

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 13.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

## Christian Campaign For Freedom

What was described as "a very small meeting for London supporters of the Campaign was held on Saturday, 29th September, at Penrhyn Lodge.

Some of the Chairman's opening remarks were as follows.

"This is the first meeting of more than three people which the Christian Campaign has held since it came into being just over two years ago.

"While the first of our stated Aims is to *provide a meeting ground*, and while we naturally wish to take action in association, I think it is true to say that for action, in these days, a certain amount of isolation seems to be necessary. The **PRESSURE OF WORK** of all kinds is one of the things we are trying to combat, and in order to combat it, many of the extra things which we have to do are found to be more possible alone."

Referring to the belief that in association men can get what they want, he continued, "We are concerned therefore to associate with those who want what *we* want. We do not find many of them—or if they want what we want, they call it something else and so we are unable to associate."

... "The philosophy on which our policy is based is the Christian philosophy. The Christian Campaign has therefore turned to those in Authority in the Church.

"We have found that the Christian philosophy for society is very loosely defined so far.

"Even in the Roman Catholic Church, which seems to stress the importance of clear-cut definitions more than does the Church of England and much more than the Non-conformist Churches, the main attempt to form a Christian Social Philosophy is of comparatively recent date—though we must not forget what was attempted in the Middle Ages.

"We do think that we hear echoes—rather faint echoes perhaps—of what we have been trying to say. . . . The same thing is reported to us from New Zealand, by members of the Dunedin Group who have recently written to us. Incidentally, when these good people write, they express their gratitude for the work you have been doing in this country.

"The Aims of the Campaign have been carefully drawn up to include, if it is ever possible for us to undertake them, actions on various fronts. The Campaign should be capable of reaching others than the clergy—individual supporters might well consider if something could be done in the direction of the educational world, possibly by making use of Dr. Monahan's booklet, ". . . Neither Do They Spin . . ." which in part deals with education.

"A supporter wrote recently that we in the Campaign did not stress *responsibility* sufficiently, nor obedience to the Natural Law. In our reply we said that when we men-

tioned freedom we did so in the sense of "Whose service is perfect freedom," and that being so, obedience to the Natural Law was implied."

The Chairman went on to speak of the Responsible Vote, drawing attention to its place in the third of the Campaign Aims, and reading a very condensed and important letter which had appeared on the subject in the New Zealand press.

Before calling on Mr. Frank Atkinson, whose later account of his work and his plans for the future was both lively and heartening, he briefly outlined the steps by which the present stage of the Campaign has been reached from our first hearing that Mr. John Mitchell had "a new project," through his writing on the difference between Power and Authority, to the stage where Automation came to the fore and support was gained for the Bishop of Oxford's statement that "Work for Work's sake was not a Christian maxim," on through the new Editorship of Rev. H. S. Swabey to Mr. John Brummitt's articles which begin to answer the question as to *how* men's hands and minds might be freed.

The Chairman had some encouraging things to say about our relationship with those members of the clergy who have been able to respond to us, and struck the keynote of his address when he said, "It would, I feel, be a grave mistake to be discouraged if we do not seem to make the headway which we would hope to make. 'No great policy was ever carried through which did not once seem impossible,' wrote the historian J. A. Froude in 1886."

## Living Contrary to Nature

A valuable article in *ABC* (Rome) dealt, on July 1, 1956, with Marxian communism and opened with the remark Benedetto Croce made in 1911 that "socialism is dead," for Marx's socialism of the Manifesto had killed utopian socialism. But, the writer added, "Marxian socialism, which called itself scientific, was dead as well. . . . We have always said that Russian bolshevism gave definite proof of the unreality of Marxian communism, of its utopian and infantile nature, denying history and human nature. . . . Its government was bound to be a dictatorship, and a cruel tyranny as well, for the unsuccessful attempt to impose on men a life contrary to their nature could only be made with suppression and violence. . . . The crimes of Stalin are an essential aspect of the system."

We agree that the system is contrary to nature, but we are not satisfied that "the democracies" have yet put into practice a system that accords with man's nature—else the worries, frustrations, strikes and discontents could all be ascribed to subversion, which plainly is fantastic.

## VOICE

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

"Liberty consists in the freedom to choose or refuse 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: PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON, N.W.1. Euston: 3893.

### Communism Or . . .

We present this week a review of a book on *Communism and Christianity*, and at this point would merely ask how it happens that our society drifts so quickly in the communist direction. The owning of private property or means, for instance, is under ruthless attack; the benefits of public ownership (whatever that means) and of standardised education are assumed; and particularly all parties agree that "Full Employment" alone entitles a man to subsistence.

