

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 23.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26, 1955.

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.

The Church—Waking Up at Last

"In the past the Church in England sinned grievously in not condemning the prolonged unemployment of millions, the foulness of the slums, and the undernourishment of children. Even when the remedy was not plain the Church should have prophesied against these social evils as contrary to the will of God. Today the Church should condemn.

"But the Church must not be aggressive only in condemnation. It must make constructive demands for justice. It must fight the battle of the poor, the hungry, the refugee and the aged against the world which too often turns a deaf ear to their appeals. Its leaders should call out for social justice.

"In every diocese, rural deanery, and parish, clergy and laity should form a social conscience which makes itself felt against policies, actions and negligences which are plainly contrary to the will of Christ. The Church will provoke abuse and unpopularity when it speaks out boldly; but it is only a militant Church that will attract the warm-hearted and courageous, and at the same time gain a hearing from the world, which ignores the bleating of sheep, but is alarmed at the sounding of the trumpet summoning to battle."

We didn't write the above; we are quoting from an article in *The Sunday Times* for February 6 by the Archbishop of York and consisting of extracts from his new book "World Problems of Today."

It is only ten months since *Voice* started publication and extended its function in the Christian Campaign For Freedom. Modest, self-denying stalwarts rallied to us immediately, others came in later. (People would be astonished if we revealed with what slender means we have carried on our campaign.) It is only one of the points which we have been making, but it has been our foremost cry, that "what is lacking in society is the voice of Authority; the Church must express Authority." We have only started and have a long way to go, but "things are moving."

The Archbishop of York, as are all the bishops and so many of the clergy, is sadly lacking in knowledge concerning the true nature of Authority in society; but he is repentant

and showing an awareness. He must be informed. We will inform him, and all the bishops and clergy, and keep on informing them, so that they will not have a shred of an excuse to plead ignorance. *They are responsible that God's Law in society should be spoken, known and understood.* Great is their responsibility to express it; and grave indeed will the consequences be to them, particularly to them, and to society if they fail in their responsibility.

Dr. Garbett says "the world rejects or ignores the one true God, and worships the gods of power, money and pleasure," and for the old gods has "substituted the dictator, or the nation, or technical knowledge."

"In the modern world there exists on a large scale the same sins which stirred St. Paul's indignation. But there is something more fundamentally wrong in the world than a multitude of sins and crimes committed by individuals. There is something evil within it which turns to wickedness what was intended for righteousness.

"It is, however, necessary for the Christian to remember that neither is the Church perfect nor the world utterly evil. . . . The Church must repent of its own sins before it denounces those of the world.

"... there is one thing Communism has never done, it has never brought freedom—instead, either steadily or slowly, but remorselessly, it has destroyed it in the countries over which it has control. . . .

"There can be no reconciliation between the Christian and the Communist views on ethics. The Christian believes that the law of God is above the laws of nations and societies, *and is binding at all times and in all places.* (Our italics.) But the Communist holds that there is nothing higher than the will of the State."

The central truth concerning God's Law in society is concerned with:

- (1) The restraint and distribution of power: "The meek shall inherit the earth."
- (2) The relation of the individual to the group: "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."

Over against these clear statements from the New Testament of the temporal objects of Christianity, there is the inescapable and undeniable evidence of history and of our own times of the objects of the un-Christian, Satanic, use of power:

- (1) The concentration of power.
- (2) The subjection and enslavement of the meek.

There is no difference in principle between the Welfare State, or the Socialism of the so-called Conservative Party and the Labour Party on the one hand, and on the other of Communism. The difference is only a matter of degree. And where principle is abandoned it is only a matter of

time before degree is also abandoned. The dictionary gives the meaning of principle as (1) The ultimate source or origin of anything, or (2) A general comprehensive law, doctrine, truth. If the Church is not concerned with principle (the ultimate, law, doctrine, truth) whatever it professes to be, it is not concerned in any true or practical sense with Christianity, for as He said, Christ came in the cause of truth.

The same principle is evident in the society, or social order, of the Welfare State as in Communism; it is the destruction, or penalisation, of freedom of association in favour of monopoly or centralised control. This is a collectivity, and the institution enabled to dominate the individual. It may produce a temporary, or even a permanent security of a kind—so does a prison; but it demonstrably does not provide individual freedom; and for that reason quite clearly breaks the Law of God in society. Despite the fact that the Archbishop of York says that “The law of God is binding at all times and in all places,” both he and the official Church of England are supporting this breaking of the Law of God by their support of the Welfare State, from all of whose institutions contracting-out is prevented or penalised.

