

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 25.

SATURDAY, MARCH 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: Benlley 3182.

The Devil's Advocacy

The Church of England is disserved by two weekly newspapers. One of them is *The Church of England Newspaper* which is not so dangerous because it can be seen to be quite openly Socialist (blood-brother of the Communists) and therefore quite openly un-Christian. The other is the *Church Times*.

The *Church Times* claims to be a Christian newspaper, but is it? Its "Christianity" appears to us an abstraction, a mere vapour. No doubt its proprietor and editor are most sincere people, and quite sincerely believe that they are Christians. That is what makes them all the more dangerous if what they say is in fact not Christianity.

On March 4 the *Church Times'* leader was entitled "World Without End." The article opened: "The end of the world is now realised to be a practical possibility." After describing various attitudes of people to this possibility the article continues "... fear is the most natural thing in the world. But it is not a Christian thing ... The last word lies with God's grace, which can supernaturally transform nature into a divine pattern ..."

"It is therefore quite out of character for the Christian believer to regard the possible end of the world with incredulous horror ..."

"True religion is always and essentially otherworldly. The Incarnation is often mistakenly adduced as evidence to the contrary. This is to misunderstand fundamentals. The Word did not take flesh because flesh is the ultimate reality, but to make it possible for the flesh to be subdued to the Spirit. Christianity was not designed to save the world for men, but to save men out of this world into another.

"The Christian should pursue his faith through this transitory life unmoved by what, from the secular point of view, is the possibility of utter catastrophe ..."

"The sudden fore-shortening, through science, of the world's remaining lifetime should be regarded by the Christian as simply a renewed challenge to him to strengthen his stakes in eternity ..."

The general attitude of Church leaders and clergy to politics is well known: people must not commit murder,

theft or trespass by their private actions, but politically in their capacity as electors they are subject to a different moral law. In this capacity providing that of the alternatives offered (excluding abstention from voting) they choose the lesser of the evils offered, they may support policies which lead to any of these evils on one condition, and that is that the policy is "legalised" by Caesar's stamp.

We are now told that it is un-Christian to be natural; that to be un-natural is to be Christian. To be un-natural is to be perverted. To be perverted means "to turn, divert, from proper use or function; to misdirect, to misapply."

Now, fear, which the *Church Times* says is un-Christian, is an emotion given to man by his Creator whereby he may sense those things which may do him harm, physically, mentally or morally. Like all emotions it is a healthy and useful thing if it is controlled; it has a proper use and function.

Unlike the *Church Times* we believe that this world was created by God. And, although we have no awe for perverts and the perverted use of God's creation by the corrupt, we have a proper awe for natural creation. We view its possible destruction with horror. Not so the Archbishop of Canterbury. He has said: "Christians must not worry whether the world will be destroyed or not, in the near future." The Archbishop's advice was based upon an absolutely literal interpretation of Christ's injunction: to "take no thought for the morrow; sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof." Now, this advice was quite obviously intended to warn people against allowing false unnecessary uncontrolled fears for the future to prey upon their minds so that present life is rendered miserable and present evils

Does the Church Support Freedom?

It is being said that the Church is only interested in getting people to go to church, and does nothing to support the cause for which Christ came: Freedom for the individual person, which is the fruit of practising Truth in society.

We should like to be able to do what we can to deny that.

This paper will be sent to thousands of clergymen, and we ask them to help us deny it by sending us a postcard, saying:—

"We support your efforts,"

or

"We support the rights of the individual person to enjoy unpenalised freedom of association for any purpose sanctioned by the Criminal Law."

Reply (giving name and address) to:—

CHRISTIAN CAMPAIGN FOR FREEDOM,
PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1.

are unattended to. Christ did not tell His hearers to build their houses on sand: quite the reverse. What is clearly implied is that if we attend effectively to the evils of the present we shall have a sound foundation for life and no cause to fear the future.

The threat of annihilating war and the manufacture of nuclear weapons is a *present* evil, and one which has to be dealt with now, otherwise this *present* evil will result in the future destruction of the world. Because the advice of Dr. Fisher and the *Church Times*, if followed by their listeners, has the effect of dulling and discounting their natural and God-given protective emotions towards the awesome punishment which will come from present evil if unchecked, it is a direct discouragement to them from attending to the evil.

The statement that true religion is always otherworldly and "Christianity was not designed to save the world for men" is a direct contradiction of the Lord's Prayer—"Thy will be done in Earth as it is in Heaven"—and Christ's assertion that "the meek shall inherit the Earth."