The views of Marx are enunciated as scientific, but are in reality a hotch-potch of pre-Christian assumptions (on the *Chosen*, for example, in this case the "workers") and of directives that violate the nature of man as he is; while the mesmerism they exercise serves as a valuable tool for those who design to control others by stripping them of independence. We notice that the United States are only outdone by the communists in their opposition to British influence, and that the attack relies on emotive words, like "colonialism" and "under-privileged." Yet the communists would be the last people to relax their hold on their recent conquests, so that the attack is not only hypocritical but self-seeking.

All this is obvious and trite enough, yet we persist in the same direction, and no one says, "Boo!" to the goose or plucks up his courage to challenge the barefaced assumptions on which the whole movement rests. Equality of men is one advertised assumption—very much with the tongue in the cheek, of course—and we admit that men are equal in their liability to perverseness to some extent, although they obviously differ in their potentialities. (There is only one Chaucer, etc.) But then we are supposed to trust our perverse selves to another race—not the chosen workers but the chosen *planners*—who, we are asked to assume, are superior to all perverseness, self-interest or influence. Either we all have a certain amount of ability, despite lapses, to look after our own affairs, or else the supermen are just as hopeless as the rest of us. If, on the other hand, men have the ability to grow and to form associations, the planner is superfluous and stunts natural growth. Or possibly he is intended, and endowed, to pervert genuine growth? Finance has certainly done this, and promoted very unhealthy growth industrially, which is quite unnecessary for any but alleged financial reasons.

Because communism and planning are presented as reasonable, they must be dealt with by reason, and not—as one might well prefer—be dismissed with a contemptuous or incredulous gesture, or by claiming that man is not an attribute (or "accident") of a factory. Further, we must

point out that we stand for an alternative set of principles which neither violate nature nor reason. We hold that man's physical needs can be very easily satisfied in the modern world, and the more easily the better, and that their satisfaction would release man's energies for more important, non-material, pursuits, or for what pursuits he cared to follow. He might care to fly to the moon, but at least he would not be forced to consider space travel for reasons of Full Employment.

### Nile Water

Jean Pleyber in *Ecrits de Paris* for September suggests that we note for future reference the names of the "boute-feux" who will not in person attend the war. He continues: I would say that it is quite possible that the intentions of the Egyptian dictator are not unmixed, but for the moment he has not "detroussé" in measure beyond that used by the french "nationalizers" of 1944 and '45. And he would recall that Nasser is an excellent product of the French "Mission Lai'ique."

After which he ironises on the immortal principles of 1789.

Mr. Eden has succeeded, as our Canadian colleagues have noted, in getting Russian pilots onto the Nile, partially balanced by a few U.S. citizens. Whether Mr. Eden's rise from brotherly group photographs of himself and Maisky to writing prefaces for Mr. Eliot represents a mental improvement on Eden's part, or merely the lightness of scum that floats on a current, we cannot say. It is to be recalled that what American journalists call the "inside dope" back in April, 1939 had it that "Churchill and Eden were going to get into the government in order to get the war started." Just which side of conservatism this trend represents we do not know nor can we hope from light from South of the channel where the remains of Maurras' monarchism exhibit a curious immaturity or decline from the awareness of Talleyrand or Thiers. Our Toynbees and the American Kennedys are unlikely to revive an interest in these Parisians. We do not recall Toynbee's having stressed Talleyrand's anxiety lest our British Constitution be damaged. We search in vain for contemporary thought in France. For surely at this time of day any writer who avoids the problem of monetary issue is either affected by political infantilism (as opposed to conservatism) or by pusillanimity, which is a very imperfect preservative, or by downright criminality.

XAVIER BAYLOR.

### The Apprehension of Truth

Not long ago it was believed that truth was apprehended with the highest of our faculties, which is the intelligence, and which reason serves. But nowadays we are met by such ideas as that expressed in the following quotation from Arnold Toynbee's *An Historian's Approach to Religion* (quoted in *The Tablet*, September 8, 1956): "The Truth apprehended by the Subconscious Psyche finds its natural expression in Poetry; the Truth apprehended by the Intellect finds its natural expression in Science." We are glad that Dr. Toynbee has retained the Intelligence at all, as it seems to be most unpopular these days, when our thinking is done for us.

## Father D'Arcy and Freedom

The Rev. Martin D'Arcy, S.J., has tackled communism, in his book *Communism and Christianity*,\* at the thinker's level and deals with the problem largely in terms of freedom. Readers will be glad to know why communism is inherently unsound and what are the relations of dialectic materialism with other types of thought. Nevertheless the book raises more questions than it answers, or at least leaves the reader wondering why such a weird collection of dogmas as Marxism should have been widely accepted, and should now be influencing countries that claim to be "anti"-communist; and, if, as we trust is the case, the reader is sufficiently adult to disregard labels, he will ask further why the Marxist view of man as primarily a worker, rather than a thinker or a free spirit or a creator, should have laid its dead hand on political thinking almost everywhere today, not least in "conservative" circles.

