

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 3. No. 3.

SATURDAY, JUNE 2, 1956.

6d. Fortnightly.

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.

Canon E. Blackwood Moore's Sermon

(Concluded.)

These evil powers are capturing education, and their aim is a World Police State. Listeners, are you going to continue to eat and drink and play? The evil tentacles of Unesco are already closing round your children in and out of school. The Auckland Public Relations Office is the latest propaganda medium for World Government. Read the booklet printed by Whitcombe and Tombs and sold to children at the recent Birthday Carnival and you will see something of the methods of these World Federalists.

Then read also in the *New Zealand Herald* of Thursday week; "The *Daily Mail* yesterday accused the United States of working indirectly with Russia against Britain in the Middle East. Most Americans would recoil in horror from such a thought, said the newspaper, but it was true. American influence has been exerted, directly or indirectly, knowingly or unknowingly, to get us out of Egypt, and to weaken us in Jordan and Persia, and when we come out Russia walks in." Can that be denied? Since it was written we can add Ceylon, and we are in process of adding Malaya and Singapore. According to the "Oakland Tribune," an American paper, President Eisenhower's closest adviser is his brother Milton, regarded as the most left-winger member of the party. He is one of the leading lights in Unesco, and in a Government document "The Kansas Story on Unesco" he is quoted as stating in a speech at Kansas "One can truly understand Unesco only if one views it in its historical context, and viewed in this way it reveals itself as one more step in our halting, painful, but, I think, very real progress toward a genuine world government." A United States Government investigation into the affairs of the "Voice of America" (Report of Committee on Government Operations No. 928 February 3, 1954) revealed that the head policy controller of the entire U. S. Information Agency at the time of the investigation was responsible for introducing a number of Communists and near-Communists into the "Voice of America" as script writers, including

Howard Fast, one of the leading Communist authors in the country. Many of the broadcasts were not the Voice of America, but the voice of the Kremlin, as are some of ours. Christians, when you sit down to eat and drink, do a little thinking too! Much of the stuff written about the atom and hydrogen bomb is deliberately intended to frighten you into a World Police State, where the Kremlin will reign supreme. "Fear not the things which kill the body, but the things which kill the soul" is the Christian message. Scientific humanism kills the soul. Professor Hogben, one of its ablest exponents writes; "Our expectation of life has increased as we have learnt to worry less about the *good* life than about the good drain." Jesus Christ said, "He that is not for me is against me."

Are we going to succumb to the blandishments of those whose thoughts are directed to one end only—the World Police State? That way madness lies. The hosts of the enemy are closing in. There is a remit to the National Council of Women which would make Esperanto a compulsory subject in schools. Part of the plan. Christians awake, or there will be no happy morn to salute. If nothing be worth dying for, as Unesco teaches, then nothing is worth living for.

World Government is condemned by the utterances of its own leaders. Listen to what Mr. Nicholas Doman has to say in "The Coming Age of World Control." "It is conceivable that the principles prevailing in the super-national political structure will not be acceptable to some or all of the organised religions. Representatives of these religions might challenge the political authority, and scheme for its removal. If religion linked its cause with nationalism and the nation-state, it might well share their fate In the case of the religious challenge, the political authority might attempt to restrict or ban the activities of the Church." Does that smell of Moscow?

Unesco launched a 600,000 dollar project to alter the history text books of the West to favour World Government. Our Minister of Education has admitted, in writing, that he is a supporter of World Government. The British Empire, what is left of it, is worth both living and dying for, because the Christian Faith is worth living and dying for. The ultimate warfare in the world is the warfare of ideas. Knowledge in the sense of science, or the exact science of measurable things, important though it be, is not the chief thing in life. It does not in fact touch the best things at all: goodness, beauty, love—these things are not measured but appreciated, and they are the things we cherish most. Unesco just does not know what it is talking about. It is not among the untutored savages of Patagonia that we hear most of war, but among precisely those nations where scientific knowledge has been brought to its highest capacity. Unesco would bring peace and security by modern science,

but those who prate most about it seem to be blissfully unaware that the heart of the most modern science is that in the absence of resistance, energy has no power and vanishes.

Wake up! before it is too late.

Let us stand for God, Queen, and Country. Stand fast in the faith once for all delivered to the saints. If God be for us who can be against us? Perhaps you would rather sit down, to eat and drink and rise up to play? It is for you to determine.

But there will be little opportunity—in concentration camps.

Auckland,
New Zealand.

