

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 26.

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 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.

### Make the Word Incarnate

The Archbishop of York, speaking at Bradford on March 18, said that one of "the fields in which Britain could still give a lead" is "in showing how authority and liberty can be combined." If what remains of our civilisation is destroyed the main reason will be because the clergy, and particularly the leaders of the churches, not only do not know their own business, but demonstrate an unbreakable obstinacy in refusing to learn. The Archbishop's statement is on a level with a child saying that he would show that "a fire could be combined with heat." Freedom is a property of Authority in the same sense that heat is a property of fire. It is not a question of whether it *can be* combined with authority; it *is* an attribute of Authority. The Founder of Christianity did not say that freedom *can be* combined with Truth, He said the Truth *shall* make you free.

What the world in general lacks is concrete, specific knowledge of the nature of Authority. If the world *hasn't* this knowledge, it cannot obey Authority. And, it should be obvious that what the world wants from the bishops and clergy is not vague statements and abstractionism, but specific, detailed guidance on the nature of Authority in society. But, every time the bishops are asked they refuse to answer. It is their special business to know this and to provide guidance to society, and yet they refuse it, although society is disintegrating and is threatened with destruction for lack of this knowledge.

Concluding chapter III of their Report entitled "The Church And The Atom" the Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York said:

"It may well be that the problem which this Commission has been charged to study can only be solved when it is realised that the divine law imposes certain irremovable limitations upon the rights and powers of all political authority."

That Report was published in 1948, and the Church of England has still failed to provide those (the electorate) who provide 'political authority' with power with any guidance on the limitations which the divine law, as they

say, imposes on all "political authority."

The Chairman of the Commission was the Dean of Winchester. The editor of this paper lives in the diocese of Winchester, and has personally sought guidance from the Dean. He has been met with nothing but evasiveness.

We invite the Archbishop of York to state here, on this page, the limitations which the divine law imposes on all political authority. We invite him specifically to state:

Does the divine law sanction political authority penalising freedom of association for any purpose which is not recognised as criminal by either the Ten Commandments or the Common Law?

Does the divine law impose any limitations on an elector voting

- (a) for something which he doesn't understand?
- (b) for something which he knows is wrong?

We invite him to state any other limitations which the divine law imposes on the use of political, economic or financial power.

### Drivel from The Church Times

The leader in *The Church Times* for March 25, is entitled "Conscience In Politics." It eulogises Sir Richard Acland and Mr. Aneurin Bevan for "making a firm stand on an issue of conscience." The former, whose views on important issues we do not share, has done the correct thing by resigning from the Labour Party when he found himself in disagreement with its policy. We leave out of the discussion his future intentions. The latter wants to remain in the Party and oppose its official policy.

The remarks of the Chairman of the T.U.C. on Mr. Bevan's attitude—"Every man has a right to his conscience. But, when personal conscience interferes with the good of the Party, then the personal conscience must give way to the Party"—are perhaps rather ambiguously worded. But there is nothing either ambiguous or incorrect about the T.U.C.'s Chairman's demand that Mr. Bevan should leave the Party. The policy of this paper is totally opposed to the policy of the Labour Party, and we do not indulge in Party politics, but we hold entirely to the view that nothing but anarchy and chaos can result if the point is conceded that the rules of an association can be altered at will by any member of it. *The Church Times* doesn't think so. On the assumption that every Parliamentary member of the Labour Party has a conscience, it thinks that the Party should have as many policies as there are differences of opinion, and that the rule of association in the Party, that anyone who disagrees with policy should toe the line or be excluded from membership, should be abandoned.

Mr. Bevan has not been asked to abandon his conscience, but to leave the Party. We personally think that if the power of the Party Machine is now so great that, saving

only his exclusion from Parliament, it results in Mr. Bevan's power being clipped so that he represents solely the policy of his own constituents, (or such part of them as vote for him) then that would demonstrate at least one, if the only, service which the powerful Party Machine has performed for the country. We think it much more likely, however, that Mr. Bevan eventually is destined to capture the Party Machine, and then will be demonstrated the full absurdity of *The Church Times'* claim that "Mr. Bevan also stands for the right of a Member of Parliament to make up his own mind on the great issues of politics." *The Church Times* seems to be concerned, like the cartoonists in the newspapers whose ostensible policy forbids them from openly defending Bevan, to present him as a kindly, inoffensive person of high ideals, instead of being easily the most potentially dangerous politician in Great Britain.

