

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

# VOICE

INTEGRITY  
FREEDOM  
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 14.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 23, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

## The Bishop of Wakefield

We are grateful to the Bishop of Wakefield for his letter published in this issue.

Our own position will be made clear, we hope, if we point out that those connected with the publication of *Voice* and a large proportion of our readers have been in one way and another, outside party politics, associated with attempts to make Christian objectives effective in political, economic and financial policy for more than a quarter of a century. During that long period we were always conscious of being severely handicapped by what always appeared to be, at best, a neutral attitude on the part of the Church—politics was taboo.

While not the first, *Voice* was published as a special attempt to present the proposition that political policies and actions are inevitably as disastrous in the production of evil results as personal policies and private actions if they do not accord with the Moral Law. In fact, because they are associated with so much more concentrated power, political actions unguided by Authority are more widely disastrous.

The first point which we wish to make is that while all true Christians must recognise a responsibility to discover and adhere to the Moral Law, it is not *our* special responsibility as laymen to *express the Law*. That is the special responsibility of the Church, and particularly of the leaders of the Church. In our first issue we said that "we ourselves have for long felt that it should not have fallen to laymen to take up a task which obviously belongs to the Spiritual Authority, and we know that in an earlier age it would not have been necessary." But we might have added that it is to the Church that the public looks, if now only half-heartedly after being so long disappointed, as the depository of special knowledge, from which it should as of right expect guidance in the many problems which have beset society during this century. It is precisely because, in common with large numbers of others outside our ranks, we have been so long disappointed that we have deemed it necessary to 'thrust' what we have to say at the Bishops and clergy as a matter requiring urgent attention. We think that now the hour has become perilously late to avert what will probably prove the final calamity for Christian civilisation if effective action is not taken.

In the thirteen issues of *Voice* which have preceded this issue we have presented our case, not, we think, judging by the many commendations we have received, ineffectively. Before proceeding further we may justly contemplate withdrawing for a time from the discussion, watching for that guidance from the Church which is so urgently required, for we consider that the special responsibility for saying what we have been saying belongs to the Church, not to us. We have intervened only to point to the need.

We are especially pleased that the Bishop has drawn

attention to the inadequacy of the two resolutions we published in abbreviated form in our article "What Is Truth?" In earlier issues we have repeatedly said that Authority to be effective must be expressed in regard to specific objects and specific actions, *i.e.*, advice must be concrete and detailed. To illustrate what we had in mind in our second issue we published a form of pledge which went into considerable detail. We would draw the Lord Bishop's attention to this Pledge as also to the Declaration which we published in our last issue with an invitation for the clergy to support it, and we would be grateful for his advice as to whether he considers these are inadequate and, if so, in what way.

"Do freedom and justice always go hand in hand?" we are asked. And we reply that freedom is just, and justice begets freedom. Can it be said that justice is not truth? To that a Christian could not say 'no.' And Christ said "the truth shall make you free."

We have said that "Law, in nature and human society, is the discoverable expression of Authority; '*laws*' are enactments of Power. Only when *laws* truly reflect Law, is the 'State' of Society healthy." If we substitute the word 'truth' for 'Law' in this statement we are not altering its effect.

When Christ said "Woe unto you also, ye lawyers! for ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne," was He not saying that their *laws* were superfluous, that they did not reflect Law? And when Christ said "Woe unto you, lawyers! for ye have taken away the key of knowledge," was He not saying that the lawyers were so circumscribing peoples' actions by man-made regulations that they were prevented, by the individual experience of trial and error, from knowing reality?

We ask the Lord Bishop to say whether this interpretation is correct?

We have said in an earlier issue that the Common Law grew from the climate of opinion created by the Mediæval Church; and we have said that the Common Law is crystallized Authority in that it is more or less a true reflection of Law in the Universe. The Common Law increases real freedom; the reverse is true of the laws of the Welfare State. These laws are *de-moralising*. We echo the words of the Archbishop of Canterbury at Minneapolis: "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 demoralising." But we do not echo the Archbishop's support of the Welfare State, which is contradictory and is open to the suspicion of mere expediency.