"A Mongrel Flatness"

At a time when those who imperil and weaken their country receive the awards and positions, an article by J. Biggs-Davison, M.P. in *The Tablet* (12th May, 1956) which gives the case against world government deserves respect and dissemination. The advocates of world government should, he says, be quite clear what it would mean. "Sovereign nations would . . . in effect and in time be reduced to mere local authorities dependent upon an almost all-powerful centre." He has never been satisfied that such a world government would be "compatible with the human freedoms . . . It would hardly be a Christian world empire . . . There is one blueprint for world government in Moscow."

He calls the nature of the nation "organic," and suggests that there is probably "an optimum size" for political units. The federation of distinct communities involves "the subversion of national traditions by cosmopolitan influences." We might ask what he means by 'cosmopolitan,' a term which usually indicates the presence of rootless adventurers. Montreal, for example, is not so called merely owing to the presence of those of French and British origin. We are grateful to Mr. Biggs-Davison for indicating a source of subversion.

The Commonwealth on the other hand, he says, "is building something more delicate and more precious to the world than a superstate." This contrast between the British and the One World systems has drawn upon us a flood of propaganda designed to weaken Britain in favour of a centralized slavery, and the writer points out that world government "could only be tyrannical. . . . Those who would break down the barriers of nations would not only reduce human quality and diversity to a mongrel flatness but drain civilization of its life-blood."

He further requires that every nation should "maintain effective control of its economic and other affairs."

Another writer, S. Musulin, in the same issue of *The Tablet*, complains, when dealing with the Austrian elections, that "It is far easier to shout slogans about cradle-to-grave insurance than to persuade voters that even the Welfare State has its disadvantages."

We hope that disgust with international and national policy may lead these writers to appreciate those who advocate a reverse policy.

Man No More The Toiler

(from *The Daily Telegraph*)

Sir—It does not seem to be realised by the Trades Unions that automation will eventually usher in the Leisure State for them.

A 30 hour week, a three-day week-end and a good standard of living is quite a possibility only if our financial system is so completely recast as to reflect the real wealth of the nation, which is bound to increase as the result of the new process.

In the matter of progress increased mechanisation can have only one object: to abolish the individual's physical toil of providing himself with the necessities of existence in order that hand and brain may be set free for some higher order of activity.

Teething troubles in the early stages are to be expected, but these cannot be so very bad in the present time of fully paid under-employment (that is, three men to one man's job).

H. A. Parfremont.

["Automation does mean that some men on the assembly line become redundant," notes *The Observer* in a leader entitled *Bogy* on May 13th. Those who bewail the dreariness of the assembly line should therefore welcome automation provided that it's benefits are passed on. No one in a reasonable order would be penalised financially for a public benefit—Ed.]

Correspondence

A Religious Issue

Sir—All money reformers have blundered badly by regarding money reform as a political issue. It is a religious issue of major importance for the whole Christian Church of all denominations.

J. Creagh Scott, Lt. Colonel.

Basic Issues

Sir—The most depressing feature of the Pound Case is that none of the basic issues raised either by the Case or the Cantos has been discussed by any English or American critic.

The Italians cannot be expected either to have understood or even now to understand Pound's attempted debate with what now appears to have been a totally in-existent American intelligentsia. On the question of the abuse of executive power, for example, Mr. Pound does not appear to have barred excess as such, as for instance Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana in an emergency, or at least during a rare moment of opportunity. Pound did claim that in the case of executive excess, all liberties would be lost *unless* someone protested.

The principle of free speech in an age of radio was referred to in the Pisan Cantos. The line was improved in the German translation: *Redefreiheit ohne Radiofreiheit gleich nul ist.* (Free speech without freedom on the radio amounts to nothing). There has been but one printed reference to this line in either England or America (*Sunday Observer*, March 1, 1953).—William Watson.

Freedom

Sir—There is, I think, both need and opportunity at present for a campaign for freedom. The conception of individual freedom seems to be disappearing from the view of so many folk, not through the fault of planners etc., but through their own fault. The fact of individual freedom is completely and undestroyably tied up with the Christian Doctrine of Man. To enlarge briefly, Man, made in the image of God, given free will, the power of choice, should not abuse this freedom by meekly subjecting his own will to that of misguided authority or intimidation. E.R.

“Self-confidence To Win”

Dr. W. H. C. Frend, writing in *The Church of England Newspaper* (20th April, 1956) insists that the propaganda war in the Middle East can be won. Before 1939, he says, “It was quite obvious that the French were heading for trouble in both Algeria and Tunisia. . . There was, too, an underlying fear even at this time of the expanding influence of Jewry.” These factors increased the influence of Egypt. Dr. Frend adds: “First, we must be clear both on what we do in fact represent in the world, and also how we wish to represent ourselves. Secondly, we must have the self-confidence to win a propaganda war. We stand for much in the world. . . We have much to give.”