Now, *The Church Times* urges that "when the General Election comes all Christian people should openly question candidates of every Party to discover whether they intend, if elected, to owe their first and last allegiance to their Party or their conscience." The only justification we can think of for a political Party seeking the support of the electorate is that it is a convenient way of putting before a large electorate a common policy. And the only justification for putting any policy before an electorate is that *they* have the only right in the country to decide on policy. So that it is policy, not the candidates conscience, which the electorate is primarily concerned with. If it turns out that they elect a man with a faulty conscience, the proper people to blame and sack are the local Selection Committee. If not, what is the purpose of the Selection Committee?

Questions of far greater importance than the consciences of candidates, which are quite easily dealt with under existing machinery, are:

What are the nature and limitations of democracy?

How are people — the electorate, the politicians, the Government and the technicians—to be made responsible for their actions?

These are matters of TRUTH, how things *naturally* work to produce intended results, and, as such, matters which truly concern the Church. They are matters which in the first place are concerned with whether policy shall serve the Christian purpose, the development of human personality; and in the second place, whether power shall be divorced from responsibility or whether every single person exercising political power shall be made personally responsible for the results which his actions produce or help to produce.

"Some hearty stones need to be thrown in the direction of the politicians. They must not come from a glass-house," says *The Church Times*. At least we agree with the last sentence; and as the editor of that paper has started this discussion and has started throwing stones, we suggest that he should take this advice to heart himself, and consult his own conscience both concerning whether he is letting the light of Truth in regard to this question into the columns of his own paper and whether what he is urging Christians to do is the truth.

We invite the editor of *The Church Times* to consider what is published below under the title, "The Nature of Democracy"; and we ask him to publish the truth in his paper.

## The Nature of Democracy

Reverting to the question of culpability for the perversion of human effort which is so plainly evident, there is a strong tendency to suppose that a statement that the financial system is at fault, especially if accompanied by suggestions for its reformation, may be regarded as covering the ground of the problem. So far from this being so, the second proposition that I wish to emphasise to you, with no suggestion of its novelty, but a strong insistence on the difficulty of obtaining recognition for it, is that action on or through an organisation, involves three ideas—the idea of policy, the idea of administration, and the idea of sanctions, that is to say, power.

Because administration is the most obvious of these ideas, Socialism, so-called, has tended to concentrate upon the glorification of administration, which, to my mind—because of the increasing pressure of Socialist ideology upon Government action—is a complete explanation of the ever more disastrous results in increased bureaucracy and other undesirable features from which we suffer.

Now, while no action involving co-operative effort can take place without the presence of these three factors of policy, administration, and sanctions, and therefore they are all essential, and in a sense, equally important, the first of them in point of time must be policy.

In regard to the objective of policy, as applied to human affairs, I can say nothing to you which has not been better said by the great teachers of humanity, One of whom said, "I came that you might have *life* and have it more abundantly." So far as I am aware, no great teacher of humanity has ever announced that he came that we might have better trade or more employment, and I am wholly and irrevocably convinced that while we exalt a purely materialistic *means* into an end, we are doomed to destruction. In other words the aim of the *human individual* is ultimately a totalitarian aim, a statement which, if it is correct—that is to say, if it is true that our best interests are served by our ultimately taking a general and effective interest in everything—is, in itself, the negation of the idea of the totalitarian *state*. There is an old and very true saying "*Demon est deus inversus*"—"The devil is God upside down"—and many phenomena in the world confirm it.

In regard to administration, I do not propose to say very much beyond the fact that it is and must be essentially hierarchical and therefore it is a technical matter in which the expert must be supreme and ultimately autocratic. There is more accurate and technical knowledge of administration in any of the great branches of scientific industry than there is in all the socialistic literature or bureaucracies in the world.

The foundation of successful administration, in my opinion, is that it shall be subject to the principle of free association, which will, in itself, produce in time the best possible form of technical administration. If the conditions of work in any undertaking, and the exercise of authority are ordinarily efficient, and there is in the world any reasonable amount of opportunity of free association, such an undertaking will automatically disembarass itself of the malcontent, while being obliged to compete for those whose help is necessary to it.

On the other hand, if there is no free association, the natural inertia of the human being and the improper

manipulation of methods and aims will make an undertaking inefficient, since there is no incentive to reform. The idea that administration can be democratic, however, is not one which will bear five minutes' experience. It may be consultative, but in the last resort some single person must decide.

But, at the present time, there is no question that it is in the domain of sanctions that the human race is involved in its great difficulties.

. . . The problem, in fact, is a problem of the victory of political democracy, that is to say *democracy of policy. Means or Ends?*

To understand what I believe to be the only effective strategy to be pursued, we have, first of all, to recognise that though we do, beyond question, possess the rough machinery of political democracy, we do not use it. It is not democracy of any conceivable kind to hold an election at regular or irregular intervals for the purpose of deciding by ballot whether you will be shot or boiled in oil. It is not democracy of any conceivable kind to hold an election upon any subject requiring *technical* information and education.