Not long ago we were in conversation with a distinguished agriculturalist who had just returned from a Government mission to East Africa. When we asked him if he would agree that a certain unofficial policy popular

among the settlers was sound he replied "yes"; but he added: "you cannot put the clock back." When we suggested that the truth might only be found by going 'backwards' instead of 'forwards' and asked "what then?", he would not reply.

The latter half of the last paragraph in the Bishop of Wakefield's letter is phrased in such a way as to give the impression that because we have a "complicated society" we *must* go on having a complicated society even if the price which we are paying for it, and will increasingly pay, is the sacrifice of freedom and with it truth, and hence the abandonment of Christianity. In other words that we cannot 'put the clock back.' If that is the attitude of the Bishops and clergy then the Church has already abandoned Christianity. And it would account for the attitude of the Archbishop of York, who urges us to surrender our sovereign power (and independence) as a nation to a "world authority," because he says otherwise "there is little hope of permanent peace."

But there are many Christians who have the strongest objection to the abandonment of the Christian approach to these urgent and grave problems. The Christian approach was given to us by the Authority to whom the Archbishop owes first and absolute allegiance: "Seek ye first the kingdom of God . . ." The kingdom of God is governed by Law, and it is only by seeking and obeying that Law that any of our problems can be resolved, whether it be how to establish a secure peace or the long neglected problems which have produced a 'complicated' society. Expediency and the following of 'trends,' the surrender of our will to facile clichés such as "you cannot put the clock back"—these take us further down the slope. Some of the eminent Victorians foresaw the disastrous consequences to which so called "progressive" concepts in politics, industrialisation and mass production would lead us. Even Gladstone was uneasy, but insisted that these things must not be publicly spoken. But the Church to whom was given the key was silent and has remained silent. We are now passing through the Gates of Hell.

But the Gates have not yet closed. The Church can, if it will, prevent them closing, and guide society back up the slope. Will it do so?

Our society is sliding because it has no absolute concepts to which it can cling. It is the business of the Church to provide these concepts. We invite the Bishop of Wakefield to read the remarks of Elias F. Shamon, Special Justice of the Boston Municipal Court, which we reprint in this issue. We cannot in one move get rid of all the manifest problems which beset us, but by obeying the Law as we have indicated we can resume advance in the right direction.

---

## VOICE

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.*

---

## The Bishop of Wakefield's Letter

From the Bishop of Wakefield to the Chairman of the Christian Campaign For Freedom dated September 28, 1954.

Bishop's Lodge,  
Woodthorpe,  
Wakefield.

Dear Dr. Steele,

Thank you for your letter. I had already received various copies of *Voice* from a local correspondent who has been faithfully upbraiding me, however politely, with my indifference in not answering as he wished, and who, I regret, seemed deliberately to misunderstand my answer when I sent it.

However, let me say at first that I am very glad to see this paper *Voice* and the plea which it makes for freedom. Such a note does need to be sounded to-day and if many of us do not respond in the way you expect, it is not for lack of sympathy with the principle. I do not frankly agree with the manner in which *Voice* seems to have protested, to judge by my own experience. It has been thrust at people, almost with the demand that they should answer it at once and in the terms required and when they have not done so or danced to its tune, it has taken up much space in attacking them, particularly, and as usual, the Bishops! I hope that you will continue your stand for freedom but on constructive lines, for there seems a real danger that this would appear just another pressure group trying to get support for its own views. I know that this is not your intention; but you must forgive me for once if I have exercised my own freedom in not replying as your correspondent has asked. By constructive criticism, I would refer to the article of September 11 which you brought to my notice. This seems to make certain general accusations, particularly about freemasons, without any evidence to substantiate them except that certain public leaders are, in fact, also freemasons.