He agrees with the call to abandon ‘the trivial and partisan’ in our national life. What we stand for and what we have to offer would of course be immensely enhanced if we shook off our own chains and had a policy of freedom instead of ‘work-for-all,’ and a genuine measure of national wealth instead of the inflated and diluted money that comes from an unworkable system.

Book Reviews

A Plea for Man by Mario M. Rossi. Edinburgh University Press, 9/6d.

At the end of the seventeenth century, the author says, a “sober view of history was superseded by History with a capital H.” This resulted in “the emergence of historicism due to the limited outlook of those who forgot the work of the historian in choosing facts and the hand of Providence in producing them.”

The book continues its refreshing attack on those who use the past to enslave the present. Historicism, he continues, offers the widest scope to anyone willing to “change his mind for a consideration and to sell his soul to a totalitarian regime.” It denies eternal truth, the everlasting laws of conduct and everlasting God, and “destroys morals because it implies that man is never free,” making truth and falsehood, good and evil “relative to the passing moods of men”: historical events must accord with the pattern the historian wishes to impose and “the pattern is determined by the choice of events.”

We may agree that man should be free from propaganda history, but Mario Rossi does not ask why history should be falsified or in the interests of what policy the falsehoods are pushed and man is demoralised.

He then attacks philosophy, which has suffered from “a mistaken approach inherited by all thinkers,” and points out that Plato and Berkeley both criticised the theories for which they are famous. He contrasts the classical belief in the Golden Age and the modern myth of Progress, and calls the Marxian implication that technical, social and cultural changes happen in the same kind of time “a monstrous error.” The Golden Age philosophers would not entertain the Marxian thesis that society is in a perpetual flux which conditions gradual and violent changes. He adds, “The Golden Age myth appealed to direct experience when it denied that an ideal society might ever be planned.” We might add that a servile society is being planned.

He holds that freedom and responsibility “are the very core of human existence” and that surrendering them is the ultimate sin. After discussing existentialism, he says, “personality will appear as the intimate, coherent destiny which has ruled our lives . . . The individual is free because he is bound by his own laws.” The historian disregards this freedom of man, and “teaches that the individual is irresponsible.” He commends biography as a paramount science.

The author’s insistence on freedom and responsibility is welcome as is his attack on the insidious forces that ‘dehumanize’ humanity. *Voice* also stands for Freedom and Responsibility, and has a similar dislike of plans. On the other hand, a purely episodic view of history fails to account for a continuous policy of denying man the freedom he should have. We are forced, for instance, to pay for the Welfare State and its education, whether we approve of them or not; and these forces in turn influence men, women and children to accept less freedom and to evade responsibility. Nothing less than a change of policy in accordance with the realities of the situation will set man free. We hope that Mr. Rossi will plead for this.

Christian Diplomacy and War by Herbert Butterfield. Epworth Press, 8/6d.

The Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge suggests that a comparatively few Christians could alter the course of history as powerfully as the communists have done, “quietly penetrating free minds,” acting as the leaven. We should like to feel that those connected with *Voice* may act as leaven.

Dr. Butterfield asks whether the world can be made any more tolerable in spite of the power which solidifies in great masses. He cites the total war, the revolutions and the barbarism that have appeared since 1914, adding that the unlimited “war for righteousness” is a theory of war that has been known for centuries and that gives the conflict its “daemonic character.” He refers to the “sinister application” of the whole technique of the war for righteousness, mentioning the Russian aggressions before 1914, the promise of Constantinople to Russia and other promises to Italy, and calls the billing of Germany as the sole wicked power in Europe “the slickest ethical conjuring trick of modern history.” The “righteous” outlook gave war a greatly magnified role in history and allowed unlimited expropriation. As for news—and the Professor omits recent events from his survey explicitly at least—“all peoples are

at the mercy of Government officials who have the defects of human nature." Our predecessors felt that the prosecutor should not also be judge of war crimes. The trial of General Yashima was a shocking case; these trials have added a new horror and desperateness to war. The menace from a conflict of "giant organised systems of self-righteousness" needs no emphasis. The quality of mercy withers, and the disappearance of the urbanities and of tolerance are signs of modern barbarism. Civilization "requires the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins."

