

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 16.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

ON THE BRINK OF THE ABYSS

MAKE NO MISTAKE. AN ARMED UNITED NATIONS ORGANISATION POWERFUL ENOUGH TO CRUSH ANY AGGRESSOR COULD—AND WOULD—AT THE BIDDING OF ITS ANONYMOUS FINANCIAL BACKERS, CRUSH ANYONE WHO DARED TO OPPOSE IT WITH ARMS OR EFFECTIVELY TO FLOUT ITS WILL. ONCE LET IT SUCCEED IN ESTABLISHING ITSELF, AND HUMAN FREEDOM, OF NATIONS OR OF INDIVIDUALS, IS AT AN END. UNDER WHATEVER NAME, TYRANNY, TOTALITARIAN RULE, IS ENTHRONED, IRRESISTIBLE AND ACCOMPLISHED.

Voice regards the prevailing babel of opinions which confuse the public mind in the Press, through Broadcasting and by all means of mass hypnotism, as the apotheosis of pseudo-democracy—the reduction to impotent absurdity of the false principle that states can be conducted successfully, in the interest of those concerned, by the operation of the lowest common denominator of intelligence concerning *how* things should be done, while completely safeguarding from all individual decision, the vital question, TO WHAT END, to what common objective, should things be done, and to what extent the individual consents to participate actively in the necessary steps to secure these ends. In what we have stigmatized as pseudo-democracy, *Voice* declines altogether to participate.

Current Notes

Wisdom, equity, discipline, order, courage, good fortune; qualities which succeed each other in the order they are mentioned, form the chain of action in truly great men. The proceedings of those who unjustly arrogate to themselves that title offer, on the contrary, nothing but rashness and obstinacy, the companions of blind ambition. A vain confidence in their talents, presumptuous dependence on their good fortune; all consequences of flattery, which generally enslaves no persons so much as those false heroes who think themselves born to subject the whole world.

(From the *Memoirs of Sully*, translation of 1778.)

So wrote the minister of Henry IV of France in the early years of the seventeenth century. Now we are in the age of "false heroes" who desire or subserve the monopoly of power. I have seen no public question as to whether the Canal is really necessary, and a correspondent suggests that even our *premises* are wrong. References to the Palestinian refugees are confined to an article by Major General Fuller in *The People* (November 4), but I have recently heard from a political figure that the Palestinian refugees are a sore in the Middle East that has really caused trouble. A contributor to *Voice* remarks, "What seems quite plain is that this country has been used once again to make the world safe for Israel—a continuous policy since the MacMahon letters in 1915."

The Church Times (November 16) has this to say on the "Reason Why":

There has been a great deal of natural speculation over

the reason why Britain and France suddenly agreed to a cease-fire in Egypt, when to do so damaged their prospects of military success irretrievably. The real reason was revealed by what may be termed "authoritative sources" in London, on Tuesday. According to these sources, the United States threatened Britain and France with drastic economic sanctions, if they did not accept an immediate cease-fire.

In an article in *The Sunday Times* (November 18), "Suez: An Appraisal," Lord Strang, formerly Permanent Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs says in connection with the Middle East that there is no more difficult political problem in the world and that at the heart of it lies the question of Israel. He goes on to say that the Western world is now paying the price for the Balfour Declaration and all that flowed therefrom.

Communism and Political Zionism

"Through all 'the tumult,' the rise-and-fall of states, the collapse of nations and the destruction of liberty, through the three tumultuous decades, these two new forces alone prospered and became more powerful, until today they dominate the scene. . . . Both sprang from the same place: Russia. Both became openly powerful at the same moment, namely, October and November, 1917. . . . Both worked hand in hand and promoted each other's aims during the next thirty years (*whether in the third act they will separate and strike at each other, or appear to do so, is a revelation reserved for the Fulminant Fifties*)."

—Douglas Reed, *From Smoke To Smother*. Our italics.

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.

Reply from a Bishop

5th October, 1956.

"I have read the booklet *Neither Do They Spin* with interest.

"With its main contention—which I take to be that all men should be free to develop their personalities into what God meant them to be, I am in complete agreement. And I wish it were true that all schools, and especially church schools, were chiefly concerned with this, instead of too often trying merely to give the children what will enable them to earn their living in the world outside. Although I do think (and I see a certain amount of teachers and schools) that a number of both are really concerned with this question, and are trying to give their children something more than a mere commercial and technical education.

