

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 10.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 28, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*  
*One year 15/-; Six months 7/6; Three months 3/9.*  
*Offices—Business: LINCOLN CHAMBERS, 11, GARFIELD STREET,*  
*BELFAST. Telephone: Belfast 27810. Editorial: ROCKHOUSE*  
*FARM, LOWER FROYLE, ALTON, HANTS. Telephone: Bentley 3182.*

## Communism via the Water Tap

We quote on another page extracts from the Archbishop of Canterbury's address at Minneapolis in which he says that "freedom, without which truth cannot live, is threatened with extinction by the mounting forces of power groups of mass direction." In our last issue we quoted the Archbishop of York's warning that individual citizens are losing their freedom and responsibility, as a result of the Welfare State in which "they are impotent in a mass-organised-society," which provides so much for them that "the individual loses the power of independent judgment."

It is in this context, and in no other, that we think the plans to fluoridate the water supplies of the "Free" World should be viewed. It is fundamentally a question of whether Power in the State is departing from Authority; and a subsidiary question is, why is it doing so? Once you enter the discussion\* of whether fluorides in the water do in fact benefit one section of the community or not, or whether, if they do benefit one section, they do harm to another, you are conceding that the fundamental question is not fundamental at all; and, furthermore, you are putting before a mass jury technical questions which they are not competent to judge. Thus you are departing from Authority in your methods of resistance to a proposition which can be shown to be evil in itself.

We have looked through a mass of literature *pro* and *con* fluoridation, the great bulk of which is highly technical. Both sides seek the support of medical authority, and both sides have the support of medical authority, which, in the case of the *pro* fluoridators, has in some cases been shown to be mere parroting of what some other authority has said or to have inaccurately claimed. On the other hand a correspondent who has read through the Official Report of the Parliamentary Debate on July 23, on The Food and Drugs Amendment Bill, writes to say that "not one word was said in defence of our liberties."

So we have it that the representatives of the people, when debating a measure which would remove another freedom of choice from the individual citizen, do not even bother to consider this fundamental postulate of Authority.

The full gravity of the situation is only apparent when it is known that the established Church of the land, claiming to be the Church of Christ and the representative of Authority

\*Organisations and journals whose specific interest or function is medical such as *Health for All* and *Heal*, both of which oppose fluoridation, are not envisaged in the remarks which follow here.

in the State, has had nothing to say on this issue, either in the House of Lords, where it has a voice, or in the country where the plans to mass-medicate water supplies are being pressed upon local councils. The Church is silent every time a specific liberty is infringed by legislation, despite the fact that its leaders are conscious, as is shown at the beginning of this article, that the principle which is violated and treated with contempt is the very principle of Authority in society. The position is rendered even more intolerable, when, as at Norwich, a bishop is asked to express Authority on this very issue and, contrary to the obvious facts, states that liberty is not infringed.

What is Authority on this specific issue? Speaking on "The Moral Limits of Medical Research and Treatment," Pope Pius XII said on September 14, 1952:—"Is there any moral limit to the 'medical interests of the community' in content or extension? Can public authority, on which rests responsibility for the common good, give the doctor the power to experiment on the individual in the interests of science and the community in order to discover and try out new methods and procedures when these measures transgress the right of the individual to dispose of himself? In the interests of the community, can public authority really limit or even suppress the right of the individual over his body and life, his bodily and psychic integrity?"

"It must be noted that, in his personal being, man is not finally ordered to usefulness to society. On the contrary the community exists for man.

"Now medical experiments immediately affect the physical well-being. Public authority has no power in this sphere.

"... science is not the highest value, that to which all other orders of values—all particular values—should be subordinated. Science itself, therefore, as well as its research and acquisitions, must be inserted in the order of values. Here are well-defined limits which even medical science cannot transgress without violating higher moral rules. The confidential relations between doctor and patient, the personal right of the patient to the life of his body and soul in its psychic and moral integrity are just some of the many values superior to scientific interest."