With regard to the two resolutions which you urge on page 2, I should call them much too general to afford any guidance. All government involves some limitation in personal freedom; the question is whether the limitation goes beyond what the actual circumstances demand. For instance, is the National Health Service under this category as being destructive of freedom and justice, or all forms of national service or nationalisation? Beyond this, do freedom and justice always go hand in hand? To secure justice for some it may be necessary to limit the freedom of others, as in the factory legislation of the last century. The issue is not as easy as these general resolutions imply. Many people are pressing for some limitations to freedom in the name of justice. I should like to see your paper devoting more time and thought to asking what the fundamental principles are, and how much individual freedom, as most people interpret it, cannot fail to be affected by the complicated society in which we are living. Without that, such general resolutions would not seem to carry much positive meaning. But having said that I hope that you will continue to examine the situation of our day and remind people of what is at stake.

Yours sincerely,  
(Signed) Roger Wakefield.

## Absolute Truth—Or Sliding Standards

The following is taken from the *Boston Sunday Post* of April 4, 1954.

Judges on the Supreme Court of the United States and other high courts in the nation are undermining the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States, according to Judge Elias F. Shamon, special justice of Boston Municipal Court.

"Some of our high court judges are injecting into their decisions a wave of secularistic thinking which is as insidious as the communist menace," Judge Shamon declared.

Judge Shamon, who pulled no punches in his forthright utterances, quoted from three high court decisions to back up his accusations. The decisions are the Tidelands case, the conviction of the 11 communists—he supports the conviction—and *Hudson County Water Co. v. McCarter*, 209 U.S. 349.

"There are statements in these decisions which declare that all concepts are relative—including truth and morality—and nothing is absolute," Judge Shamon said.

"The thought that all concepts are relative effects us deeper than the mere logic involved," he said. "Our government is based on the assumption that there are certain absolute concepts, referred to in the Declaration of Independence as 'the laws of nature and of nature's God.'

"The concept of God is certainly not a relative one. The concept of truth is certainly not relative and to say that man is endowed on birth by his Creator with certain unalienable rights is certainly not a relative concept," Judge Shamon stressed.

"In the decision upholding the conviction of the 11 communists—a just decision—the opinion of the court contained this language: 'Nothing is more certain in modern society than the principle that there are no absolutes, that a name, a phrase, a standard has meaning only when associated with the considerations which gave birth to the nomenclature. To those who would paralyze our government in the face of an impending threat by encasing it in a semantic straitjacket, we must reply that all concepts are relative.'

"It is disturbing that such gratuitous assumptions have been permanently recorded in the reports of our highest tribunals and that they have received so little analysis," said Judge Shamon.

"They lead us to a way of life which is as deplorable as the communist system," he declared.

"It is totalitarianism to hold that morality and customs are changeable as the times, because if we subscribe to this doctrine, we must say that the will of the majority makes right and what was true yesterday may not be true tomorrow—it all depends upon who is in power," he said.

Citing further examples which tend to support his accusations, Judge Shamon turned to other decisions of the Supreme Court.

"In the Hudson County case," he said, "the court declared, 'all rights tend to declare themselves absolute to their logical extremes. Yet all in fact are limited by the neighbourhood of principles of policy.'

"In the Tidelands case where the Supreme Court denied to the States the title to off-shore lands, we read, 'Property rights must then be so subordinated to political rights, as in substance to coalesce and unite in the national sovereign.'"

This statement, according to Judge Shamon, is tantamount to declaring that no absolute rights exist—that they are all relative—and is against the concept that property rights exist by law.

"It means the State—the sovereign—can look over a person's home, decide to take it without benefit of eminent domain proceedings and tell the owner that his rights of property are subordinate to the will of the sovereign," argued Judge Shamon.

"These views are dangerous," he said. "They would eliminate in the Declaration of Independence the words, 'the laws of Nature and Nature's God' and also cancel out the words 'all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights,'" Judge said.

"They would substitute for these lofty thoughts the authoritarian tenets that 'might makes right and truth is a majority vote of that nation which could lick all the rest.' Such concepts are foreign to our American form of government as established by the founding fathers and as set forth in the Declaration of Independence," he said.

---

## Democracy

The following striking passages are taken from *Liberty or Equality* by Erik von Kuehnelt-Leddihn, edited by John P. Hughes (London—Hollis & Carter, 1952).