"But when the writer goes on to speak of leisure, and universal independent incomes, then, I fear, I am unable to follow him.

"I can't agree that work is the 'Curse of Adam.' Invariably I find that those who have work to do, are happier than those who have none; and is it really true that if all had independent incomes the majority wouldn't live on them and do nothing at all?

"It seems to me that every man ought to make a contribution to the society of which he is a member—the rent for his room on earth—and if he won't I can't see why he should live at ease on the work of others.

"Supposing he gives one fifth of his working life to producing food, clothing, and shelter (as we none of us know how long we have to live it might be difficult to calculate this; but no matter). This leaves him with the greater part of his life, in which to 'choose with freedom whether he will or will not assent to any project which may be placed before him.' Presumably then, the graceful things of life, the things which make it worth while living, will depend on how far men, who have served their time in the production of food, *etc.*, are ready to begin again and produce different kinds of things—music, art, scholarship, and so on. Or perhaps as the booklet says, 'furnishing the home with articles built from the point of view of the craftsman.' But a craftsman is one who has served a long apprenticeship. And moreover is it not likely that the majority having served their 'fifth,' will live on their independent incomes and do nothing at all? And if you want to know what a miserable sort of life that is, ask some of

the men, who through no fault of their own, have been retired in the forties, and can't get another job. They have their 'independent incomes' all right. And why should a man who in his 'fifth' has become a skilled workman want to sit down and 'furnish his home with craftsmanship,' rather than go on exercising his skill at his own job?

"Today men are free from the necessity of devoting themselves entirely to the production of food, *etc.* That is done by a small part of the working community. Surely the difference between the men who built the Cathedrals and the men of today who make lesser things, is not that the former were free of the necessity of devoting themselves entirely to the producing of food, *etc.*, but that both are freed by the work of others to produce non-essential things, and that one is employed in producing finer things than the other. But I do wonder how many of them would have devoted themselves to the building of the cathedrals, if they had not earned their bread and butter thereby.

"There are one or two points I can't follow in the booklet. On p. 6, how is it impossible for a country to prosper by an excess of exports over imports? We have to buy food from abroad. If our imports exceed our exports, how are we going to pay for it? Is it true to say (p. 15) that our basic needs in food, *etc.*, are provided by a diminishing portion of the population? Surely one of our most serious problems is that we must import much of our food.

"P. 21 says, 'We have learned by experience that all Caesars (*i.e.*, all politicians) go to Hell.' This seems to me the kind of remark which is unbalanced and rather shakes our confidence in the judgment of the writer of the book from which it is quoted.

"These few remarks, made rather at random, do not however alter the statement with which I began, that I am in agreement with the main contention of the booklet."

• • •

The Chairman of the Christian Campaign referred the Bishop's letter to Dr. Monahan and in his reply to the Bishop quoted the following comments, which were made by Dr. Monahan:—

"It is, I believe, quite true that the sudden universal distribution of independent incomes sufficient to cover the cost of living would lead to undesirable consequences. But this is because the policy controlling industry and government and education—the conception of 'Full Employment'—is *wrong*. What is wanted as a preliminary to a more rational and satisfactory human condition is that the wrongness of the present conception should be recognised and challenged, with a view to securing a re-orientation of policy. It is clear, for example, that some families possessing inherited wealth produce a succession of members who are able to live on independent incomes, but who devote themselves—in the best cases dedicate themselves—to some worth-while activity. Here, of course, we must be careful not to adopt a utilitarian view of 'worth-while.' 'Worth-while' is to be measured by the effect on the man—by his degree of perfection 'in the sight of God.' Such families show us where we should aim.

"'Those who have work to do are happier than those who have none.' If this is true, how can it be true that the

majority of those with independent incomes would do nothing at all? The root question is this: Is it true that a man is happier when he is *forced* (by the alternative of starvation) to do any sort of work than he would be if he had an income sufficient to keep him free from starvation, plus the opportunity of increasing his income by paid employment? That is what is meant by 'whether he will or will not assist in any project which may be placed before him.' He is not forced to live in 'compulsory retirement' on an inadequate income, just as he is not forced to undertake employment in a project of which he disapproves. This progressive freedom to choose employment would, over the course of time, and with a re-orientation of educational policy, lead to an improvement in the conditions *and objectives* of employment.