Unpenalised freedom of association is the condition for individual freedom in society; it is the condition for the growth of an organic society, instead of an organised society. The only restraint should be the Common Law.

What are the Archbishop and the Church going to do about this?

The Moral Law decrees freedom of association, because only thus can individuals control institutions, instead of *vice versa*. As a leader of the fight for the recognition of Moral Law in America, Admiral Ben Morell, says “The fact that the consequences of breaking a moral law may be slower in action and are less obvious than the consequences of falling from a building does not mean that moral law can be violated without having punishment meted out with the same degree of certainty.

“Unfortunately, the consequences of breaking a moral law enmesh the innocent along with the guilty. What is worse, natural law seems also to decree that innocent generations of the future must suffer because of the evil of their forefathers, thus ‘. . . visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation.’ It appears that violations of moral law, whether knowing or unknowing, put in motion a set of irresistible forces which bring about ultimate retribution.”

“The mills of God grind slowly, yet they grind exceedingly small. . . .” It is the business of the Church in society to be the Authority on the mills of God. There cannot be a stable society providing individual freedom, without such a recognised Authority dedicated and devoted to seeking and expressing the truth concerning God’s laws, because the will-to-power of able, ruthless men is never absent in any society and will always find means of deceiving and misleading the masses in the interests of power if the ‘shepherd’ sleeps or evades his responsibility.

If our British society continues on its collective path *via* the Welfare State and Socialism to Communism it will be primarily the fault and responsibility of the bishops and clergy of the Established Church, because they failed to

express the law. They have the responsibility and they will have to answer to God for their failure to discharge it, unless they repent.

But we warn the bishops and clergy that *true* freedom of association must be secured, otherwise we shall merely return to the world of artificially engineered financial and economic crises that we had between the wars. The real nigger in the woodpile—the Financial Monopoly—deliberately wrecked the old order of politically-free independent forms of association and free enterprise by the manipulation of credit supplies which it monopolised. The methods by which it was done have been most thoroughly investigated and reported on in great detail. Many thousands of competent people are fully acquainted with the facts and what was then necessary to remedy the situation. The Financial Monopoly saw to it in various ways that their counsel was negated, either by gross misrepresentation or suppression.

It is not necessary for the Church or individual Christians to be competent accountants or financial technicians in order to give *moral* judgment on a system, or to insist that it must produce in conformity with the Moral Law certain results of an opposite character which have the hallmark of Truth.

A system which is:

(1) Continually depreciating the value of money, so that through no fault of their own people’s savings and capital is destroyed.

(2) Destroying the independence of governments and producers by placing them in pawn through a mountainous debt to the International Controllers of money.

(3) Wholly reliant on a continuous and increasing production of capital goods, exports and armaments in order to keep men both employed and with adequate purchasing power to absorb the consumers goods which do come on the market.

(4) Artificially intensifying competition so that by advertisement and publicity people are continually being persuaded that they want things of which their own natural inclinations have not taught them the need.

(5) Causing the “making of money” and “a job” to be the be-all and end-all of a man’s working life.

(6) Perverting Technocracy into a monstrous tyranny, instead of facilitating its true and natural object: the freeing of a large and increasing number of people from paid employment for creative leisure. (A Full Employment policy in an age of powered-machinery is a wicked anachronism, designed to keep the population from being independent and in subjection to the Managerial State.)

Such a system (and we could easily lengthen the list of evils given) has all the marks of un-Truth.

The Church, which in faithfulness to its Founder should stand in society for all men to see as the pillar of Authority regarding the Truth, has never raised its voice against the system or the monopoly which produces these evil results. This being so, it is inevitable that many sincere men and women will be, and in fact are, both astonished and disgusted.

Monopoly must by its very nature as the destroyer of freedom be against the law of God; and a system which

produces such evil results is clearly likewise in flagrant contravention of the law. The same law, says the Archbishop of York, "is binding at all times and in all places." If the Archbishop and the Church genuinely believe and accept this, how comes it that they have not long before advised their congregations and the general public to withdraw their support from the political parties (which means all of them) which have supported and continue to support this system? Is the law only binding in theory and not in practice; only when it is politically convenient?

