

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 18.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18, 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.

### Chaplain To The State

It was Voltaire who wrote to Catherine the Great's Minister in 1768: "It is only your illustrious sovereign who knows how to reign; she pays the priests; she opens or closes their mouths at her pleasure."

When Mr. C. L. Berry of Wakefield moved a motion in the Church Assembly that bishops and deans should be appointed by the Sovereign on advice from ecclesiastical persons in the Privy Council, instead of by the Prime Minister, or his adviser, it was eventually so amended, with the assistance of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London, that no principle remained in it. Furthermore the Archbishop subsequently made it clear that the debilitated motion would receive so low a priority in Church business that it was virtually shelved. The Assembly accepted the Archbishop's assurance that the Prime Minister always consulted him and that there was little likelihood of an unsuitable appointment. As the Archbishop was himself appointed on the advice of the Prime Minister's adviser, as all the bishops and their predecessors for many generations, an independent, objective observer can quite understand that the cumulative effect of these appointments is to create a climate of Church opinion not dissimilar to that which obtains in Downing Street on what is or is not a suitable or unsuitable appointment. Such a point of view was not even aired in the Assembly.

"There is a saying that when a man gets gaiters he changes in a mysterious way. That is because he is now part of something which has put him where he is and in honour he cannot really do much about it but line up." These words of one of our clerical correspondents represent the views of a number of others who have written to us. And so is reflected among the clergy in the Church that same plague of petty loyalties noticeable in the lay world, which are allowed to supersede the greater loyalty. "And he that taketh not his cross, and followeth after me, is not worthy of me." Lord Selborne said that "the man-in-the-street looked upon bishops and deans as government officials, and that this was an impediment to preaching the Gospel." It is not mere coincidence, that, as a number of the clergy have written to tell us, the Church of England is being

"organised as a chainstore"; while the parson's freehold is being destroyed, bishops are chosen for their administrative abilities and 'good mixers' are encouraged as recruits to the ministry.

This is the body, whose voice, when heard, supports the Welfare State and World Government, slavishly imitating the voice of the State. Even in the simple case of horror comics, as the Bishop of Coventry pointed out, the Church merely followed the lead given by others. This is the poor thing which the Christian man in England has as a chief bastion to guard him against the supreme tyranny—the completely unified State chained to a World Governor. If Christianity has to depend in this country on the *official* Church of England the saying of Chateaubriand at the beginning of last century is apt today: "The days of the desert have come back. Christianity will have to begin afresh in the sterility of the Thebaid, surrounded by a world of idolatry: man's terrible idolatry of himself.

As Lord Percy of Newcastle has said in *The Heresy of Democracy*, a book worthy of the attention of all who love freedom as the essential way to God, there is being constructed "a power plant to be driven by men who all think alike"; nothing must be allowed to disturb the crucial alchemy which is "to fuse the people into one, and, mould them into a single General Will." And to that end 'religion' and education must be subordinated—to quote the ex-Jacobin Fichte: "Progress is that perfection of education by which the Nation is made Man." Indeed it has been truly described as "Democracy's characteristic Mark of the Beast"—a uniform State education. To such fell victim, under the name of *Gleichschaltung*, the poor dupes of Hitler's persuasive enthusiasm, supported by the unholy trinity of Schacht, Norman and Baruch, only to be sacrificed in a war which International Finance wanted in the interests of a greater unity.

Once again we celebrate the advent of Christ and the Christian message into the world. If the spirit of this message is the spirit of love, love of the truth, because the truth is of God, it is a love which cannot be enforced; if it is love it is a love, not from the senses, but from the understanding; if it is love it is love not *only* of self-interest, but love which reconciles self-interest with and embraces it as part of a greater whole which is God's kingdom. And if we seek not God's kingdom we have lost faith, hope and charity. "There can after all," says Lord Percy, "be no deeper contrast than between the temper of Christian brotherhood and this civic altruism [the Welfare State] which so complacently normalises compulsion." The Welfare State is not Christianity. It is "one of the corrupting tendencies of State Planning: its tendency to dissolve a personal sense of duty into a compulsory 'sentiment of sociability'—a 'social conscience' which is directed by the State is limited to what the State can effectively undertake, and has, consequently, no immediate relation to personal conduct."