He will in fact ask if a valid alternative to Marxism exists, and if it does—if, that is, Christianity really has a different policy—why he never hears about it, while the Marxian view is "plugged" on every conceivable vehicle of publicity. Either most Christians are "deviationists," (deviating to Marxism, that is,) or they have allowed their minds to be "infiltrated" to such an extent that they embrace what should be from their point of view the "reactionary" teachings of Marx; or there must be some most influential people about who *desire* the success of the "bolshies," for their own ends presumably, and find that Marx suits their purposes of flattening any likely opposition. The intelligent reader will begin to suspect that these exceedingly influential people aspire to great power, and have discovered that the Marxian "sob-stuff" enables them to arouse the least worthy emotions (like envy) of numerous voters in order to demolish the obstructions to power. Otherwise the advance of Marxism is totally inexplicable.

Fr. D'Arcy, we may allow, 'bends over backwards' to be fair to Marx, but he brings out the contrast between the communist and the Christian points of view with increasing clarity throughout his book. He says that Marx was so struck with the saying of Hegel that "World history is progress in the essence of freedom, progress which we must understand in its necessity," that he (Marx) interpreted it to mean that "freedom is the recognition of necessity." Such a phrase appears to be as much a contradiction in terms as it would be to say that health is the recognition of disease, or that peace is the recognition of war. Fr. D'Arcy also notes the will o' the wisp nature of communism, in that it always looks to a good time coming, but ever so far away. He says that Lenin increasingly distrusted the bureaucrat towards the end of his life, but that "the centralisation of power is the outstanding feature of the Stalin regime." Yet this music hall philosophy poses as the new gospel, and even its "opponents" assert that society must be heavily vaccinated with the poison in order to avoid the disease.

Marx, the author says, "a Jew by race and a Christian for form's sake, had all the thwarted impulses of the ghetto and a hatred of the smug superiority of the Gentile surviving in him," and he injected his followers skilfully enough with hatred of the best Gentile or European features. And he

says that the Marxian view of man "is far removed from the Christian emphasis on person and the ideal of personal freedom." If this ideal of personal freedom had been realised, and abundance had been distributed instead of being destroyed in a levelling-up process which removed poverty, nothing would have remained to hate and Marxism as political thought would have collapsed. But poverty and hatred were preserved, quite unnecessarily, like a snake in a bottle; power was centralised instead of being distributed, and in some obscure way it was taken for granted that the millenium would be advanced by the dismemberment of the British Empire.

Fr. D'Arcy finds the fallacies in Marxism skilfully enough, for Marx, he says, takes for granted the hypothesis that the living arises from the non-living and "lays down as a necessary and obvious truth of his system what the scientist regards as a hypothesis. . . . The dialectic is called in and exercises powers which excel those of the genius of Aladdin's lamp." A little later he points out that what has happened in history "falls just as plausibly under some general theory of power," and that the actions and policies of the Bolsheviks provide an excellent example of such a theory. Materialism, in fact, he adds, has "deprived itself of the wherewithal to give a proper account of the infinitely variegated universe."

Nor, he says, does Marx do justice to the experience "which informs all the high religions," although he preserves his connection with the Hebrew religion, for "it is not easy for a Jew to be entirely uninfluenced by his past": the chosen race and the material kingdom exemplify this lasting influence. And, we would add, the repudiation of any such balanced divinity as the trinitarian leads to the repudiation of a theory of balanced, constitutional, government and to the monopoly of power. Fr. A'Arcy draws attention also to the ardour of Communism, but Christianity "does not meet violence with violence." Then he points to the time when "the State gave priority to the spiritual authority," when in fact power bowed to authority in matters of right and wrong.

We might interject at this point that the complaint made about the modern Church, that it is too remote from daily life and should come down to earth, would appear to rest on a fallacy: for in truth the Church takes most of its thought—on what policy man should pursue—too directly from the current politicians, whereas we need guidance from the Church's point of view and not from the politicians, of which we hear enough already. Repeating what the politicians say seldom represents wisdom and may well sanction error. The lesson of the Middle Ages was that the Church "could not turn its back on human society," our author says, while its object was "justice and freedom in each Kingdom." Today we have accumulated the data for a more mature philosophy of society, he adds. Yet our leaders can only think of man as a "worker," just as Marx did; which would appear neither a more mature nor a fuller description than that given seven hundred or two thousand years ago. The advance is not in thought but in the ingenuity of power, and Macchiavelli himself would have shrunk from a world ruled by a handful of men.

