and clergy on the vital questions discussed in these pages. It is the special responsibility of the Bishops and clergy, not only to know the answers, but to give guidance on these questions. Nothing can bring this home to them better than by repeatedly asking for this guidance by repeated questioning. This aspect of the campaign which we are conducting, at least at this stage, is of primary importance. The publication and distribution of *Voice* is complementary to this activity. There is not one reader who cannot ask questions—his own questions—and press for a reply. There are far too few doing it.

In the correspondence published below there are a number of questions left unasked and others unanswered. We hope that they will be followed up. The letters are published to encourage others to enter actively into the spirit of the campaign. Perhaps nothing about the Campaign is more striking than the revelation that where initiative and preaching "from the rooftops" should be there is only passive agreement with the need for the campaign.

We omit the names of individuals from what follows:—

15/10/54.

"Dear —,

"Thank you for your letter and enclosures. I have been receiving copies of *Voice*, I presume from the issuing office, and lately had the October 9 number with its appeal for signatures.

"I entirely agree with the main contention of the Campaign, that individual liberty is gravely invaded by the State and in real danger of dwindling to vanishing point.

"But I should find it difficult to sign the Declaration, which seems to suffer from over-simplification. Some terms used, also, need definition, e.g. Authority.

"But I do wish success to the movement.

"Yours truly,
" —, Bp."

[Correspondent's reply:]—

20th October, 1954.

"Dear Lord Bishop,

"I write to thank you very much indeed for your letter of the 15th *instant* and for your sympathetic consideration of the policy of the Christian Campaign for Freedom.

"With regard to your comment that the issues tend to be over-simplified, it is our viewpoint that fundamentally they are of the simplest and that any attempt to elaborate unduly would, in our opinion, do nothing but cause confusion in the minds of those we are endeavouring to reach.

"You mention also the need for the definition of, e.g. 'Authority,' and on this point I am enclosing, in case you have not received it, a copy of *Voice* dated August 14, 1954 and would refer you to the article 'What is Authority?'

"Yours sincerely, —."

[Later]

3rd November, 1954.

"Dear Lord Bishop,

"Further to my letter of the 20th *ultimo*, I thought you would be interested in the comments of the Bishop of Wakefield in the latest issue of *Voice*, enclosed.

"Also, may I respectfully enquire whether you would agree to your letter to me of the 15th *ultimo* being published in *Voice* (copy herewith), and, what alterations or additions you consider to be necessary to the Declaration (a) for the sake of clarity and (b) to gain widespread assent and co-operation in the Church.

"Yours sincerely, —"

[Reply]

6th November, 1954.

"Dear —,

"Thank you for your letter. I entirely agree with what the Bishop of Wakefield has written, especially 'The issue is not as easy as these general resolutions imply.' As I wrote in my letter they suffer from over-simplification, particularly in the statement that 'all political parties . . . offend against the law.'

"The elector has the choice between two parties and has to decide which of the two advocates a policy which most tends to restrict freedom of the individual. By merely abstaining from voting he will probably be aiding the party in favour of increased restrictions and so defeating his own object.

"I should not like my letter published over my name, as I do not want to be involved in correspondence; but there would be no objection to your quoting from it as the views of 'a bishop.'

"Yours sincerely, —, Bp."

[Reply]

15th November, 1954.

"Dear Lord Bishop,

"Thank you very much indeed for your letter of the 6th *instant* and for your co-operation in allowing the Editor of *Voice* to quote from you anonymously. This is very much appreciated.

"In as much as all political parties seek to impose or refuse to withdraw restrictions endangering individual freedom, they are offending against the Law of God. As a voter who believes in such freedom, the *only* sanction I have is to vote *against* the only two parties who put themselves forward as desiring to represent me—or should I say, more correctly—desiring me to support their policies. If these restrictions are contrary to God's Law then surely, as Christians, we cannot compromise with those who seek to impose them—not even with the lesser of the two evils. 'Those who are not with me are against me.'

"Yours sincerely, —"

THE VISIONARY GLEAM— (continued from page 2.)
and breath and all things." Then comes the passage quoted by Dr. Toynbee and this is followed by the injunction that "they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him and find him, though he be not far from any one of us. For in him we live and move and have our being . . .

for we are also his offspring . . . therefore we ought not to think that the Godhead is like gold or silver or stone, graven by art or man's device."

