

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

VOICE

INTEGRITY
FREEDOM
RESPONSIBILITY

Vol. 1. No. 1.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: home 1½d. abroad 1d.

SATURDAY, APRIL 24, 1954.

6d. Fortnightly.

Our Title

We do not speak before we have thought and we do not believe that we should think without being guided by something deeper than thought; likewise we do not speak without intending to be heard, neither do we believe that thought and speech are of any avail if they are not consummated in action.

VOICE makes its appearance because it is believed that there is a need for it, not because its policy is not ably represented elsewhere, but because strategy requires that this policy should be represented in a different setting than is to be found in other journals and in a different way.

Our policy is the restoration, the preservation and the extension of the *power* of the individual to choose for himself. Our policy is based on the philosophy inherent in the Christian Faith that *individual* man is made in the image of God, created by God with an *individual* creative purpose. We believe that God's creative purpose is immanent in the spirit of *individual* man, and for that reason we believe that individual liberty is not merely a desirable state to attain; we believe that it is essential to God's purpose. We believe that all people who in any way support policies the effect of which is to restrict or destroy the individual person's power to choose are acting against God's purpose. As everyone who would put his hand in the fire or jump off a cliff knows, there is Law in the Universe which is inexorable. It is the Creator's Law; and consequently we believe that, whether in this world or hereafter, those people who by deliberate design or knowingly from mere weakness of will support policies which defeat God's purpose will suffer.

When we speak of individual liberty we speak of a spiritual necessity. It is a necessity to which many, including the Church, give lip service. It is the hall-mark of the traitor, his cloak, that his actions belie his words, that what he affects by his words to support he betrays with his actions. It will be our persistent endeavour to urge our readers to challenge all and sundry, particularly, to give expression to their belief or unbelief in the overriding importance of individual liberty, and invite them to square their actions with their professions of belief. *With your co-operation* we will regularly give examples in these pages to illustrate on the one hand deeds matching words and on the other deeds giving the lie to words.

Our first loyalty is to God, and that is why 'Under God' is part of the headpiece of this paper. We assert categorically that he who supports policies and organisations which further individual liberty is for God; and we assert categorically that he who, whether by design or from expediency or feebleness, supports policies or organisations which restrict or destroy individual liberty is convicted by

his actions of disloyalty to God.

We affirm our conviction that it is only on this spiritual basis that any action taken to defeat the Satanic forces so powerfully working for the enslavement of mankind, can succeed.

Our second loyalty is to our country. As we believe in the fundamental rightness of the sovereignty of the individual, so we believe that its attainment is impossible without sovereignty of individual civilised nations. We do not fall for and we shall seek to expose that perversion of nationalism which avows that the citizen exists for the nation. This is an inversion of the Christian maxim that "The Sabbath was made for man." A nation's greatness, no less than its strength and happiness depends pre-eminently on the Government and all its institutions serving the individual citizen. Neither do we fall for that perversion of nationalism which sees covertly or overtly in other countries an object for exploitation. Whether for peaceful purposes or the safeguarding of peaceful purposes we believe in the maximum of international co-operation. But we denounce as utterly of the devil interference with the sovereignty of any nation, whether by financial, economic, political or military means. For the sake of the wholeness of our policy we shall make reference to these matters, but only briefly. Briefly, because we conceive that our special usefulness and purpose is along other paths: to harmonise the actions of all minority groups (other than the power-politics type) into concerted action.

Our third and fourth loyalties are to the individual and the minority. No one person shares completely the preferences and tastes, the skills, abilities and inclinations of another individual. If this were not so the collectivity, the mob, the herd would have been the accepted order of society from the beginning of time, down through the Ages, and there would not today be the fundamental cleavage of policy which divides and threatens to disintegrate society. Despite appearances and mass propaganda to the contrary this cleavage of policy is not fundamentally geographical in grouping. It is the fundamental cleavage of *real* policy in every country on earth. It is a divergence of policy which has many forms and many guises. Those of us who have lived with this problem and battled with it for many years recognise that there is a particular strategem, conscious or unconscious, of *all* those who occupy high places in the State, Industry or Press to burr across and obliterate the lines of this cleavage. One of our objects will be to make the lines plain to all we can reach. The question of the liberties of the mind and mass-conformity of thought, of the individual's policy in relation to group activities, are questions which in our view can only be effectively resolved by the marriage of two forms of action. One is expository and exposure, and the other is the religious *practice* of certain principles by individuals in politics; these principles are stated also in the headpiece of this paper: Integrity,

Freedom and Responsibility.

Integrity is the complete consummation and reconciliation in action of what one really believes.

Freedom is the ability to choose or refuse one thing at a time.