Fr. D'Arcy writes feelingly about freedom, for he says that the Christian ideal "enhanced the idea of law, of freedom, and of personality," while the modern individual is

\*Penguin Books.

called free but is uprooted and depersonalised by modern productive methods. I doubt whether the methods are inherently vicious, but the perversion of them certainly is, especially the treating of production as an end in itself, almost divorced from consumption. Fr. D'Arcy has little time for "labour unions or big business or State control" as answers to the problems. This is correct enough, but his own suggestions are tenuous, although he notices the multiplication "as never before" of the inhuman and bullying type of bureaucrat.

In short, he exposes communist claims to superiority, but fails to show how such a barbaric doctrine ("all is permissible" which will serve the end, for example) could have raised the enthusiasm of people with even a smattering of civilisation. The picture, as he rightly says, closely resembles "that of an ancient slave society"; but then our precious European society is conforming more and more closely to the same picture. The opposite to the slave is the free man, and independence melts before proletarianization: so that communism has advanced by the suppression or disregard of a valid alternative, that of increasing the number of free men at the expense only of the international fraternity who find no weapons too big in their drive for world power. We read of red priests and pink clergy who would perhaps say that their own system of thought has no contribution to make to affairs; but surely Bishops, thinkers and writers cannot all agree with this abandoning of the ship, and would still claim that their faith (not Marx's) shapes their ideas.

Much else that is sound appears in the book, in which *libertas* and the Common Law figure as the permanent gains that civilisation has won from chaos and from the monopolist of power. He notes the purges—in which it is said that fifteen millions have been murdered in Russia and twenty millions in China—and he says that "This dignity which every individual has is the kernel of the philosophy which calls itself Christian," and which insists that man is a free person. Either, then, the ideal of personal dignity and freedom is unattainable, and progressively more unattainable, which even the most ranting centraliser would hesitate to affirm; or else we are being sidetracked from realising this ideal by interested persons, who have a large share in information and publicity and would have a larger share of power.

Fr. D'Arcy proves all his points, but the lacuna in explanation remains: why, that is, such a repugnant creed should have found a foot-hold in Europe; and why, if it poses as a remedy for poverty and insecurity, remedies have not been applied (of course they are known), which will cure these maladies and forward the advance of man towards independence, responsibility and integrity. H.S.

### Long-Term Policy

C. H. Douglas in *The Great Betrayal* (1948) wrote:

... Perhaps it is desirable ... to bring again into prominence the practical importance of recognising the world's ill as the result of a long-term policy. A skilful propaganda to the contrary has been linked with anti-Christianity. . . .

The first point on which to be clear is that if we are

not faced with a long-term policy, our position is quite hopeless. If every step in the industrial arts merely confronts us with more devastating wars, more restrictions and controls, and, except in the United States, a lower standard of living, mankind is so hopelessly perverse that his only tolerable future lies in early annihilation, more especially in view of our decreasing (average) intelligence. But if we are facing a Satanic policy, our position, although very serious, is not necessarily irremediable. But we must first face the facts. No policy, no cure. Clear policy, clear problem. A problem clearly stated is half solved. The second aspect of this situation is equally indisputable. Policies *in vacuo* are a contradiction in terms. Policies embody strategies; you do not fight a strategy, you fight the human beings who are carrying out that strategy. "It's the system we're fighting not men" is one of those half truths which are of the greatest assistance to the Enemy Generals.

. . . The best defence is attack. Do you propose to allow your enemy the monopoly of it?

This raises the question of (a) The inimical objective; (b) The Enemy troops.

For clarity and brevity it would be difficult to improve on St. Matthew, iv, 8-9: "And the devil taketh him up into an exceeding high mountain and sheweth him all the kingdoms of the world, and the glory of them, And saith unto him, All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." That is an offer of World Dominion, on condition of the acceptance of collectivism—the worship of the group idea.

In these days, we are fortunate in one thing, if in no more. We can actually see and read in our daily paper that the devil's offer has been accepted, and two attempts, the League of Nations, and U.N.O. have been set up. By their Fruits, ye shall know them.

Now as to the troops . . . the most important part of the organisation of the World State is financial and industrial—the control of credit and raw materials.

While it is difficult to deny the existence of such organisations as the international chemical trust, the World Bank and international monetary fund and similar world cartels, because they are visible to the eye and mentioned in the newspapers, their relation to the world state is not so visible and not so easily exposed. But if we grasp the fact that the essence of Communism, which is the politics of the World State, is centralised vesting of the planet in an organisation expropriating and cutting across all local and personal sovereignty, we cannot be much in error if we identify internationalists, open or concealed, with treason to the individual and his race and country. Mr. Jacques (now deceased, a former Canadian M.P.) remarked "The Hon. Member for Macleod said, if I remember correctly, that there are just two kinds of people in the Civil Liberties Association (a Canadian 'Red Front'), traitors and stooges, the dupes."

(To be continued.)

#### FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

Contributions to The Treasurer, Christian Campaign For Freedom, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1.