The Christian conception of society is not an ideal: it is the conception based on an ascertainment of truth—of the reality of God's kingdom underlying all social forms, to which society should conform, not fall away. It is not idealistic, it is real. Neither is it just a 'social gospel'; it is only so in so far as none other than the Christian form of society leaves men free individually from all but the barest compulsions that are necessary to protect the members of society from evil-doers. The freedom which they then have is the *essential* basis on which Christianity, or Christian ideas, can guide the individual person, according to his capacity, in the development of his individuality.

A bishop has said that a man can be a Christian even if he is a slave. What does this mean? What is a Christian? Did Christ come into the world that men might be called Christians? Or, did He come to show us the way to the kingdom of Heaven? "Not everyone that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." There is no promise of the kingdom to those who merely believe, but only to those who do the works which follow from the understanding derived from correct belief. "Woe unto you, scribes and pharisees, hypocrites: for ye shut up the kingdom of heaven against men:" Tyrants, particularly modern tyrants, with the aid of the scribes and pharisees, take good care and are adept at enslaving men mentally as well as physically. For that reason they control education and information and that is the purpose of propaganda. Can a man so enslaved be a Christian in the sense that he is consciously and correctly striving by his works to seek the kingdom of God?

"Still more, the would-be Free World of today may usefully remember that, in the last two thousand years, the ideas of a good life and the perfection of humanity have acquired a new meaning and a new reality in human thought: that, in that thought, freedom has become the individual's way of access to God, and the moral order no more, but no less, than, as it were, the hedges that mark the outer limits of his way; that, within these limits, the freedom of the individual has been chiefly prized (to vary the metaphor) as the means to a re-creative change in man's very nature; and that this change has been conceived as accomplishing itself in a form of association which is neither the State, nor can it be produced out of the State by any extension or refinement of its law.

"This belief, since it first came into men's minds, has been at the heart of their love of liberty; it had been the intellectual foundation of all genuine philosophies of freedom. From it have emerged all those forms of dualism which are fused into the political life of the British commonwealth of nations: not only the dualism between Church and State, but the dualism between Crown and Parliament, between local and national self-government, between State services and voluntary co-operation. By contrast, without it, liberty has been little more than an opportunist catchword of many meanings; never a political principle which can command the intellectual assent of successive generations of citizens, or give a consistent direction to the policy of governments. Without it, liberty has been the party motto both of conservatives who are at ease in Zion and of radicals who envy them their ease; it has been the battle-cry both

of oppressed nationalists, in revolt against alien rule, and of liberated nationalists, bent on the conquest of new territory; it has been the prudential maxim both of economists intent upon the optimum production of wealth in a competitive world and of industrial corporations equally intent on eliminating competition—but in none of these guises can it be an answer to the religious gospel of communism. Indeed, has it not been the characteristic slogan of all those 'bourgeois' revolutions which Marx recognised as the forerunners of communism itself?"

Society is confronted with three inescapable facts, although it does not realise it; the practical necessity for some measure of government, a Moral Law which is inexorable, and an immanent sovereignty which is personal to each individual, and which however inchoate is the medium for God's purpose. A realistic constitution is one which conforms with this trinitarian reality.