As Lord Acton said, there is "Divine, objective right, anterior to every human law, superior to every human will." It is that right that we are justified in looking to the Church of Christ to defend and uphold. Specific offences against this right are now being committed. Concerning these same offences it is for the Church to speak, be those offences committed by individuals or majorities. "When Christ said, 'Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's,' he gave to the State a legitimacy it had never before enjoyed, and set bounds to it that it had never yet acknowledged. And He not only delivered the precept but He also forged the instrument to execute it. To limit the power of the State ceased to be

the hope of patient, ineffectual philosophers and became the perpetual charge of a universal Church.”\*

What of the subsidiary question: why is Power seeking to fluoridate the water supplies? The original drive to fluoridate water supplies did not come from the public nor from dentists. It was started by the United States Public Health Service after one, Oscar Ewing, became head of that service as well as of the Federal Security Agency. Formerly he had been attorney for the Aluminium Company of America, from the processing of whose products fluorides are a waste product. In 1949 Ewing issued his report on socialised medicine, which included “Plans for the mass fluoridation of water supplies.” Under him Ewing had 36,000 employees and a budget of two billion dollars. He appointed as his chief lieutenant, Edward L. Bernays. He was responsible for Public Relations, and this is what he had to say to his minions as reported in the American Press:—“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organised habits and opinions of the masses must be done by experts, the public relations counsels; they are the invisible rulers who control the destinies of millions.

“ . . . the most direct way to reach the mind of the herd is through its leaders. For, if the group leaders accept our ideas, the group they dominate will respond.”

In a talk to public health education leaders the same speaker said:—“A united leadership must eliminate lags by the engineering of consent. You, as a leader, must get people to follow you. You must gain their consent to your health programmes by gaining their support through many types of persuasion. But all this must be planned, indoctrination must be subtle. It should be worked into the everyday life of the people—24 hours a day in hundreds of ways. Public Health Officers cannot afford the professional modesty professed by physicians.

“A redefinition of ethics is necessary. . . . The subject matter of the propaganda need not necessarily be true.”

Such were the people and such were the methods used to engineer consent for a large number of ‘experiments’ on populations in America. And these were the people who gave hospitality, as well as information, to the British Government Mission which went to America to make a report on the experiments.

Is it supposed that people whose minds work in such a way are seriously concerned about dental caries in young children, which is the sole ostensible purpose of fluoridation?

With this picture in mind, consider what Lenin said: “Get control of the public health agencies and furnish the keystone in the arch of the socialist State.” In Princess Ileana’s book *I Live Again*, the communist leader Ana Pauker, of Roumania, is quoted as saying that America would become communist by the acquisition of the utilities, and the poisoning of the water supplies.

Ex-Communists, including Rena M. Vale, have testified before various committees in the U.S.A. that “fluoridation of drinking water is known in Communist circles as a vehicle of Red warfare.”

Various experiments have been carried out in a number of countries by independent medical men and scientists, the results of which demonstrate that fluorides have an effect on the brain. As these experiments are in their early stages, they will not be specified here, nor the nature of the effect on the brain indicated. But we think that it is significant

that fluorides are used in the production of ‘madness-gasses.’

The installation of machinery, whatever its original purpose, which enables water to be treated in the way suggested, is, in our view, in the present state of the world, a risk which should be avoided. Councillors who support such measures take on a very grave responsibility.

As it is a well-known fact that *wholesome* food provides all the fluorides which are necessary to maintain healthy teeth in young children how much more sensible is the action of the Salvation Army, who it is reported to us, are urging the use of wholemeal bread in all their Homes for young people. Why does the Government deny this bread the subsidy which is applied to the national loaf, from which fluorides have been removed? It seems all very strange. As the Cheshire N.H.S. Executive Committee Chairman, Dr. John Kerr, is reported in the press as saying on July 30:—“The more extensive use of wholemeal bread would do away with the necessity of adding fluorine to our water supplies.”