Yet the voter in the parliamentary democracy, no matter on which side of the Atlantic is in his political capacity an "individual" and not a "person."(\*) In total anonymity and secretiveness he votes as the smallest mathematically indivisible fraction of a nation. (Neither should it be forgotten that this procedure represents the zenith of an invitation to irresponsibility.) Yet the impersonal nature of the voting process forces us to analyse the character of democratic "self-government" more critically. [\*Note: Cf. Jacques Maritain, *Three Reformers* (Sheed & Ward, 1928) pp 19-25; R. Garrigou-Lagrange, *Le sens commun, la philosophie de l'être et les formules dogmatiques . . . The Mind and Heart of Love* (M. C. D'Arcy, S. J.) . . . and Nicolas Berdiaeff: *Cinque méditations sur l'existence* (tran. Irene Vilder-Lot, Paris: Aubier, 1936). He remarks (p. 176): "Democratic metaphysics misunderstand the problem of personality, which is not a political, but a spiritual shortcoming." Max Scheler alone seems to differ; he speaks of a 'Christian individualism.' See his *Von Ewigen im Menschen* (Leipzig. . . .)]

Fisher Ames, a century and a half ago, had no illusions about this claim of democratic apologists. Of course, if self-government is viewed from a national or collectivistic point of view—if a multitude is considered to be one organism with something like a responsible "group soul," and if we simply identify the greater part with the whole—then the talk about "self-government" is justified. Yet such a point of view is only possible on a "nostrist" (and

“vostrist”) basis, and political power from such a source comes curiously near to the anathematised statement in the Syllabus: *Auctoritas nihil aliud est nisi numeri et materialium summa* (“authority is nothing else than numbers and the sum of material things.”)

It is obvious that all these vistas are unacceptable to anybody clinging to a non-materialist philosophy; we have to reject them as fragmentary and return consciously to the realities of the human person. It is, after all, *man* with all his glories and shortcomings, all his desires, longings, and emotions, his reason, his faith and his despair, who faces history and politics—and not some imaginary polycephalic centipede. To the philosophies of the New Mechanism the difference between the effectiveness of one person’s vote among five and among 500,000 will be merely in degree. The statement is mathematically correct. But “existentially” this is by no means the case.

Yet let us go a step further. If, for instance, the voters of France should be graphically represented by a solid column of the height of the Eiffel Tower (over 980 feet), one individual vote would measure not more than one three-thousandth part of an inch. In a modern mammoth state the individual at national elections is nothing more than a microbe; whether *he in particular* goes to the polls or not makes hardly any difference. His person and personality, as Aristotle stated melancholically, is counted and not weighed, and this treated . . . “by number but not by importance.” [Note (shortened) . . . John C. Calhoun, *A Disquisition on Government* (New York: Appleton, 1853) . . . Peter F. Drucker, *The Future of Industrial Man* . . . Rosalind Murray, *The Good Pagan’s Failure*. Compare also with Bertrand Russell’s dictum: “You have, it is true, a twenty-millionth share in the government yourself, you are therefore much more conscious of being governed than of governing.” *Authority and the Individual*. Russell, incidentally, is also one of the few modern authors to stress the factor of envy and jealousy in the democratic ideology. . . .]

The monarch . . . is potentially the protector of minorities—especially the small, powerless and unimportant minorities—just because he is “everybody’s monarch.” The very concept of a “minority” is non-monarchical and democratic. The constant counting and comparing of numbers characterises all egalitarian-parliamentary regimes. . . . In democratic republics . . . we have always seen tiny, unpopular minorities being sacrificed to the whim of majorities, who in times of stress blissfully disregard constitutional injunctions. (Take, for example, the case of the *Nisei* in the United States during World War II.) A monarch can, at least, be reminded of his coronation oath, but the citizenry stands under no *special* obligation or pressure save from their weak and vacillating consciences.