History demonstrates that the Church has recognised this trinity as cognate reality, as a trinity in unity, in that the Church has consecrated sovereigns as the head of executive power in the State; has dedicated itself to seek the truth concerning the Moral Law, to be a repository of knowledge concerning it and to be the guide to governments in securing obedience to it; and has entered into 'holy communion' with the people, whose education it has recognised as part of religion. The Christian philosophy of government is thus, not dualistic as postulated by Lord Percy of Newcastle, but trinitarian. A trinity which reposes power in the Executive to initiate and execute legislation; power in the Church, not to execute, but to express authority; power in the people via a legislature to refuse consent, by withholding supply, to legislation—a negative power. A society thus bound back to reality would be a stable, happy society, ensuring to its individual members an optimum power to choose or refuse. Obedience to the Moral Law produces contentment, and for that reason would a Church sanctified by truth and performing its role in society have authority with people and government. No such stability or contentment is evident today; and if bishops and clergy had true humility they would take note of it and know the reason.

A Church which is in true communion with the Sovereign will express the Moral Law to the Government; a Church which is in true communion with the people will express the Law to them and advise them to withhold consent to legislation which violates the Law. A Church which is sanctified by truth will do its duty; if it does not do so, as is the case today, it is unfaithful to God.

There are many groups among us seeking to mobilise the will of the people on this, that or the other. They are all power groups, and as such open to capture by power seekers. The will of the people expressed in power only has truth in it when it is expressed negatively. Only thus does it constrain power, and only thus has it spontaneity.

"... for, behold, I bring you tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.

"For unto you is born this day in the city of David a Saviour."

The hope of salvation for the world is in a Church reanimated by truth. It will not just happen; someone has to do it.

*From The Pendulum of Politics*

by AUBREY JONES

(Faber &amp; Faber Limited, London, 1946).

## (Ch. II. GOD OVERTHROWN.)

... It has been customary in England, while readily according the description 'revolutionaries' to the Bolsheviks, to withhold it from the National-Socialists. The explanation would appear to be that the term 'revolution' is taken to refer to the end as well as to the means. If the end proclaims itself noble, however violent and destructive the means, then the movement will be acknowledged a 'revolution'; and the people, despite themselves, will feel a sneaking sympathy for it. But if the end is thought ignoble the movement will be whole-heartedly condemned; and the people will deny to it its just character of a revolution. I say 'its just character,' because what makes a revolution is the trait of destructiveness, a trait which is the result of the means used and which the nobility of the end can do nothing whatever to mitigate.

... What I now wish to emphasise is this: that if there are two movements, both of which are unprincipled in their means, but one of which promises in its end to be noble and the other ignoble, both will finish up exactly the same in character; both will bear the impress, not of their diverse ends, but of their common means; both, in short, will be ignoble in an equal degree.

... the distinction between means and ends is a false and a misleading one.

For means are not a phase through which men pass and from which, finally, they emerge immaculate, ready to grasp the all-justifying end. They and their end are what their means make them. Is anyone who has committed deliberate murder a fit person to reform society? By transgressing the most elementary rule of civilised society he disqualifies himself from improving society; just as the revolutionary who stoops to ignoble means thereby clouds and smothers in his soul the capacity to feel nobly.

## (Ch. III. MODERATES AS ACCOMPLICES IN CRIME.)

... Scientific discoveries might be labelled without qualification as good and beneficent, were their sole effect to induce men to be humble, to impress upon them their littleness and worthlessness amidst the majesty of creation. Such, however, is not their effect. Too often they lead, not to humility, but to arrogance, to a puffed-up claim that man is now master, that he can bend to his will forces of which he was formerly the prisoner. A sign of that arrogance in our own day is the primacy accorded to the scientist; it is he who is held up as the chief promoter of the nation's well-being. The first benefactor of a nation, however, is never the explorer of matter; it is he who keeps before the nation the eternal truths of the human soul. The nation that forgets that, which scorns the meekness that is the foundation of all goodness, is far gone in spiritual decay.

Scientific knowledge and mastery over nature are not in themselves salvation. The problem lying before the world is whether they can be made accessories of salvation, whether it is possible to enjoy them while retaining one's hold of spiritual values, or whether it is not in fact their nature to subvert salvation altogether. True salvation lies in dominating the material by the spiritual; while it is the mark

of science to turn away from the spiritual and to seek escape from the material in the material itself, to try—vainly—to satisfy desires that are infinite rather than to limit them.

