

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 19.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 12, 1957.

6d. Fortnightly.

Talk of the Devil

Denis De Rougement, a Swiss writer, warns us against the wiles of evil in *The Devil's Share* (first printed in 1944, Meridian Books 1955) which contains one very significant chapter.

Other parts of the work deserve attention, when for instance he deals with myth, "a story which describes and illustrates, in dramatized form, certain deep structures of reality," and which manifest "millenary experience."

Dealing with evil, he notes, "One can steal the child, not paternity. One can steal power, but not authority." He defines the Devil as the agent of Nothingness, while evil is "a bad use of good." But, the author asserts, "despised reality will automatically take revenge." For evil advances to falsifying the scale of truth—like a grocer who tampers with his scales, and "what is properly diabolical is less the doing of evil than the baptizing of it as good when one does it." As a result, reality is distorted and forgotten, and the vocation of the person is drowned "in the irresponsible anonymous."

The author stresses the closeness of freedom and responsibility, but startles us when he proclaims that when Hitler is beaten (he wrote during the war) "we shall no longer have an enemy." This betrays a misunderstanding of the deeper workings of power. We may agree that the war was "the great adjourning of our problems, the justification by public opinion of universal irresponsibility," but it was certainly no great furlough for those active in planning the enslavement of the world and the liquidation of the British Empire.

However, the author turns on his readers to remind them that Christianity has taught that the Kingdom of God is within us and that evil is also in ourselves, and yet we persist in making "the people across the way responsible for our ills, or else we lay the blame on the force of things." Shortly he defines evil as first and foremost "the absence of creative virtues"; we could go further and condemn more utterly the suppression of creative virtue—not only in art but in economics—or the substitution of the fad for the genuine. For, unfortunately, much popular science is irrelevant or mischievous, and widens the gap between the mind and things as they are.

We should, I think, agree that "the entropy of the world is growing," for men show less determination to settle their problems. A further saying that "the gods of men are merciless. They are devils," may be referred to current abusers of power, responsible and irresponsible, although he was referring to the outdated deities of Class and Race, which may indeed represent something. Disraeli constantly praised race, and exclaimed that "all is race."

But the chapter which chiefly interests us is entitled, "The Mal du Siècle: Depersonalization." In our epoch, he remarks, the individual *hardly exists* and he refers to

Kierkegaard's understanding of the "diabolical *principle* of the mass: fleeing from one's own person, no longer being responsible . . . and becoming at one stroke a participant in the divinized power of the Anonymous." A crowd, he insists, is an abstraction. "In order that there may no longer be any responsibility there must no longer be anyone . . . in order that there be no one responsible there need only be a mass. Satan therefore will create masses. . . . Almost all our technical inventions, most of our ideals, in short the general evolution of the time favours this Plan. Everything conspires to deprive us of the feeling of being responsible persons." Man is made a subject predisposed to collective hypnosis. The crowd is "in the minds of the men of our time."

Things of course do not conspire, and technical inventions could just as readily be used to enhance the individual's freedom as to favour a Plan (there is no doubt about there being such a Plan) to deprive the individual of the feeling of being a responsible person and to hypnotise him. The author quotes Scripture frequently, but does not mention the *synagogue of Satan*, which is an apt description of those who wield power—financial or military—in accord with the policy of depersonalization. These are details which we must fill in, and oppose to Satanic policy the contrary policy of individual responsibility and freedom.

The author further complains that the person is becoming lost in the modern world because "the frames have grown too big"—they have of course expanded since he wrote: he further pours scorn on "all the famous economic, technical, social and financial 'necessities'" for the process. He notes the *abrupt expansion* (his italics) at the beginning of the last century of the material framework of our life, and calls it Babelization. It created enormous cities and "into these cities were compressed shapeless human masses, drowning and dissolving the groups organised around small enterprises." And at the present time, "Never was man more powerful, and never, as an individual, has he felt more impotent."

We note again the author's use of the impersonal or of the passive tense, and again take issue with him when he asks, "Why are we becoming collectivised, if this is something we don't really like? It must be that it somehow suits us." He tends, in his attempt to present the Devil as a formidable entity, to neglect those who perform his will and implement his policy. If, for instance, we looked at the Communist experiment in Russia, we should not ask why peasants were collectivised against their wills only to reply that it must be they somehow liked it, but should comment that it suited their rulers and those who hired and financed their rulers.

The final section, called *The Blue of Heaven*, sharply warns the reader against the abuse of language: "Men can pledge themselves only by clear, sharp words, and by twisting and debasing the meaning of words he (the Devil)

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.*

destroys the very basis of our loyalties." Since then most words, even Peace and Justice, have been so debased but the book ends with a word of hope.