In a Report, "Moral Re-Armament," issued by the Church Information Board of the Church Assembly, just prepared by The Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly, on which sat the Bishops of Sheffield and Birmingham, we find these words: "Never was there an age in which it was more imperatively necessary to implement the Truth, the whole Truth and nothing but the Truth." These are words which admit of reconciliation, but quite definitely rule out compromise, because Truth being absolute cannot be compromised and remain Truth. But we do not find that the bishops ever either denounce the evils mentioned or the system which produces them. If the bishops really mean "imperatively," "the *whole* Truth," "*nothing but* the Truth," they cannot deny the absolute importance of the need for integrity in the use of the political power (the vote) which sanctions policy. What advice have they given on the need for absolute Truth in the use of the vote? We most truly hope that our readers will refer their own diocesan bishops to these statements by the Archbishop of York and the bishops and ask for their advice.

Despite the fact that in this paper we consistently direct severe criticism at the bishops and clergy (a criticism which we are glad to see they are more and more directing at themselves), we do not accuse them, or the great majority of them, of insincerity of motive or belief. What we do accuse them of, is failure to integrate their belief with their actions, a failure which we suspect is due to a lack of determination to think things out properly—a failure either of ability or will to reflect. Because we believe that a return of the mass of the people to Christianity and a belief in the Church very likely hinges on it; and because it appears to be the main stumbling block to most clergymen being practical, and therefore realistic, about their beliefs, although it is a matter of theology and not sociology, we are going to refer to a particular attitude of mind. In their Report on Moral Rearmament (to which we do not adhere) the Social and Industrial Council of the Church Assembly say:

"You may try to do God's will for two completely different reasons. Either because your personal relationship with God is such that to try to do His will is the natural thing to do. Or, because you think that if His will is done, the world will be a more secure and comfortable place to live in. If the second is your primary motive, then history and experience strongly suggest that before long God will largely have dropped out of the picture, and you will be doing the practical things for purely this-worldly reasons. And in so far as God does come into the picture, you will be trying to use Him and His power as means towards ends which you believe desirable for reasons unconnected with Him. . . . But those who take seriously the fact of the Fall, as the Church of England does, cannot leave the matter

there. For they believe, and they have very good ground for believing, that every human motive, even the strictest sense of duty, contains within itself elements of selfishness which in time will inevitably turn the resultant actions into some form of individual or group self-seeking. And so in the long run it does matter—"

The latter part of the foregoing statement is a welcome theological confirmation of Lord Acton's dictum that all power tends to corrupt, and reinforces our continual assertion that the primary, urgent fundamental need in our society is the effective expression of Authority by the Church to restrain and contain the use of power within the bounds of the Moral Law. But it is the 'either or' implication of the first part to which we take exception. The posing of a choice between the two reasons is an exact reflection of the schizophrenia which we witness between the Church and the world and between the spiritual professions of clergy and churchgoer, and their political attitude and actions.

There is an obvious integral truth which links "Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven," "I came that ye might have life and have it more abundantly," "a tree is judged by its fruit," "I pray not for the world, but for them which thou hast given me," "Sanctify them through thy truth. . .," "they are not of the world," "that they may be made perfect in one, and that the world may believe that thou hast sent me." It is clear from this that the two reasons given for doing God's will are for the followers of Christ not different, but complementary; and that for the world only the second of them is valid—that the world does in fact only judge by results.

A generation which has witnessed the Church either silent in the face of or identified with the recurrent policies of Caesar which have produced such evil results, has judged the Church and found it sorely wanting. How will God judge the leaders of such a Church?

It is clear that now only the most determined stand by the Church on the whole truth can retrieve the situation. The clarion call must go out that all who believe in God must refuse political sanction for Caesar to take what belongs to God. Obedience to the Moral Law must be shown, not as an ugly necessity, but as the only means to freedom and the abundant life. Untruth in accountancy makes us all slaves of the Money Power; untruth in a Full Employment policy in a power-machinery age makes us all slaves of Technology. On these and other things the Church can find the truth if it will look elsewhere than to the seats of the mighty, to Caesar's colleges and to Caesar's friends for information and advice.

Technocracy and Full Employment

"In automated factories, one person pressing a row of buttons, will direct the complete operation of a machine costing often as much as several million dollars. The electric bill for that operation will be much higher than the wage bill. . . . (Wages are also a minor cost in the generation of electric power.)

"In factories now being blue printed, electronic systems will pick up raw materials, allocate them in the correct proportions, send them through the processing machinery,

sort out the final products and automatically package them. The climax will be reached when the packaged product keeps moving right out of the factory door and is mechanically placed in its proper location in a freight car or truck.”—*Human Events*, Washington.