... Just suppose that, in a society dominated by a material end, inequalities are forcibly ironed out; what is likely to happen? I suggest one, or a combination, of two things: individuals still animated by material motives to the exclusion of others are bound, after a space, to re-create inequalities as gross and as harsh as those that existed before; or society, acting in a collective capacity, but still pursuing material ends, will perpetrate injustices as great as, if not greater than, those committed by the most rapacious individuals. The outstanding fact is that, despite the changed arrangements, the spiritual quality of society will remain exactly the same—new arrangements will not make it change; and it is this, not laws, which in the end determines whether or not the members of that society are just and charitable towards one another.

... Where charity has withered, only one thing can make it flower again—a change in men's fundamental conceptions, a change by which they concentrate less on their present satisfaction and more on their common subordination to a power beyond them, a change that is of a religious order. It is the mark of Socialism that it promises exactly the same result from a change merely in certain external arrangements, as from a change that is of a political order. In this sense Socialism—moderate as well as revolutionary, for they are both shoots from the same stock—is a usurper of religion. . .

The materialist interpretation of history is nothing but a gigantic fraud, an elaborate façade to allow certain people to do whatever they like and to take the law into their own hands. The sure result of their thus acting is that the garden will be much more unlovely than it was before. He who accepts the materialist interpretation of history must, if he is logical, be prepared to go the whole hog; if he believes that laws and principles are merely the result of the selfish will of others, then there is nothing, except expediency, to stop him from breaking them right and left. Equally he who believes that laws and principles are to be respected, that they are vested with a more than earthly authority, must decisively reject the materialist interpretation of history. There is no half-way house.

Religious thought tars everybody, exploiter and exploited alike, with the same brush; it tries to equalise men by subjugating them all to a supreme external power. It is of the essence of Socialist thought, on the other hand, that it draws a distinction between some kinds of men and others, between exploiters and exploited; it promises that, when the latter have displaced the former, all will be well. . . .

There are, I know, large numbers of British Socialists who still remain faithful to their religion. They are, for the most part, pious Nonconformists and are to be found in the ranks of the trade unions. But the thought by which the British Labour movement is dominated has no grounding in religion; the chief exponents of that thought do not hesitate to proclaim themselves non-religious. The devout trade unionists are scarcely aware of the paradox of their position and are, in any case, inarticulate. It is the non-religious intellectuals who alone are vocal; what they say to-day will hold sway to-morrow. . . .

Doctrines are not, as Marx would have it, the product of material status; they are the product and the reflection of character. And those, who from whatever class, upper, middle, or lower, turn to Marxian, all testify to the same thing—their own moral degeneracy. The restraints of religion, of a 'good unattainable in this world, irk them too much; they ache and pine for release and lo and behold, Marxism comes along and gives them the excuse and justification for a rupture—the excuse that perfection belongs not to some far-off hypothetical life, but, if we would only see it, is here at hand, awaiting our grasp. And, in the glory of this vision, when the restraints and the abstinences are cast off, then, with Pablo Picasso, on his joining the French Communist Party, they murmur beatifically: "I have never felt more free, more complete." (*Daily Worker*, December 15, 1944). . . . But this freedom is attended not by the splendour that they foresee; rather it is a beckoner to evil, which, oozing forth, submerges the dykes that have held it and engulfs the converts themselves. . . .

### From "Crockford"

The following are extracts from the Preface to *Crockford's Clerical Directory* (1951-1952):—

[Commenting on the Archbishop of York's remarks on the decline in church attendance]. . . . "The root cause of the grave position is manifest; the Church is unable to attract people to listen to the Gospel and is unable to preach and teach it in a way which induces belief leading to action, when people hear it.