Sometimes the giant cuts his own throat, "sometimes a greatly inferior power throws in his path an imperceptible obstacle" which grows and becomes insurmountable. He instances a reed which is caught in the current of a river, accumulates silt and changes the river's course, and recommends that each should become such an imperceptible obstacle to evil, the feeble reed which changes the course of the current. He adds, "I say that the condition of this victory is that we become, each one for himself, a man, a responsible person."

As always, our fate depends not on forces or trends but on the responsible individual, and it is about time that the individual insisted that the trend should be in his direction for a change. H.S.

Grosseteste of Lincoln

Robert Grosseteste, Scholar and Bishop, Edited by D. A. Callus, Oxford.

This book, "a collection of essays in commemoration of the seventh centenary of his death," is chiefly of academic interest, but gives us a glimpse of the character and stature of one of the greatest ecclesiasts of English History. The saying that all great men are bad men, attributed, I think, to Lord Acton, is one of those near-true statements, so noticeably so in our day, belied by the exceptions which, if they do not prove any rule, can be identified by their works. His great ability and learning gave him prominence in his day; his honesty and force of character made him a power in the land. His treatises on scientific subjects remained in use for several hundred years and, as a contemporary said, only "God knows" why he was not canonised, although several representations were made to Rome. The author of the section on the subject thinks one reason to have been his unsparing criticism of the papal Curia. He lectures Kings and Popes alike in his zeal for cleansing both state and church, and usually got his way. If there had been men of his calibre later it is conceivable that there might have been no Reformation.

The section dealing with Grosseteste as a scientist traces the rise of inductive thought and the experimental method through him down to Bacon; but it is his relations with, and influence on the state which is of more particular interest to us. He had not to contend with many of the evils existing in our day, if at root they are always the same;

some in their present manifestation had scarcely yet arisen, others were to some extent in abeyance. Edward I was yet to reign but Stephen Langton had already fought his battle and won.

Grosseteste's concern was to maintain the Church in that purity, without which its authority would have been weakened. Much of his effort was directed against such evils as simony, plurality, the appointment of unsuitable men, and the laxity of the existing clergy, whom he is continually reminding of their responsibility to God and men for their actions and omissions to act—a work which his predecessor St. Hugh, who had assisted Langton with Magna Carta—had not been backward in. Before his elevation to the Bishopric of Lincoln he had already given up voluntarily several lucrative sinecures for the reason that he could not efficiently administer them, rather than through sentiments of sacrifice—money was less "tight" in those days and consequently less concentrated upon, so that the clergy had not to spend most of their time collecting it either for themselves or the Church. Grosseteste seems to have had enough; the generosity which this made possible is indicated by his offer of an allowance to educate a young and illiterate candidate he had refused to institute, although requested to do so by a powerful and influential patron.

He had several encounters with the King, and Simon de Monfort sought his advice. At his own request King Henry III received instruction on his duties and responsibility. Such a laudable humility on the part of the King is a commentary on the relations between Church and State we lack, and on the myth of absolute monarchy in the days when the highest in the land recognised the supremacy of overriding law. More than once in later years he had occasion to remind the King of what he had learned, and usually with effect. The courteous and "gentle, persuasive terms" in which his rebukes were couched in no way lessened the power of his inflexible mind and purpose.

In an age when some progress had been made towards a conception of government which had its roots in the idea of the eternal stability of a trinitarian universe, Grosseteste, while concerned with the whole, was as a cleric naturally preoccupied with that leg of the tripod which, if weakened, would imperil the whole structure of the state. The keynote of his character was the fearless intransigence from whence proceeds his strength, together with integrity. His single-minded search for truth laid the foundation of modern science and did as much for a stable society, which if similarly built upon would doubtless bring an equally spectacular success. H.W.

Press Lies

It would be Utopian to hope that our generation will learn enough in time to be of much use to itself, but if we are to have any hopes for posterity it might be well to leave more records of the sort of idiocy that plagued us. It is said that a government gets into a mess when it starts to believe its own lies. Luigi Villari's book (published by Devin, Adair) on Italian Foreign Policy will not find many readers and, of those, few will want to learn from the recent past. It is no news that our press lies, and the wreck of empire is a tiresome theme. Of a thousand examples we take one expressed in moderate tones:

"In connection with this conference there was a typical example of the methods of a part of the British press. I remember seeing one day in London the posters of an evening paper announcing in huge headlines, "MUSSOLINI'S NO" to some suggested agreement. A day or two later I happened to meet one of the Italian delegates to the conference who had just come over to London, and he assured me that there had never been any "No" from Mussolini or any Italian delegate on any point whatsoever. The invention had been an invention pure and simple by the paper's correspondent.