"*Exports and imports*: Assume that the price-values attached to goods are a correct measure of their exchange value. England requires to import a certain value of food-stuffs, and to do this must export an equivalent value of other goods. Now any exports *in excess of this value* represent a physical loss of goods, the loss being balanced by money. But this extra money could be spent only on those *English* goods which have been exported. The effect of this, of course, is to inflate the prices of the goods which have not been exported—or, to put the matter in the way in which it appears—the inflation of prices in the home market makes it appear necessary to obtain more money from abroad by increasing the surplus of exports. If cauliflowers and cabbages require equal efforts to produce, and one man produces cabbages and the other cauliflowers, if one man 'exports' two cabbages, and 'imports' one cauliflower and one shilling—he is worse off by one cabbage, the shilling, in this case, being meaningless and useless.

"But these technical matters are not vital to the theme of the pamphlet. An understanding of them helps, that is all. I hope the Bishop will appreciate that I have no hope of a panacea. I believe we are headed for disaster, because we are following a wrong policy; that a change of policy is urgently required, but will never come from the politicians, or the 'leaders' of industry or labour. But it might come from moral leadership. And if it does come, it will take many years of difficulty before the terrible consequences of the wrong policy are overcome and outgrown; but at least we would have a chance of moving in the right direction. Otherwise, some order like that of 'Brave New World' or '1984' appears to be a certainty". . . .

The Pope Mistranslated

A Quebec subscriber sends for our attention the report which follows—of a mischievously, subtly misleading translation. He also sends his English version of the reply he received to a letter sent in May to the Secretariat of State on the matter.

The reply, dated June 14, 1956, acknowledges his letter "about an erroneous translation of a passage in an address of His Holiness," and says that the Secretariat of State of His Holiness "wishes to inform him that the translation by the N.C.W.C.'s News-Service bears no official authoritativeness and that the inaccuracy of its translation in the

reported instance was immediately brought to the attention of that organism."

Our correspondent adds that although he is a Catholic and French-speaking Canadian, nevertheless he knows of "no other group of thinking people in the world today who pay superior or equal interest (I mean REAL interest) to the papal pronouncements, than the gathering of English-speaking protestants who seek and fight for Truth" whose work includes the publication of *Voice*.

In view of the fundamental error of translation made in America he would be greatly interested to learn from any of our readers how this passage was translated in England or Ireland.

Misleading Translation in a Papal Address

On September the 14th, 1952, His Holiness Pope Pius XII addressed the scientists, convened in Rome for the first International Congress of the histopathology of the nervous system, on The Moral Limits of Medical Research and Treatment.

This papal address has been widely used all over the world by the resisters to forced fluorine-therapy.

The papal address was pronounced in the French language.

The French text says:

"Pour justifier en morale de nouveaux procédés, de nouvelles tentatives et méthodes de recherche et de traitements médicaux, on invoque surtout trois principes:

1. L'intérêt de la science médicale;
2. L'intérêt individuel du patient à traiter;
3. L'intérêt de la communauté, le bonum commune."

This has been translated as follows by the National Catholic Welfare Conference's News-Service, of Washington, D.C., U.S.A.:

"In order to justify the morality of new procedures, new attempts and methods of research and medical treatment, three main principles must be kept in mind:

1. The interests of medical science.
2. The interests of the individual patient to be treated.
3. The interests of the community, the "bonum commune."

Where the French text says: "three principles are mainly invoked" the English translation says: "three main principles must be kept in mind."

This is not only a faulty translation but a very grievously faulty one, in that it has the effect of giving the impression that His Holiness is himself upholding as worthy of commanding agreement and submissiveness the very principles falsely and erroneously advanced by the scientists who claim an un-limited right to carry on with medical research and treatments.

So far from being the case, the papal addresses has the expressed object of examining what those claims to un-limited research and treatment are worth, and of dismissing any absoluteness thereof by wisely defining their limits.

Remarks on Pamphlet En 38 of the N.C.W.C. Translation of the Papal Address of September 14, 1952, on

The Moral Limits of Medical Research and Treatment

This address is by the Pope to a gathering of physicians.