There is a divine pattern in all natural things, and all un-natural things are a divergence from it and therefore sinful. That is what we are constantly saying in this paper. The assumption of the editor of the *Church Times* that God will grace perversions of the natural deviations from natural law, which is the divine pattern of nature, is a demonstration of arrogance which we think will jeopardise rather than "strengthen his stakes in eternity," and the stakes of all those clergy who think like him.

If the world is threatened with destruction, it can only be because *power* is concentrated and misused, because only power which is both concentrated and misused can destroy the world. This is a fact so crystal clear that, although it can be ignored, it cannot be denied. The fundamental evil with which the world is confronted, therefore, is the concentration and misuse of power. It is an evil with which it is confronted here and now in the present. It is an evil so great, so terrific, so direly wicked that it can destroy all God's living creation in this world.

Is that something to be ignored?

Or, is it a sin of the first magnitude to ignore it?

It is God's power which is misused. It is Satan who is perverting the minds of those who exercise the power. It is Satan who is perverting the minds of those millions of people who give them the power to misuse. It was Christ who came to found a Church that the world might have a guide in the right use of His power in this world. It is the archbishops, bishops and clergy who have the main responsibility in the world to provide guidance to the world on the correct use of God's power.

It is Satan who says: ignore the evil.

It is the archbishops, bishops and clergy who are silent. In this matter his advocacy is silence.

It is to the archbishops, bishops and clergy that the public has been taught from childhood to look, and to whom they naturally look for God's guidance. And it is these 'servants of God,' who spend so much of their time bickering among themselves, and distracting the attention of those people, who still remain attentive, to minor evils, most of which have their origin and source in the main evil.

It is the archbishops, bishops and clergy who will not answer questions on the use of power in society. It is the editors of the 'religious' press who will publish nothing about it.

What price their stakes in eternity?

What does the Devil advocate?

He does not only offer destruction of the world. He offers destruction of the world—or . . .

The alternative offered is submission under World Government. And World Government is the same evil: it is the complete concentration of power, and the complete subjection of the meek. It is the antithesis of the divine pattern in natural law governing social structure, governing the relation of the individual to the group, governing the binding back of power to responsibility in each individual action, whether it is a private action or a political action.

Anyone determined to find out what is behind all the Devil's advocacy in this world at the present time can ascertain that the main propaganda and financial backing on both sides of the Iron Curtain for Communism, Socialism, the Welfare State and World Government are coming from the same source.

Anyone, therefore, who is determined to find out what is God's truth, will find this out; and having found it out will seek the divine pattern in society, and work for it.

All true law is a restraint on power, not its servant.

The Plan for World Domination

"The scheme of a Universal Republic was embodied in the oath of the great Secret Society, the Illuminati of Bavaria, founded in 1776 by Adam Weishaupt. The initiates swore to contribute by all means in their power 'to avenge the people for the oppression under which they were held by princes and the great ones of the earth, and to found a Universal Republic.'"—Dancien, *Le Fleau des Tyrans* (1779).

"The idea of the Universal Republic became the slogan of the lodges and the abolition of all frontiers, nationalities and differences of language and religion constituted the doctrine of the Grand Orient . . . It was towards 1850 that a modified form of this scheme became known as 'The United States of Europe' . . . but it was not until some years later that it was formally adopted as the slogan of International Socialism. The impulse again came from the Masonic Lodges."—Nesta Webster, *Surrender of an Empire*.

"In the course of a century the French Revolution has travelled round the world. Every state, institution, organisation and dynasty has been changed by it . . .

" . . . Its practical plan for the future: the suppression of the present European stratification under the form of socialist republics. In another century the Plan of the Orient (Grand Orient) will have been realised as completely as was the Occidental Plan (Western Way of Life) formerly."—Walter Rathenau, German Industrialist, political adviser of Wilhelm II; Foreign Secretary of the Weimar Republic; initiator of the German-Soviet Rapprochement after World War I, in *The Kaiser*.

"The task of the proletariat is to create a far more powerful fatherland, with far greater power of resistance—the Republican United States of Europe, as the foundation of the United States of the World."—Leon Trotsky, *The Bolsheviks and World Peace*, 1918.

"I consider that the immediate suppression of Bolshevism is the greatest issue now before the world, not even excluding the war which is now raging, and unless Bolshevism is nipped in the bud immediately it is bound to spread in one or another form over Europe, and the whole world, as it is organised and worked by Jews, who have no nationality, and whose one object is to destroy for their own ends the existing order of things."—British Government White Paper (Russia No. 1), April, 1919.

"There is no need to exaggerate the part played in the creation of Bolshevism and in the actual bringing about of the Russian Revolution by these international and for the most part atheistical Jews. It is certainly a very great one; it probably outweighs all others. With the notable exception of Lenin, the majority of the leading figures are Jews. Moreover the principal inspiration and driving power comes from the Jewish leaders."—Sir Winston Churchill writing in the *Illustrated Sunday Herald*, February 8, 1920.