"Our age is characterized by a prevailing materialism and secularity of mind, constantly fostered by suggestion in a manifold variety of ways, and unconsciously absorbed. To any infected in this way, the fundamental beliefs of Christianity, not to say the Church's excessive concern with its own nature, claims, and polity, seem irrelevant and unmeaning. No level of education is wholly impervious to this poison and the lowest is the least immune; but at a level well above the average, there is the added conviction that the sciences yield knowledge of far greater reliability than the contents of any religious texts, and which makes possible and probable (if not certain) an alternative to any religious interpretation of existence and the significance of human life.

"To state and defend the faith with the weapons of reason, which the Archbishop of York so soundly proclaims to be essential, means, in face of the alleged alternative, and certainly powerful 'scientism,' and the prevailing mental dispositions, to be able to undermine the positions of these enemies of faith. 'The priests going on and blowing with the trumpets' will not suffice. It is essential to provide and vindicate a religious philosophy or natural theology which Christian faith can illumine and complete. It is vain to begin by proclaiming God as 'breaking into history from beyond history, in mighty acts of redemption and revelation' to people with no belief in God or in any meaning in human existence not exhausted in material welfare.

"Considerable sections of the Christian world, excepting the Roman Catholic Church, have for long been proclaiming the uselessness of all natural theology and of any natural moral law; and in these studies our own Church has few experts or clear expositors. Continuance in this departure

from the age-long tradition of the Church, and from common sense, will prove suicidal if it is not reversed."

[An Ancient Parable.]

"It is dangerously easy to be dismayed by the condition of the world; it is not easy to find great encouragement by surveying the present position and more immediate prospects of the Church. In conclusion we would refer our readers to the story of a trivial deal in real estate which interrupted the prophecies of Jeremiah (XXXII, 8-15), an every day occurrence since man first settled on the land. The incident owes its significance to the circumstances of Jerusalem at the time, which could hardly have been worse and to those of the prophet, which were worse. There is always great encouragement in the sight of people doing ordinary, simple duties when so much else seems depressing or half mad. An American of wide experience and ripe wisdom paraphrased these verses of Jeremiah, in their present context, thus:

"I did the familiar things, I remembered all who loved me, I thought of those whom I could still help; and I went to church and worshipped and said my prayers as I have always done, because the Christian religion shall still be believed and professed and practised in this our world."

### Three Masonries

"Freemasonry is a system for setting in motion a vast number of people and making them work in a cause unknown to them. The essence of this conception is delusion, deception and secrecy. 'It is the invariable rule of secret societies that the real authors never show themselves.' M. Copin Albancelli, a Freemason who reached the Rose-Croix degree, in his book, *Le Pouvoir Occulte Contre France*, gives it as his opinion that there are three Freemasonries, one above the other: Blue Masonry (*i.e.*, the three Craft Degrees), in which none of the real secrets are revealed to the members and which serves merely as a sorting ground for selecting likely subjects; The Upper Degrees, in which most of the members, while imagining themselves to have been initiated into the whole secret of the Order and 'bursting with importance' over their imaginary role of leaders, are only admitted to a partial knowledge of the goal to which they are tending; and the inner circle, 'the true masters,' those who conceal themselves behind high-grade Masonry. Admission to this inner circle may be, however, not a matter of degrees. 'Whilst in the lower Masonries the adepts are obliged to pass through all the degrees of the established hierarchy, the upper and invisible Freemasonry is certainly recruited not only amongst the thirty-three degrees but in all the groups of the upper-degree Masonry, and in certain exceptional cases outside these.' M. Copin Albancelli describes in his book an experience where one of his superiors took him aside and instead of inviting him to take the next step in Freemasonry, the thirtieth degree of Knight Kadosch, as he thought at first was happening, asked him to enter a side door into an association concealed within Freemasonry and for which the visible organisation served as a cover." —From "Kings Enemies In Secret Session" by the present editor of *Voice*, published in Australia in 1940.