Whether any gentleness in tone, as opposed to asperity, or any accumulation of such items can bring us to focus on agenda useful now or to the next generation, the present critic is unable to state. But without accurate information even a man, or group of men, of good will cannot make useful decisions. One optimistic journalist stated recently on television that the Russian people were annoyed at being fed lies about Hungary. Eisenhower's Americans and Eden's Englishman are perhaps too proud for annoyance.

The question is, amid the flood of crises and imbecilities in the tax system and money system (issuing all new money as interest-bearing debt) whether any of us can take time out to combat past brain-washing, and adjust our views as to our allies, let alone concerning our opponents.

Great Was the Fall

Fer'nan Lesseps is falling down, while
UNO eases out the Crown.

Disraeli represented the Empire, but
Rothschild noted that a debt
of seven four million, Parliament
or no Parliament, represented
a lien: as credit master he
allowed de Lesseps to proceed, for
wealth alone juts out above Equality and
if the Country has a credit based
on debt, then Rothschild lorded both.

Fer'nan Lesseps is falling down and
Wall Street mobs have gone to town.
The Israeli complication, (USA
opposing Zionists!) reveals
Israel as *agent provocateur*,
little more, but enough for Moslems, yet
the French and British carry the can
no Rothschild dagon crashing, as
they watch America and Russia
touching hands under the table.

Fer'nan Lesseps is falling down while
UNO eases out the Crown.

"Fermented Hatred"

We quote from *The Tablet*, December 22, 1956: "If there are still some Englishmen who think that to be strong and to show yourselves to be strong is all that is necessary with the Arabs, they should reflect on the existence of Israel. Its creation and its imposition did prove that Britain and America were strong. But that display of strength has not commanded respect; it has fermented hatred, and incident-

ally and unjustly more odium for Britain than for the United States, although the political State of Israel was achieved against Britain by methods of terrorism which were an object lesson to Colonel Nasser. We may well doubt how far the Americans appreciate what they have on their hands."

A little way above this the following was written: "One of our new answers to the charges of having muddled away a position that was very strong in both Egypt and Jordan in 1945, is that the Americans were always working against us; that they made the same crude errors they had made about the Chinese Communists, whom they believed to be amiable agrarian reformers in revolt against feudalism, when they supported Neguib and Nasser, and in general the revolutionary elements for whose support the Russians have found it easy to outbid the Americans."

Pusillanimity

"Great poetry is not built on pusillanimity nor literature on the atrophy of curiosity." A Poet.

Nuri es Said

The Daily Telegraph, December 17, 1956, reported some remarks of General Nuri es Said, the Iraqi Prime Minister, which deserve repeating. He denounced Russia for Communist subversion in Arab States and urged the Iraqis to "resist Communist propaganda spread by Shepilov, Malenkov, and Kruschev, their Zionist henchmen and their foolish lackeys outside Zionism. . . . Russia's ambitions to expand and control the Middle East are not secret."

The Soviet Union had exploited its position as a member of the Western Alliance during the Second World War to transform the Russian Legation in Bagdad into a centre of Communist propaganda. In addition to Communism he, as an Arab, felt Zionism was a very real danger. These two forces were allied and many Communists in the Middle East were Jews. The Soviet Union voted for the creation of Israel and supported it with arms and oil up to the very recent past.

Background to Suez

Bewilderment has settled upon the English-speaking world since the British and French intervention between Israel and Egypt at Port Said. It may be of value at this time to look back to 1914 and follow the main events which have taken place since then in that part of the world.

In 1914 the Ottoman Empire still sprawled across the Near and Middle East and the Turkish armies included large numbers of Arabs. It was thought that it would be greatly to the advantage of the Allies if the Arabs could be detached from their allegiance to the Turks, and in order to accomplish this the Arabs were to be bribed with the offer of independence. Sir Henry McMahon, High Commissioner in Egypt, was instructed to contact the Shereef of Mecca, and correspondence ensued. The Shereef's first letter at midsummer in 1915 was cordial and contained this stipulation, "Great Britain will acknowledge the independ-

ence of the Arab countries in every sense of the word independence." A map of the Arab countries was submitted. *The whole of Palestine was included.*

At the end of August Sir Henry McMahon replied to the Shereef, "We rejoice that your Highness and your men are of one opinion that Arab interests are British interests, and British, Arab. . . . Our desire for the independence of the Arabs and the Arab countries . . . has been stated. As regards the question of boundaries it would appear to be premature to consume our time in discussing such details in the heat of war."