"... it was found out that the following persons, as well as the banking house mentioned, were engaged in this work of destruction: Jacob Schiff, Guggenheim, Max Breitung, Kuhn Loeb and Company, Felix Warburg, Otto Kahn, Mortimer Schiff and S. H. Hanauer." Section I of the American Secret Service Report transmitted by the French High Commissioner to his Government, and published in the *Documentation Catholique* of Paris on March 6, 1920.

"The aim of the Communist International is to organise an armed struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and the establishment of an International Soviet Republic."—Harry Pollitt, at the Communist Party Congress, 1932.

"We are engaged in the process of creating a European unit in the world organisation of the United Nations."—Sir Winston Churchill at Strasbourg, August 18, 1949.

"The foundation of the Charter of the United Nations was laid at the Conference of Foreign Secretaries at Moscow in 1943, and upon those foundation a structure was built at the meetings at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington, D.C. The design was discussed and criticised at San Francisco, April 25-June 26, 1945, on which date representatives of 50 allied nations appended their signatures to the Charter."—Whitaker's Almanack, 1949. N.B.—The U.S.A. representative was Alger Hiss, close friend of the Secretary of State, and subsequently gaoled for perjury at a Communist trial.

"The political Bureau is definitely convinced that a new World War is absolutely inevitable, but explains this as the obvious preparation for the world revolution. With the aim of self-preservation and in the interests of the World Revolutionary Movement, the Soviet Government must do all possible to enter the camp of the States which build the strongest coalitions..."—Resolution of the Political Bureau of The Communist Soviet, February 21, 1935.

"Only in war, or under threat of war, will a British Government embark on large scale planning."—*Planning*, October, 1938, organ of the influential Fabian organisation Political and Economic Planning, which guides the higher ranks of the Civil Service, and with which several leading "Conservative" Ministers have been associated.

"When I once asked Lord Haldane why he persuaded his friend, Sir Ernest Cassel, to settle by his will large sums on... the London School of Economics, he replied, 'Our object is to make this institution a place to raise and train the bureaucracy of the future Socialist State.'"—Professor J. H. Haldane, K.C., in *The Quarterly Review*, January, 1929.

"We are deliberately putting a world order before our loyalty towards our country."—Mr. Clement Attlee, at the Annual Labour Congress, 1934.

All members of Parliament take an oath of allegiance on the Bible to the Crown.

"In plain terms we have to re-transfer the prestige and prerogatives of sovereignty from the fifty or sixty fragments of contemporary society.

"I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly, but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. *And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands.*"—Professor Arnold Toynbee, Director of Royal Institute of International Affairs, speaking at Copenhagen, 1931.

We could fill this paper many times over with similar evidence of double talk, double dealing, and the betrayal of our heritage of a Christian social order. But what we have printed will serve to warn our new readers, and will provoke action in any honest Christian.

Leftward Ho:

The Report of the Reece Committee on Foundations By WILLIS J. BALLINGER

The Majority Report of the Reece Committee on Foundations* is an exposure of the most effective technique used by Marxists to undermine a free society—manipulation of its intellectual life. For the now extensive group of *parentes indignati Americani* it constitutes a factual vindication of long-harboured suspicions that something was radically wrong in education. This Congressional Committee puts its finger on a ruling clique in large foundations and scholarly societies using the tax-exempt fortunes of dead industrial leaders to promote collectivism and world government.

The Cox Committee, its predecessor, operating for only sixth months in 1952, had found: (1) as early as 1936 the Kremlin had plotted the infiltration of American foundations; (2) seven important foundations had been infiltrated. Two of these subsequently lost their tax-exemption charters. The Reece Committee thus summarises this important work of the Cox Committee:

"We know from the evidence that the Communists succeeded in the case of seven foundations: the *Marshall Field Foundations*, *Garland Fund*, *John Simon Guggenheim Foundation*, *Hecsher Foundation*, *Robert Marshall Foundation*, *Rosenwald Fund* and the *Phelps Stokes Fund*."

The Cox Committee (before expiring) had urged further inquiry into foundations. Early in 1953, Representative Carroll Reece headed a new Committee. Reece was a former university teacher himself, ex-Chairman of the Republican

* House Report No. 2681, Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D. C. Price: \$1.25.

National Committee, had served nearly 30 years in the House and was one of the most respected men in Congress. Few committees, however, ever laboured under more harassing conditions than the Reece body. Its requested appropriations were drastically slashed and its public hearings terminated by the obstructionist tactics of one Committee member—Representative Wayne Hays, Ohio New Deal Democrat.