The monarch is a *responsible person*. . . . In spite of the republican-democratic emphasis on “responsible government,” subject to the sanction of not getting re-elected (and of being impeached in only the grossest cases of corruption), the demo-republican government nevertheless derives its authority from anonymous, secretly voting masses on a purely numerical basis. It is even impossible to trace the empowering individual; and thus we get what French authors call the “cult of irresponsibility.” The electees, rejecting all responsibility, can easily blame the electors for their

“mandates.” Thus we get today the immoral idea of making whole nations responsible for the deeds and misdeeds of their rulers, regardless of whether these had majority support or not. This collective judgment of moral acts is one of the great maladies of the democratic age. . . . Neither is it sheer coincidence that in the latest war the Church has received abuse from *all* sides, and has suffered most grievously and unjustly in a struggle which was, in a sense, the fratricidal strife between the three heirs of the French Revolution: democratic nationalism, national socialism and socialist internationalism—all of them claiming to be the sole and only embodiment of true democracy.

#### KNOWLEDGE

. . . President Garfield, in reply to Macaulay’s criticism, said: “We confront the dangers of suffrage by the blessings of universal education.” Yet we see how the knowledge of the voters as well as of their representatives remains insufficient to be used in an evaluation of the momentous problems of the world. Even John Stuart Mill had his doubts about the egalitarian character of democratic suffrage; as a result of all this, emotions increasingly dominate the political scene; and the shrinkage of “one world” on the other hand, rapidly multiplies the number of questions having a bearing on individual nations. Owing to the perversity of this situation we have a never-ending series of failures, the reaction to which is often a cry for an unlimited rule of experts. These are asked to rule with an iron fist, and to enforce a pagan utilitarianism of the worst Benthamite stamp. Ethics and human freedom would then be dispensed with as needless impediments. . . .

As to the problem of control by experts, we want to repeat that the most pressing problem of good (and that automatically implies *ethical*) government lies today in building up defence machineries around spheres in which the person should have *power and self-government approximately commensurate with his own capacities*. The Middle Ages and their aftermath were characterised by a multitude of such autonomous and semi-autonomous spheres; medieval man frequently belonged to a variety of these. Moral perfection and intellectualisation for central governments, coupled with a *restriction of their radius of action*, should be our programme—the very reverse of the existing trends.

It is fairly obvious that the enormous disorder and chaos in this world is not the result alone of the flagrant breach of practically every ethical postulate, but is also due to the retreat of knowledge and reason from the domain of politics. . . . It really seems that *statesmanship* is incompatible with “politics” in the democratic sense. Products of the old British oligarchy like Disraeli or Gladstone would be unthinkable in the democratised parliamentary scene of today.

The fact remains that in all democratic nations the person of the “politician” is treated with contempt, and “politics” are looked upon by a healthy public opinion as a cocktail of deceit, lying, treachery, double-dealing, graft, theft, insincerity, perjury, imposture, dishonourable compromise and other vices. There is, however, a time-lag between the disappearance of the general respect given to the human organs of the constitution and that given to the constitution itself. . . .

(To be continued.)

# THE CHURCH AND FREEDOM

## Christianity and the Use of Political Power

### Declaration

---

#### AUTHORITY.

"To this end was I born, and for this purpose came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Everyone that is of the truth heareth my voice."

"Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make you free."

"I came that ye might have life and have it more abundantly."

"Seek ye first the kingdom of God . . ."

"Render unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's."

#### REFLECTED AUTHORITY.

" . . . there are dangers where the State is unsympathetic or hostile and there must be constant endeavour to resist encroachments by the State which endanger human personality."—Part 1. P. 19 of the Report of the Lambeth Conference. (1948.)

"Christianity endorses every claim that can rightly be made for man . . . it regards men's personality as sacred."—Part 11. P. 3 of the Report of the Lambeth Conference.

" . . . Man is more than a function of his society, more than a producer or citizen. His claims as Man are dependent not on any concession by an earthly state but upon divine endowment and prerogative which no human authority gave, or can take from him. If man is heir to everlasting life, then the State exists for man, not man for it."—From the Report of the Lambeth Conference, Part 11. P. 10.

"For Freedom and justice in the world depend on there being enough men and women who say, 'We must obey God rather than man.'"

We, therefore, the undermentioned clergy of the Christian Church, believing, —

(1) That the use of power, whether political, economic or financial, unless guided by Law provided by God, can only produce evil results in society;

(2) That the uninformed and irresponsible use of political power, unguided and unchecked by Authority, is the chief cause of the evils evident in society;

— deem that the first urgent duty of Christians, both clergy and laity, is to give exemplary action and advice to the electorate and Government on the use of political power according to God's Law.