Whatever the real reason for adding fluorine to water supplies there is something curious about *all* the governments of the “Free” World wanting *all together* to carry out this proposal.

### Archbishop in America

*The following are extracts from the text of the address delivered by the Archbishop of Canterbury at the opening service of the Anglican Congress in Minneapolis as reported by the Church Times.*

*St. John 8, verses 31 and 32.*

If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed: and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.

In the symbol or badge which has been chosen for our Anglican Congress appear in Greek the words: “The truth shall make you free.”

~~Whoever chose these words, chose well.~~ For they take us straight to the heart of the Christian Gospel, of the Church’s task in the world and of the world’s predicament. God’s truth, and that alone, can liberate men from the chains and fetters which they impose upon themselves. Man’s freedom cannot be had or sustained by any man-made endeavour, but only by obedience to God’s truth.

Truth is apprehended by reason: but all Christians will add, as St. John does—not by reason *alone*. Truth for the Christian is more a moral than an intellectual possession. It involves the response of the whole man. Truth is to be learned by discipleship, to be translated into action, to be lived: Our Lord, who is the Truth, is also the Way and the Life.

Hence it is that truth and freedom are inseparable: they are moral qualities inspired by Christ and governing the relation of men to nature, to one-another, and to God. They cannot be separated without ceasing to be themselves.

Freedom without truth, or at least some reaching after truth, becomes the freedom of the Gaderine swine. It is only too easy to illustrate the way in which through history, up to this very day, one freedom after another, obtained by the energy and inventiveness of the questing spirit of man, but undisciplined by truth, has been cheapened or

(continued on page 4.)

\*Miss Gertrude Himmelfarb in her book on Lord Acton.

## The Christian Approach to Politics

by JOHN MITCHELL

Many, perhaps most, good men have an aversion from politics. This is not surprising having regard to the general character of politicians and the reputation their profession has acquired. But, as the actions of politicians and their creatures, the bureaucrats, now directly or indirectly control or interfere with so much of our lives and thoughts, if good men are going to leave politics to the not-so-good, it is self-evident that matters will become worse. As Burke said: "For evil to triumph, it is enough that good men should do nothing."

If we look at the political world we find men called Christians taking part in all manner of movements and parties, supporting every kind of ideology; and the only possible conclusion from this state of affairs is that there is no recognised Christian approach to politics. It might be said that Christians "don't know their own business."

Is there one, single, correct approach to politics?—not a multiplicity—and if so, what is it?

One of our greatest thinkers said: "Christianity is either something inherent in the very warp and woof of the Universe, or it is just another set of interesting opinions . . ." In other words Christianity is an expression of Law in the universe. If we ask how we can find infallibly the Christian approach to politics, we are asking what is the Law we have to look for and obey.

It is not a bad thing to study success as well as failure. In one great realm of the universe, mankind has achieved something which seems to approach mastery, namely in the physical sciences. The physical and the metaphysical are parts of one world, created by God. They are both governed by law. How have the scientists succeeded in discovering law in the physical world? It is worth enquiring, because science is the only sphere of human activity where the technician and the public automatically apply the Christian maxim "a good tree does not bring forth bad fruit" and *vice versa*.

The scientific approach is an attitude of mind, which is said to have started from the advice of Francis Bacon, who said in effect that what is required is a just (that is to say a realistic) relationship between the mind and things. The hallmarks of the scientific approach are objectivity, humility and an unwillingness to accept anything as fact until it is proved. The results have been spectacular. What the scientists have not done is to go to a problem with a preconceived theory and see if it fits the facts (or try and make the facts fit the theory).