He endorses the saying of Acton that power tends to extend indefinitely, notes that revolutionary states are particularly aggressive, and marks the sameness in such aggressors as Spain, France, Germany and Russia.

Whether any of the Professor's remedies would be effective before power is restored from the group to the individual, before finance is decentralised and dethroned, before giant organized systems of self-righteousness are dispersed into their constituents, is debatable. But Dr. Butterfield's defiance of humbug and his production of alternatives to UNO deserve respect and attention. He emphasises the "limited liability" wars of the eighteenth century, in which the participants refuse to burn the house down (European civilization) to roast the goose. He says, "We could be at war as a nation every minute of our history against cruelty or oppression in some part of the world," but aggression, he points out, depends on conditions and a Christian and scientific, as opposed to a Pharisical and moralistic approach should check the emergence of conditions. Such an outlook would not regard it as legitimate to complete the destruction of Germany or of Russia, while a crude moralistic approach has led to colossal blunders. He regrets the passing of the time when a lying diplomat was despised, and deplores the error of our weakness in the inter-war period. All of which constitutes no little reproach of modern politicians.

He continues writing as a Christian when he says that, "Our civilization could never have been developed on the ethics of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth." We have, he says, neglected the 'imponderables' in our thought on preserving the national and international order. The powers should feel that they are partners. (But whose partners? Those of Kuhn, Loeb and Co?) Turning again to the eighteenth century, he points out that then they realised that the status quo should not be frozen, but that the victor should not provoke undue resentment in the vanquished. The 'imponderables' of this international order preserved a stable equilibrium, and the smaller states which enjoyed peace acted like the ball bearings of the system. Now we are left with huge powers which provoke great crises.

His remarks on ideological diplomacy appear as rather a mixed bag, although we may agree that "we can be fervent supporters of revolution when we dislike the victim," and that the net result of war is its effect on the distribution of power, if by power he includes financial power—an 'imponderable' that he fails to mention. He asks whether we are opposing communism with a counter system, but at the moment we appear to be making a pale copy of it. We may support his appeal to abandon the 'war for righteousness' and to reject revolution and war as instruments for achieving

good. Christian charity, he concludes, is the grand and mighty exorcism.

We, of *Voice*, might modestly claim to be opposing communism by a counter system and, if Dr. Butterfield is not one of the historians of light morals condemned by Rossi, he should be ready to act as a 'partner.'

Principalities and Powers by Emile Cammaerts and Jeanne Lindley. The Cresset Press, 6/-.

This book is a different pair of sleeves, or matter, for the Professor and his daughter argue on the duty of a Christian today regarding politics as if the dilemma were between practical non-participation and socialism. What we may find are useful arguments against both attitudes. Mrs. Lindley, for instance, says, "the crying need in the field of politics is for economic planning; but it is becoming more and more apparent that the economic planners can also become spiritual planners and oppressors." In the next chapter, Professor Cammaerts replies: "We can already picture this cold symbol of the State of the future, the hilt of her sword wrapped up in red tape, weighing our hours of work, our wages, our insurance fees, our taxes, leading us slowly from cradle to grave . . . beyond the reach of human or divine love . . . Christians cannot witness with equanimity the centralization of affairs in the hands of the State. Power remains the greatest source of evil. The more power is decentralized in the family, in the municipality, in the county, the more healthy the nation will be."

The active and passive roles of the sexes appear to be reversed, and we may sympathise with Mrs. Lindley's desire to take action to prevent famine or another depression. But the kind of action suggested such as forcing farmers to grow wheat and depriving man of "freedom in his job" demonstrates that Mrs. Lindley was obsessed at the time of writing (1947) with the idea of a scarcity that soon vanished. We agree with the Professor that "the man who is completely taken up in the money-making or job-finding machine has not ears to hear," and that "the State is made for the citizen, not the citizen for the State," also that the State is an "abstract entity" which cannot control family or local life without disastrous consequences. But we cannot accept his implication that political activity involves adherence to a political party. The real choice is not between parties but between policies, of freedom or of slavery. The Professor does not underestimate the value of freedom. He quotes Spinoza, "the true end of the State is liberty," and emphasises the threat from those who "disregard the freedom of the person and the supreme authority of God." He complains of state interference in private affairs which has increased in the last fifty years "out of all proportion."

Yet centuries before Christ, says the Professor, belief in a divinity "restored a sense of balance" in man's conception of the universe, while atheism leads to the atom bomb. So true religion does clearly influence us, and should sift the false from the true. While it is the Church's function to give authoritative guidance on personal or domestic matters, this function must not fail to extend to other issues which inevitably affect the former.