Nothing could be more fantastic, for instance, than to hold an election on, say, whether aeroplanes or airships would be better for the purpose of defence, or for any other purpose. Yet the information which is required to give an intelligent opinion on the use of tariffs or monetary policy is at least of as high an order, and is, in fact, in the possession of far fewer people, than the thorough knowledge of aerodynamics necessary for an election on aeroplanes versus airships. So that the first requisite of a political democracy is that its operation shall be confined to objectives, not to methods.

For instance, it is a perfectly legitimate subject for the exercise of political democracy to decide by democratic methods a policy of war or no war, but it is not a subject for democracy to say *how* war should be avoided, or the *means* by which it should be waged. It is, however, a fit subject for democracy to remove responsible persons who fail to carry out its policy, and the responsibility for that action is on the democracy concerned. It will be seen, therefore, that the question of practicability is an essential part of genuine democracy; that is to say, democracy should not demand something which cannot be done, and should be prepared to accept the consequences of what is done, and to assess responsibility for those consequences. Undesired consequences may result from bad technical advice and management, or they may on the other hand be inherent in the policy pursued.

I do not wish to go over again a subject which I have dealt with at some length elsewhere, but I might, perhaps, reiterate the absurdity of the present conception of Parliament as a place in which highly technical laws are dealt with by elected representatives who did not in any case draft them, and who cannot possibly be expected to understand them. You may be interested to know that no Bill can proceed from any department of the Government direct. Every Government Bill has to be drafted by the legal department of the Treasury, which we all know to be in effect a branch of the Bank of England, thus making it certain that no Bill can come before Parliament which interferes in any way with the supreme authority of the

Treasury and that private institution, the Bank of England. [Written in 1936, *Editor.*]

In place of this we have to substitute a situation in which the Member of Parliament represents not the technical knowledge or lack of it of his constituents, but their *power over policy* and their right to the use of the sanctions by which policy can be enforced. The proper function of Parliament, I may perhaps be allowed to repeat, is to force all activities of a public nature to be carried on so that the individuals who comprise the public may derive the maximum benefit from them.

Once the idea is grasped, the criminal absurdity of the party system becomes evident. The people of this country are shareholders in it first, and employees of it only secondarily, if they are employees. Can anyone conceive of a body of shareholders consenting to the party system in their business? And this idea is just as applicable to undertakings carried on by the state as in the case of so-called private business. As shareholders we have an absolute right, and a right which by proper organisation we can enforce, to say what we desire and to see that our wishes as to policy are carried out, if those wishes are reasonable, that is to say, if they are practicable.

. . . we recognise that, its practicability having been proved, the problem is a problem of power, and we recognise equally that political power must rest upon aims and desires and not upon technical information. So far as I am concerned, therefore, I am satisfied that further argument upon technical matters will achieve little or nothing, and certainly not in the time which is available, and that the only hope of civilisation lies in forcing a new policy upon those who have control of the national activities, of whom the bankers and financiers are by far the most important.

We do not want Parliament to pass laws resembling treatises on economics. What we do want is for Parliament to pass a minimum of laws designed to penalise the heads of any great industry, and banking and finance in particular, if they do not produce the results desired. (C. H. Douglas in *The Tragedy of Human Effort.*)

### Realistic Constitutionalism

The present administration of this country is of course purely mon-archic and monotheistic, and as a natural consequence, "Common" or "Natural" Law has lost both its meaning and its sanctions, since the House of Commons, with its Cabinet which is the unitary locus of Sovereignty, has become a rubber stamp for administrative works orders, masquerading under the name of Laws—a function for which it was never designed and for which it is grotesquely unfitted. It is not without interest and bearing on this aspect of the problem that one of the ablest commentators on "Origins of the American Revolution," John C. Millar, observes: "In rejecting natural law, Englishmen also denied the colonists' contention that there were metes and bounds to the authority of Parliament. The authority of Parliament was, in their opinion, unlimited: the supremacy of Parliament had come to mean to Englishmen an uncontrolled and uncontrollable authority. Indeed the divine right of kings had been succeeded by the divine right of Parliament. . . ."

It was the refusal of Americans to bow before the new divinity which precipitated the American Revolution."

Speaking, not of course as a lawyer, but as a student of history and organisation, it is my opinion that the restoration of the supremacy of Common Law, the removal of encroachments upon it, and the establishment of the principle that legislation by the House of Commons impinging upon it is *ultra vires*, is an urgent necessity. The locus of sovereignty over Common Law is not in the electorate, because Common Law did not derive from the electorate and indeed antedated any electorate in the modern sense. In the main, it derived from the Medieval Church, perhaps not directly, but from the climate of opinion which the Church disseminated.