It has been noted by many people that, emanating from somewhere, is "an unmistakable force endeavouring to restrict and concentrate us on one plane, the materialistic-industrialistic plane." There is also a no-less-significant idea being pressed in many quarters that the Christian religion is only truly concerned with a transcendental approach to God and personal human behaviour. An example of this is contained in the speech of a politician in a London Borough recently. He said: "The New Testament is the revelation of God's personal relationship with man. It was not intended to be a revelation of God's will regarding the organisation of society, which had already been made to the Jews."

If these two ideas are allowed to go unchallenged, the most important field of human relations—the question of the relation of the individual to the group—is left as the concern

of neither the scientist nor the Christian, but is a free field in which an evil power can operate unchecked. It is the field covered by legal formulae, finance and economics. These three spheres of human activity are notable for the irreverent way in which facts are ignored, in which ideology and theory run rife. One of the former high priests of Finance, Lord Stamp, gave personal witness to the accuracy of his own words when he said "You can dodge facts; but you cannot dodge the consequences of them." He was killed by a bomb in Kensington.

Law, finance, and economics are as inexorably bound to the Law inherent in the Universe, as is physical matter or personal human behaviour. It is a fact, which anyone can check, that error in human actions proceeds from a remote connection between cause and effect. From which it is easy to see that the first cardinal principle which should form any social structure is to bring the two, cause and effect, as close together as possible. That which prevents a man from jumping off the top of the Eiffel Tower is a certain knowledge of the consequences. In this simple act there are present and operating almost in an instant the man's power of choice, his personal responsibility for his actions and the *natural* consequences that will ensue from them. These matters are instinctively if not intellectually clear to the would-be-jumper. By their collectivist philosophy and perverted outlook, what the modern politician, financier, lawyer and economist are doing is to take a group of men to the top of an "Eiffel Tower," clouding their vision so that they cannot see clearly the consequences of jumping, taking a majority vote on whether to jump or not to jump and then making them all to jump when the majority decides to do so. The natural consequences of jumping off the political "Eiffel Tower" are usually delayed and blamed on the wrong cause. If that fails the politician responsible takes a back seat for five years while his opposite number repeats the sorry business in another way.

Now, it is clear that in any society group decisions have to be taken, and it should be clear that in a Christian society, that is, a society which recognises God's will in natural law as it affects society, it is essential: (1) that the individual should have power of choice in the group's decision, and he hasn't got it if he hasn't got power to contract out of a group whose policy, as decided by the majority, is not his; (2) that those responsible for the decision on policy should bear the consequences and no one else; and (3) that those deciding policy should have a certain knowledge of the natural consequences of their actions.

Any arrangement in the social structure which does not ensure that these conditions are met is not a Christian arrangement, because the society cannot grow organically, and anyone who lends support to arrangements denying these conditions is supporting something not consonant with Christianity, for they are weakening God-given, natural checks on people jumping off political, economic or financial "Eiffel Towers." "Seek ye *first* the kingdom of God . . ."

This is the Christian approach, and it is of paramount importance that the political arena should be invaded by Christians clearly and correctly informed on these conditions and determined to insist that they be met.

The political arena today is rigged so that the choice is always between a greater evil and a lesser evil, and the temptation for which so many good people fall is to support the lesser-evil-party, simply because there seems to be no

earthly hope for the genuine alternative, the gaining of enough support to defeat *both* evils. Well, the answer is that only a true and complete hold on the faith can defeat evil. Ours is a spiritual mission and only a spiritual mission can save England now.

*ARCHBISHOP IN AMERICA*—(continued from page 2). debased, till it becomes not a freedom at all but a spiritual bondage. Equally, truth without the responsibilities of freedom is not in any significant or saving sense truth. What the scientist knows about atomic energy is not in its proper sense truth. For truth must include not only the truth to be known, but the truth to be done; not only the scientific knowledge which can split the atom, but the moral decision to use the energy so liberated only in accordance with God's will. Only truth in that sense can set men free from the fetters of their own science and of their own sin. So freedom without the restraints of truth, and truth without the free decisions of responsible action, both become unfreedoms and untruths, and are in the proper sense de-moralising.