We do, therefore, assert,

(1) That the overriding Christian objective of all governmental policy should be maximum freedom of choice for the individual person; and that this is totally inconsistent with all forms of monopoly, whether political, economic or financial, private or governmental; but is inseparably identified with the absolute right and power to enjoy freedom of association, *i.e.*, the ability to contract out of one association into any one of a number of others without interference of any kind.

(2) That any elector using his voting power, or influence of any kind, to support policies which in any way penalise or infringe the right of the individual to enjoy freedom of association or freedom of choice, other than for the protection of the rights of other persons or the defence of the realm is offending against God's Law and committing a sin.

(3) That power being the chief corrupting influence in the world, the surrender of any part of national sovereignty in order to centralise power in any World organ of control or government is especially dangerous to human liberties, and therefore an offence against God's Law.

We do, therefore, call upon all Christians to obey God's Law in society, and to this end advise electors that they can only act with integrity and responsibility (*i.e.* in God's way) by acting as follows:

(1) By openly withdrawing their power as voters from all parties, politicians and organisations whose policies offend against the Law as defined above. This means all present political parties and of their supporters.

(2) By agreeing to return that voting power to any politician who will enter into a contract, with appropriate penalties operable if the contract is broken, to support *only* policies which in practice restore and preserve individual liberty.

We assert categorically that without the practice of integrity and responsibility of action towards Christian objectives in politics a Christian society cannot become a reality; and that unless the present tendency to centralisation of power is arrested and reversed a completely pagan and materialistic society will result and individual liberty be destroyed for a very long time. (Continued overleaf.)

We invite the support of all ministers of the Christian Church, by appending their signatures to this statement, and by making it the basis of advice to electors in their charge.

(Signed)

(The Rev.) H. Swabey, The Rectory, Raithby,  
Louth, Lincolnshire.

(The Rev. Dr.) Geoffrey Soden, Barsham Vicarage,  
Suffolk.

(The Rev.) L. A. Gibson, St. Paul's Vicarage,  
Stoneycroft, Liverpool.

(The Rev.) John Carr, St. Andrew's Vicarage,  
Uxbridge.

(The Rev.) C. L. Pocknee, St. Mary's Vicarage,  
Edmonton, N. 15.

(The Rev.) H. N. Duncan, Cloverley Hall,  
Whitchurch, Shropshire.

Signature .....

Address .....

All communications, or for further information, please address The Secretary, Christian Campaign For Freedom, Penhryn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1.

The Christian Campaign For Freedom will provide information and advice, on request, to all signatories to the above Declaration on specific policies, legislation and practices which offend against Law as defined therein.

# THE DENIAL

## A Counter Statement

1. Christ did not come in the cause of truth.

Signed.....

2. Interference with the freedom of the individual to choose is the truth.

Signed.....

3. It is not the responsibility of the Church to declare the truth in regard to policies which affect the power of the individual person to choose.

Signed.....

4. The Christian objective of all governmental policy should not be maximum freedom for the individual to choose.

Signed.....

5. Monopoly associations do not destroy freedom of association.

Signed.....

6. Governmental penalties on freedom to choose, e.g. discriminatory taxation, do not interfere with freedom to choose.

Signed.....

7. The removal of power from individual members of society and its centralisation in a few hands is not destructive of freedom.

Signed.....

8. Whatever Christians do with their political power, no matter how much harm they do to other sections of the community, has nothing to do with truth and God's Law.

Signed.....

9. Christians may believe that policies which increase individual freedom are in accordance with God's Law, and at the same time give political support to policies which destroy peoples' freedom to choose; and that is integrity.

Signed.....

10. A Christian is acting responsibly if he gives his electoral power to a politician, without binding him not to support any policy which destroys freedom to choose, other than specially provided for, e.g. Defence of the Realm.

Signed.....

11. Responsibility and integrity have nothing to do with truth and Christianity.

Signed.....

Name .....

Address .....