Despite slashed appropriations and Mr. Hays, the Reece Committee was able to add substantially to the findings of the Cox Committee because of an efficient research staff which made a painstaking examination of foundation grants and reports and the testimony of outstanding scholars themselves. In addition to Professor Colegrove, the Committee heard Professor David Nelson Rowe, Director of Studies on Human Resources at Yale University; Professor Thomas Briggs, Professor Emeritus of Columbia University and one of the country's greatest experts on education; Professor A. H. Hobbs, one of the younger scholars whose book *Social Problems and Scientism* exposes the fallacious methodology of many social scientists attacking American civilisation.

The Reece Committee says that there exists an intellectual cartel composed of giant foundations and their satellites (powerful scholarly organisations whom some foundations have financed to an extent of more than \$60,000,000.) The cartel is possible because the disastrous inflation of the past 15 years has made it impossible for colleges to provide from their own funds for research. They must go to foundations for research funds and, says the Committee, the foundations do not often make grants "with no strings attached." Instead they dictate what is to be investigated, how and by whom. The result is characterised as a system of "genteel bribery."

The cartel, says the Committee, controls practically all social science research and such research is used to promote collectivism and world government. It discriminates, in general, against smaller institutions, although one scholar testified that the ablest Ph.D.'s come from smaller institutions. The cartel menaces the true teacher and scholar through its power to select research personnel and its large influence on the appointment of social science teachers. Through various channels, it has achieved "virtual control" of the great sums allotted by the Federal government for social science research (p. 18.)

In making its charges, the Reece Committee recognised the "magnificent" work of foundations in medicine, public health and natural science. Its accusations relate solely to the use of social science research for revolutionary purposes. The Committee does not say that foundation trustees or the members of great scholarly societies are in general aware of the cartel, or are accessories to its moulding of public opinion leftwards. It puts the responsibility on "a small group of professional employees" (foundation bureaucrats) who exemplify control of organisations by the few—the demonstrated theory that an executive secretary may be the real boss.

Just a few samples in the Reece report are revealing as to the astounding left-wing bias in foundation social science activities:

(1) The Carnegie Foundation provided the American Historical Society with \$340,000 to make a study of the social sciences. This voluminous work reached the con-

clusion that "our American way of life was a failure;" that it must give way to a collectivist society; and, that teachers "must now prepare the public for a New Order." Professor Harold Laski, the British socialist writer, called this study "an educational programme for a socialist America," and the Carnegie Foundation after inspecting the work lauded its conclusions.

(2) American foundations gave over \$4,000,000 to the London School of Economics when "it was the fountainhead of Fabian socialism."

(3) The Council of Learned Societies receives annually "large grants of money from foundations" and through it a great amount of social science research "is done or directed." The Committee says that for a long time "its Executive Secretary has been Mortimer Graves." The Counsel of the Cox Committee (Reece Report p. 55) "read from a long list of Communist fronts of which Mr. Graves was a member," but the Reece Committee specifically does not accuse Graves of being a Communist. The Council and the Institute of Pacific Relations made recommendations to the government for experts to be used in our occupation forces in Japan and Germany, the list of which the Committee found (Reece Report p. 57) "to be heavily salted with Communists and their supporters" and the Committee says (p. 56) that, "Graves failed to disclose the recommendations made by him to government agencies."

(4) Paul Hoffman and Robert Maynard Hutchins, former head of Chicago University, have dominated the activities of the Ford Foundation. Hoffman is a former veteran office holder under the New Deal. Hutchins has a long record (pp. 38-39) which shows he has not regarded the Communist Party as "a clear and present danger," or Communists as "subversives," and has been a militant advocate of surrender of U.S. sovereignty to a world government. He is at present in charge of a \$15,000,000 appropriation from the Ford Foundation which the Committee concludes (p. 113) is to be used to attack Congressional investigations of subversives.

(5) Rockefeller money helped finance the "Building America textbooks" barred from California schools for their Marxian content . . .

(6) The Rockefeller Foundation, says the Committee, made possible the Kinsey studies on sex in which conclusions were reached that homosexual molesters of children "may have contributed favourably to their [the children's] later sociosexual development," and that pre-marital sex relations of women "provide an opportunity for the females to learn to adjust emotionally to various types of males."

(7) Carnegie foundations—investing large sums in "International Mind Alcoves" of Public Libraries, financing speakers to college campuses, founding professorships and "indoctrinating teachers."—From *Human Events*, Washington.

SUPPORT US

If you cannot send more, we ask all who read this to send us a book of stamps.

WE NEED FUNDS.

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