They have asked him to address them on their moral duties as such.

This he agreed to do, and, at the given time, actually proceeds to address them.

Now, the Pope, as everyone shall readily agree, does not perform, himself, medical researches or treatments of any kind.

Those who do so are the physicians he is actually addressing, and among whom might be present some who, in that matter of medical research and treatment, hold very definite views as to their *un*-limited right to do so.

Those among the gathering who hold such views rely for justification on one or some of the three following grounds, tenets, or claims:

- (a) the interests of medical science;
- (b) the individual interest of the patient;
- (c) the interests of the community, the *bonum commune*.

The Pope will then start to examine, one by one, the validity, from the point of view of morals, of any of those claims made by those who try to JUSTIFY the *un*-limited right of physicians to research and treatment, and he so announces.

It is the CLAIMS made by those who hold an *un*-limited right to do anything they consider proper in the field of research and treatment that the Pope will proceed to examine, and so the tenets ADVANCED are tenets held by those physicians,—words from their own mouths—and which the Pope does not take to his account at all, as appears from the very words in which he introduces the tenets:

“In order to justify the morality . . . of new methods . . . three principles are mainly invoked.” . . .

“Invoked,” NOT by the Pope, but by those who stand for the *un*-limited and *un*-checked right of science and scientists to do everything in the matter of research and treatment, and who try to JUSTIFY their stand.

The Pope only states and repeats what those men INVOKE for justification, before proceeding to examine, one by one, what their claims are worth. B.L.

A Masonic King

Dr. Johnson threw an interesting light two hundred years ago (in the Literary Magazine for 1756) on King Frederick in a monograph entitled “King of Prussia.” Charles Frederick, who was to become an exponent of power politics, was a grandson of George I, and being of “quick sagacity and comprehensive knowledge,” had many disagreements with his father who was “rough and savage,” maintaining the tallest regiment in Europe on exorbitant taxes, most of which he hoarded. He imprisoned his son when about to leave the kingdom and forced him to marry against his will.

Charles Frederick succeeded to the throne of Prussia in 1740 and after dismissing the prime minister he “declared his resolution to grant a general toleration of religion, and among other liberalities of concession allowed the profession of Free Masonry.” The friend of Voltaire then claimed Herstal and Hermal from the Bishop of Liège and sent in his soldiers—no longer all giants—to enforce his claim. Later in the same year the Emperor Charles VI died and Frederick seized Silesia.

Dr. Johnson next gives a few details of the Code *Frédérique* which attempted to bring uniformity into the courts, fixed the number and pay of advocates and annulled the office of attorney. It allowed an advocate for the poor and appeals to two superior courts only, and tried to hustle the process of justice. Although Frederick shewed barbarity on his campaigns (threatening death to peasants of invaded countries who carried arms when he appeared, for instance) he opposed duels, torture and the death sentence for petty theft on the part of the poor.

In 1742 all appeared to be quiet when the elector of Bavaria was invested as Emperor and Prussia obtained Silesia and an alliance with the Queen of Hungary and with England. But the English parliament voted the Queen of Hungary half a million pounds and Austria recovered, and within two years was invading Alsace. Frederick saw his chance and while the Austrians were engaged abroad he invaded Bohemia with a hundred and four thousand men, claiming that he was advancing on behalf of the Emperor and of pacification.

Eventually he had to retreat, but the Emperor died the next year and this time the Queen attacked Frederick. He defeated the Austrians and invaded Saxony victoriously. With the imposition of peace Dr. Johnson concludes his study, remarking that Frederick was “now at the height of human greatness.”

We might perhaps note that the Russians have not invented the idea of using “peace” as a cloak for power any more than, shall we say, Americans are the first to meddle in another empire on the plea of improving it. Power, in fact, bears an extraordinarily similar expression under its many masks, corrupting ability, deceiving those who should know better (“the elect”) and extending the promise of plunder. Frederick said, “I mean by the word *policy*, that we must always try to dupe other people.” He commended the maxim, “That to despoil your neighbours is to deprive them of the means of injuring you.”

Possibly Henry Fielding had Frederick the Great in mind when he lampooned “greatness” in *Jonathan Wild*, which relates the aspirations and achievements of notable highway-men.

FUNDS URGENTLY NEEDED.

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