There is, of course, nothing very novel in what I am saying; much of it is in Magna Carta, which is not so widely read as it should be, and I am not sure that it cannot be found in an older document, the Athanasian Creed—a far more profound political document than is commonly realised. Some of you may remember the interest aroused 25 years ago, more especially on the Continent, by Dr. Rudolf Steiner's *Threefold Commonwealth*. For my own part Dr. Steiner did not appear to contribute anything very helpful to the practical solution of the problem, while recognising its nature, and his followers seem to have little to add to what he said. With some of his conclusions, if I understand them rightly, I should disagree. The main point to be observed is that to be successful, Constitutionalism must be organic; it must have a relation to the nature of the Universe. That is my understanding of "Thy Kingdom come on earth, as it is in Heaven." When England had a genuine trinitarian Constitution, with three inter-related and inter-acting loci of sovereignty, the King, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, these ideas were instinctive and those were the days of Merrie England. Since the Whig Revolutions of 1644 and 1688 and the foundation of the Bank of England under characteristically false auspices in 1694, the Constitution has been insidiously sapped by the Dark Forces which knew its strength, and the obstacle which it offered to treachery. We now have only the mere shell of the Constitution, Single Chamber Government dominated by Cartels and Trades Unions, (Mond-Turnerism), based on unitary sovereignty, to which the next step is the secular materialistic totalitarian State, the final embodiment of power without responsibility.

To an audience of this character, I do not need to enter into a discussion of the merits or otherwise of democracy, because whatever else it may be, Great Britain is not, and never has been, an effective democracy, and was never less so than at present. Nevertheless, short of a *coup d'état*, I do not think that the idea of democracy, which is of course very nebulous, can be abruptly abandoned. It has been too much propagandised, and means too many things to too many men. But whether by the strengthening and elevation of Common Law, and its repository in the care of an effective Second, non-elective, Chamber, or by some other method, clearly defined limits must be placed on the power of a House of Commons elected on a majority principle. . . .

But, admitting this, the individual voter must be made individually responsible, not collectively taxable, for his vote. The merry game of voting yourself benefits at the expense

of your neighbour must stop whether by Members of Parliament who double their salaries as the first fruits of an electoral victory or by so-called Co-operative Societies which acquire immense properties with the aid of Bank of England created money. There is a clear method by which to approach this end—the substitution of the open ballot for the secret franchise, and the allocation of taxation according to a recorded voting for a programme which incurs a nett loss. This would also imply a large measure of freedom to contract out of legislation of a functional character, with a consequent discouragement of the spate of so-called Laws which are little more than Works Orders.

It is necessary to provide individuals, as *individuals*, not collectively, with much more opportunity to judge political matters by results, and to be able to reject, individually and not collectively, policies they do not like, which involves a large measure of power to contract-out. Common Law is something which, if it changes at all, ought to change very slowly indeed, and the greatest difficulty should be placed in the path of an attack upon it, both by insisting on its supremacy over House of Commons enactments, and by making it subject to something at least as arduous as an Amendment to the United States Constitution. It appears to me that a properly empowered and constituted House of Lords, Spiritual and Temporal, is the natural guardian of Common Law, as the Barons demonstrated at Runnymede.

(C. H. Douglas in *Realistic Constitutionalism*.)

## "The Federal Reserve Conspiracy"

By E. C. MULLINS

This book tells how the international bankers forced the Panic of 1893 and the Panic of 1907 on the American people in order to get the Federal Reserve Act passed. This book follows the bankers to their secret hideout on Jekyll Island where the Federal Reserve Act was written by Kuhn Loeb partner Paul Warburg, American representative of the Rothschild bankers of Europe.

Most Americans think that the Federal Reserve Banks are owned by our government. **THEY ARE NOT!** They are private banks which conspired together to gain control of the credit of our Government, and since then have used our credit for their private profit. The assets of the Federal Reserve Banks jumped from five billion dollars in 1940 to forty-five billion dollars in 1946, showing that the Federal Reserve Bankers made forty billion dollars profit from the Second World War when they poured billions of dollars of Federal Reserve notes into circulation.

Mr. Mullins tells how Woodrow Wilson turned this country over to three of his campaign contributors in 1917, when Bernard Baruch as head of the War Industries Board became dictator of America's heavy industry; Eugene Meyer, Baruch's partner in the Alaska-Juneau Gold Mining Co., became head of the War Finance Corporation, where billions of dollars worth of war bonds were printed in DUPLICATE and disposed of; and Paul Warburg, head of the Federal Reserve Board during the First World War while his brother Max Warburg was chief financial adviser to Kaiser Wilhelm and chief of the German Secret Service. Thus the warring countries, Germany and America, each benefited from the financial advice of a Warburg during their conflict.

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