“A number of years ago the founders of the Lincoln Electric Company—today the largest manufacturer of arc welding equipment in the world—devised a plan for compensating their employees. . . . Fearing unionisation of the plant, the company’s founders divided yearly earnings into three parts. . . . The third part was divided among all the workers on the basis of what each had individually contributed to increasing efficiency in that plant.

“Instead of traditional union rules which held back the man who wanted to work and use his head, the Lincoln Company offered a reward at the end of each year for every employee who had improved his work output or who had originated some new plan for cutting red tape or making the plant’s operations more productive. Hours of work were strictly limited to a humane day’s work, but within this framework (which included stimulative vacations) every worker was encouraged to put forth the best effort he could as an *individual*. The result was that Lincoln electric workers earned such high pay that no union could get even a foothold in the company’s plants.

“. . . the productivity of the Lincoln Electric Company’s workers is nearly four times the normal rate for the arc welding industry as a whole.”—*Human Events*, Washington.

The strength of the Unions in the U.S.A. is over 17 millions. The two largest unions, comprising a membership of 15 millions, have just amalgamated.

“The question at once arises: if it is fitting and proper—as I think it is—to prevent an employer from compelling his employees to stay out of a union, why isn’t it fitting and proper also to outlaw union membership as a condition of employment? Isn’t it logical to assume that a man should have the right either to join or stay out of a labour union? All the arguments which caused Congress to outlaw the employer’s “Yellow Dog” contract weigh just as heavily in the case of the Union’s “Yellow Dog” contract—the contract which forces a man to belong to a union in order to earn his living. Yet, today, well over 60 per cent. of the collective bargaining contracts signed have a union shop provision. And the union leaders are planning eventually to prohibit any legislation, state or federal, which would prevent the union shop, or any other form of compulsory unionism.”—*Human Events*, Washington.

Note: The American citizen has a real income much higher than the citizen of any other country, and pays less tax per head than we do in this country.

The unwanted surplus of American farm products in store is approximately two and a half times the aggregate production of British farms for one year.

The “Aid” given away, (terms not *openly* stated) to foreign countries (including 11 billion dollars to Russia) since the war by the U.S.A. government, plus the excess of their exports over their imports in normal business amounts to approximately £1,000 per family of three.

Despite the slowing up of production by unionism, if all surplus production, “Aid,” excess of exports over imports, and armament production were to cease in America, every American family could have the same income that it is receiving today, with less than half of the adult male population in paid employment. The threat of war is necessary to maintain a Full Employment policy!

The Natural Is the Basis of the Spiritual

What could happen if Technology provided Leisure

“The evidence is abundant and positive, and is increasing upon us year by year, that the work done upon the fabric of our churches, and the other work done in the beautifying of the interior of our churches, such as the wood-carving of our screens, the painting of the lovely figures in the panels of these screen, the embroidery of the banners and vestments, the frescoes on the walls, the engraving of the monumental brasses, the stained glass in the windows, and all that vast aggregate of artistic achievements which existed in immense profusion in our village churches till the sixteenth century stripped them bare—all this was executed by local craftsmen. The evidence for this is accumulating upon us every year, as one antiquary after another succeeds in unearthing fragments of pre-reformation church-wardens’ accounts.

“We have actual contracts for church building and church repairing undertaken by village contractors. We have the cost of a rood screen paid to a village carpenter, of painting executed by local artists. We find the name of an artificer, described as an aurifaber, or worker in gold and silver, living in a parish which could never have had five hundred inhabitants; we find the people in another place casting a new bell and making the mould for it themselves; we find the blacksmith of another place forging the iron work for the church door, or we get a payment entered for the carving of the bench ends in a little church five hundred years ago, which bench ends are to be seen in that church at the present moment. And we get fairly bewildered by the astonishing wealth of skill and artistic taste and aesthetic feeling which there must have been in this England of ours in times which till lately we had assumed to be barbaric times. Bewildered, I say, because we cannot understand how it all came to a dead-stop in a single generation, not knowing that the frightful spoliation of our churches and other parish buildings, and the outrageous plunder of the parish guilds in the reign of Edward the Sixth by the horrible band of robbers that carried on their detestable work, effected such a hideous obliteration, such a clean sweep of the precious treasures that were dispersed in rich profusion over the whole land, that a dull despair of ever replacing what had been ruthlessly pillaged crushed the spirit of the whole nation, and art died out in rural England, and King Whitewash and Queen Ugliness ruled supreme for centuries.”—Dr. Augustus Jessop, *Before The Great Pillage*, 1901.