These three gifts of Christ to his Church give us our confidence and our hope in his service. They bring truth and they bring freedom: and the challenge and adventure of Christian discipleship is that, by continuing in their use, we may grow in the knowledge of his truth and so grow in the freedom which his truth gives. In the world to-day more than ever before, the sense of truth is being distorted by the evils of propaganda and atrophied by moral decay. And freedom, without which truth cannot live, is threatened with extinction by the mounting forces of power groups of mass direction, and of men's obsession with materialisms, which blind them to the next world and to the truth of this. The same forces, the devil's favourite weapons of lies and coercion, are at work in the Church as well. All the conditions favour the spread of untruth and the curtailment of freedom.

### The New Testament and Law

"Professor C. H. Dodd in his volume of *New Testament Studies* (Manchester University Press, 16s.) brings together eight essays, three of which appeared originally in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library. The essays deal with a variety of topics all extremely important to students of the New Testament. The general reader will find a special interest in the last three. The first of these deals with natural law in the New Testament. In this context natural law does not mean the things discovered by natural scientists, but the basic rules of justice and equity which may be regarded as built into the structure of the world and man. Clearly if there is such a law, and if we may rightly regard it as laid down and implanted by God, then no earthly authority can ever have the right to legislate in defiance of this law or without reference to it. Unfortunately, as we have seen often enough in recent days, the standing temptation of the State is just to claim not only supreme power but also complete competence and unquestionable authority to pronounce on all matters coming under its control. The Bible claims that there is a court of appeal beyond the highest State tribunal and a Law to which the most powerful rulers must bow."

—(The *Manchester Guardian*, August 9.)

### Support Is Growing

We are happy to report that there is a daily increase in active support for the Christian Campaign For Freedom from readers of this paper. A much higher proportion of readers than stated in our last issue is now active. The splendid and constant effort of the band of workers at H.Q., at Bournemouth and elsewhere deserves the unstinted help of every reader, and there is no doubt that when they get it there will be some spectacular results to show.

In various parts of Canada and Australia, too, support is growing. *THE NEW TIMES* of Melbourne devotes most of one issue to the Campaign. A letter from another district of Australia contains a hundred subscriptions for *VOICE*. From Canada a reader orders a thousand copies of one issue. And so on.

The Church leaders are taking notice of our activities. They cannot fail to do so, for the simple reason that it is obvious that what we are doing they should be doing. Hence the sudden emergence of the Archbishop of Canterbury as a verbal supporter of freedom. Now we want to know and have a right to know from the Archbishop and other Church leaders what they mean by freedom—what specific freedoms, what "free decisions of responsible action," should be the concern of Christians in politics, and how they advise electors to *act* with integrity and responsibility in their political actions? This can only be achieved by continually pressing them with questions both privately and publicly. During the week beginning August 7, Campaign H.Q. sent a letter headed "The Church and Crichton Down" to 200 local papers and others, commenting on the absence of the voice of Authority from the Church on this and other matters. At the time of writing it is not known how many were published and perhaps readers will help us with information about this. In any case it is hoped that they will write in support of the letter, and develop similar tactics of their own in bringing the responsibility of the Church in this matter to the notice of the public. There is no doubt that a concerted effort by all readers of this paper could have great influence in inducing the Church to do its duty. Tactically placed as they are in every parish, with pulpits, church halls, parish magazines and easy access to the local Press, twenty thousand clergy have a marvellous strategic advantage in influencing the use of political power in a Christian way to Christian objectives, whilst remaining completely outside party politics. If they did their duty, Christianity could transform the politics of this country in a very short time, and establish Christianity as something real in the life of the people. They must do their duty. Insist that they do so.

### THE "AIMS" LEAFLET

published with this issue is obtainable at

20 copies 6d., 100 copies 2/6.

Please order from K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.

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