From this it appears that neither the work of one man nor of mankind as a whole can contribute or add to God's glory: at best, it can only reflect it. As for the rest of the passage, however, it looks like 'one world' with a vengeance, although it is hard to believe that St. Paul had the creation of a 'world state' in mind. Jesus Himself had, in fact, already refused the Devil's offer of one ("My Kingdom is not of this world"), being primarily concerned that men should know the truth and thereby be set free to choose and act accordingly. With this achieved, there need be no anxiety regarding the form that society will assume; a sufficiency of free, enlightened and responsible citizens caring for their fellows will see to that.

Those who follow the 'visionary gleam' of a world state would do well to make sure that they are not seeking to determine the "seasons" and set the "bounds" for free men; that they are not trying to confine the Godhead in some graven image or rigid mould of their own devising and for their own glorification.

Since Rome was an œcumenical empire, and since Dr. Toynbee mentioned St. Augustine in his essay, it might be profitable to recall the famous comparison between Rome and *Civitas Dei*—the City of God.

St. Augustine wrote:—"Ye were proud, O Romans, of your city. Ye called her eternal, imperial, divine. But her history has rebuked your pride and proved her deities false. There is another city so glorious in ideal and achievement that yours may not be named beside her. Two cities began to be with man, founded by two loves. The one by the love of self, even to the despising of God; the other by the love of God, even to the despising of self. The first is the city of the earth whose greatest creation was Rome, which glories in self and seeks glory from man; but the second is the heavenly city, whose greatest glory is God, whose witness is conscience.

"In the one city its princes and people are ruled by the love of ruling: in the other city the princes and subjects serve one another in love. This city is co-extensive with the good, comprehends all the saints of earth, has created all its virtues and graces, all its truth and righteousness and love.

"It is the true divine city, for it is built by the only true God; it is alone eternal for it shares the eternity of its Builder. The city of Rome ruled the bodies and died through the vices of its people, but this city rules the spirits and lives through the virtues of its citizens, the saints of God."

T. N. MORRIS.

"For Many Shall Come In My Name . . ."

The following is from *Human Events*, published in Washington, D.C., October 6, 1954:—

"AS WE EXPECTED: In August we pointed out that Secretary Dulles had approved visas admitting clerics from Europe who have collaborated one hundred *per cent.* with the Kremlin, to attend a meeting of the World Council of Churches at *Evanston*. We knew that these ministers had

been hand-picked by the Kremlin (otherwise they would not have been allowed to come from behind the Iron Curtain) and that many of them had employed their spiritual office to defend Russian policies in the world—and that some had even charged that our troops in Korea had engaged in germ warfare.

"We knew that the ministerial delegation from behind the Iron Curtain was here for only one purpose—to contaminate the Christian churches of the free world. Now we have expert corroboration on this point from Dr. Carl McIntire, President of the International Council of Christian Churches. He lists what the Communist clergy 'did and gained in the World Council of Churches' at Evanston in August.

"(1) The Communist clergy increased their strength on the powerful Central Committee which directs the affairs of the Council between assemblies. Prior to the Evanston meeting, the Committee included two Communist-dominated ministers. At Evanston two more were added. According to the testimony of refugees, one of the latter had been a member and official of the Communist party. When the other was chosen the Polish Embassy in Washington released a statement by this minister praising the Communist government and reporting the official resolution of his church defending the Communists in their charges against the West.

"(2) Re-election of Professor Joseph L. Hromadka, recognised as one of the principal Protestant defenders of Communism, to the Central Committee was a smashing victory for Communism.

"(3) The Communist clergy secured recognition of Communist-controlled churches on an equal level with non-Communist churches. Their presence in Evanston 'established . . . that churches dominated by Communists may, if they come in the name of Christ, receive the right hand of fellowship.'

"(4) The Communist-controlled ministers at Evanston have 'betrayed the true Christian Church and been responsible for the persecution and suffering of true Christians in their lands,' says McIntire. But when charges were made against them in the press and representatives of the Czech government-in-exile gathered in protest outside of the hall, 'public apology was made to these Iron Curtain men before all the Assembly of the Council by the Archbishop of Canterbury.'

"(5) The Assembly actually held by resolution that these Iron Curtain ministers 'in supporting the Communist order, were loyal to Christ.'

"(6) The Communist clergy were successful in preventing passage of resolutions warning of the infiltration of Communists into churches in the free world and of the program of the Communist party to use the Church outside of Iron Curtain countries for its advantage. Evanston was silent on this theme."

CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM

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

Funds for the Campaign are urgently needed.

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