Early in September, the Shereef wrote to express his regret at the "coldness and hesitation which you have displayed in the question of the limits and boundaries by saying that the discussion of these at present is of no use and a loss of time."

At the end of the year 1915 Sir Henry McMahon wrote, "I have received orders from my government to inform you that all your demands are accepted." One hundred thousand Arabs joined hands with the British armies and the ejection of the Turks from Palestine and Arabia was now assured.

In early summer, 1917 a remarkable statement was made by Dr. Weizman of the Zionist Organisation—" . . . One of these intermediate stages which I hope is going to come about as the result of the war is that the fair country of Palestine will be protected by such a mighty power as Great Britain. Under the wing of this power, Jews will be able to set up and develop the administrative machinery which . . . would enable us to carry out the Zionist scheme. *I am entitled to say that His Majesty's Government is ready to support our plans.*" (Our emphasis.)

The Rothschilds were in a position to withhold financial support at a time when the country had to float loan after loan. Lord Rothschild wrote to Mr. Balfour, a member of the British Cabinet, and suggested suitable wording for a formal declaration by this country in favour of Palestine for the Jews:—"His Majesty's government accepts the principle that Palestine should be reconstituted as a national home for the Jewish people."

In view of the facts that 93 *per cent.* of the population of Palestine were Arabs and that Sir Henry McMahon had already promised the Arabs their complete independence in every sense of the word, it was necessary to tone down so unequivocal a statement. Accordingly, when the famous Balfour Declaration was made on November 2, 1917, it took the form of a letter from Mr. Balfour to Lord Rothschild promising the "establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jews." The ambiguity was just what was wanted.

At this point General Allenby entered Jerusalem and conquered the Holy Land. The Zionist Commissioners arrived in Jerusalem immediately.

It was not until the closing week of the First World War that the first whisper of the Balfour Declaration reached the Arabs. They were alarmed and indignant. So ugly was their mood that Lord Allenby had this Proclamation posted up throughout Palestine in every village:—

"The end aimed at by France and England in the East is the complete and final enfranchisement of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks, and the establishment of

national governments and administrations drawing their authority from the initiative and free choice of the native populations."

Shortly afterwards, the Arabs were further calmed and comforted by the reference to them contained in the Fourteen Points of America's President Wilson:—

The people's hitherto under Turkish rule "should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development."

At the Peace Conference at Versailles the draft of the Mandate for Palestine was drawn up by the Zionists, and awarded to Great Britain by the Conference.

The Mandate had not been before the House of Commons, but the Lords had discussed it and rejected it. It had not been before the French Senate or before the U.S. Senate and yet Great Britain had accepted the Mandate and France had supported it.

An all-American Committee went to Palestine in May, 1919, in order to find out the wishes of the inhabitants. Less than 1 *per cent.* supported the establishment of a Jewish national home in Palestine, whilst 72 *per cent.* expressed opposition to it. When it became clear what the administration was to be, there were riots among the Arabs who had been signally betrayed.

During the Second World War Mr. Attlee, in referring to Palestine, declared himself in favour of a transfer of population. "Let the Arabs be encouraged to move out as the Jews move in."

The methods of the new arrivals were ruthless and effective. After a few demonstration massacres the Arabs were evicted from their homes. A million refugees rotted in the desert.

Palestine was now partitioned and the new state of Israel was set up. It was discovered that Great Britain owed the new state twelve million pounds. It was paid.

A Jewish member in the Canadian House of Commons claimed that it was the obligation of the nations of the world to keep the surrounding countries from invading Palestine.

On the brink of the final act it seems that the long years of the Palestine incident have merely been a step in the march towards world domination. The situation has been provided in which Russia can erupt into the Near and Middle East. As long ago as 1917 Louis Marshall, American Zionist, stated, "Zionism is but an incident in a far reaching plan."

In her book *The Surrender of an Empire*, Nesta Webster concludes her chapter on "The Surrender to Zionism" with this paragraph:—

"The full effects of British policy in the Near East will not be seen until war is again launched upon the world. Then, with an Egypt free to make her own alliances with stronger Powers, with a Palestine in which the warlike elements have been rendered hostile by the fatal Mandate, the whole of this key position may be in the hands of Britain's enemies."

Having sown the wind, we need not be surprised at reaping the whirlwind. John Brummi