Responsibility is that the individual takes the full share of the consequences of his action and does not shuffle them on to other shoulders (or pockets).

Now, what is the practical meaning and application of these principles in politics?

We will enumerate some of the objects which individuals or minorities believe in:

- (1) That it is treason to surrender any part of our national sovereignty, politically, economically or financially.
- (2) The right to contract out of the Health service without penalty.
- (3) The right to contract out of National Insurance without penalty.
- (4) The right to obtain pure bread and water or any other foodstuff, and the right to supply it.
- (5) The right to contract out of National Education without penalty.
- (6) The right to contract out of all discriminatory taxation on commodities or services, *i.e.*, all taxation should be levied direct on incomes.
- (7) The right to contract out of Trades Unions.

This list can be added to. But as it stands it is sufficient to indicate what a wide field minority opinion covers and on what a wide front individual liberty is threatened. If the people who comprise all these minorities stood together they would constitute a formidable political force. The principle of freedom is embodied in all of them; it is a common factor to all of them. It is the link which binds all people who in any *real* sense can call themselves Christians, patriots or democrats.

There is not one of these minorities and not one member of any of them who can claim to be acting with integrity if he votes for any existing political party. We go further and say that anyone who believes in any of the causes we have enumerated or who believes that individuals and minorities have rights, is betraying his cause by voting for any party or belonging to any organisation whose effective policy defeats these causes. And we say emphatically that the only way the battle for God, country and the individual can be won is by the strictest practice of the principle of integrity of action in the political field. To temporise in the name of expediency or compromise is to give away the individual's power for good in politics.

The third principle of spiritual strength is Responsibility. It is the principle of Natural Law that anyone who breaks it suffers consequences. It is the principle of the Common Law and of a contract that a man who offends against it suffers definite consequences. Here is the practice of justice and the protection of the individuals in society against all anarchistic tendencies. The one thing that stands out above all else in politics today is that the word 'promise' has no relation to contract in any legal sense. The one thing that is needed above all else in politics is the exist-

ence of a contract between elector and representative, the penalties of which become operative immediately the contract is broken. The conclusion to be reached is obvious: that no elector should give the sanction of his vote to a candidate without a written contract with defined penalties operable immediately the candidate vitiates the contract by supporting a policy contrary to the contract.

We say emphatically that to support one Evil because it appears to be less than the alternative Evil is to play right into the hands of the Devil; and that the *only* effective action which any single individual can take, whether he is in a majority or a minority, is to practice these principles. Before you preach, practice what you preach! J.M.

A Doubtful Triumph

In an article called "A Triumph of Capitalism," contributed to the March number of the Conservative *Two Cities Gazette* by George Schwartz, the author draws attention to the irony of the present universal insistence on furnishing the world with a larger, and progressively larger, stock of capital equipment. "The political and social orders of the West may be repudiated," he says, "but not its technological and economic achievements. . . . The same people who contend that Capitalism has been a failure at home argue that, out of the great abundance it has created, liberal aid should be given to the under-developed countries."

"The purport of all the grandiose schemes for improving the lot of the poorer peoples of the world," he says further, "is to bring about the improvement by furnishing them with the necessary capital equipment and the skill to utilise it. The projects associated with Point Four, the Colombo Plan, the Colonial Development and Welfare Act, the rôle of the World Bank, can all be subsumed under this objective. Capitalism, Socialism, Communism have this in common to-day: they all favour intensive capital development."

George Schwartz does not appear to disapprove of the frantic drive for capital development which he describes in his article. In fact, he considers that one of the reasons why the British people have emerged and ranked themselves "in the upper ten of mankind" is the capital development which they have carried out at home and also in other lands, capital development "initiated and carried through by British enterprise." Yet with his perception of the irony of the situation, is there perhaps in his mind an underlying recognition that this universal advocacy of capital development may be partly due to artificial causes? George Schwartz is said to hate planning. But surely an element of planning is involved in the present situation: as has been described by others, *e.g.*:—"Industry must expand continuously *unless* purchasing power to distribute its product reaches the public through other channels than wages, channels independent of the wage system." The planning may have a negative object, the prevention of change, and yet be none the less deliberate on that account. There must be someone responsible for thus preserving the *status quo*, when the present system is without merit either from the social or economic point of view.

ALICE RAVEN.

Under Which King?

by C. H. DOUGLAS*

There is no single aspect of political economy which deserves more attention, and receives less, than the nature of an order. Like so many other matters of importance and subtlety, most people understand so little of the subject that they are practically unaware that it presents any problem; still less, a problem on which the whole structure of society depends. The immense success of mediaeval civilisation (and its ultimate failure) can be seen to be linked with one conception of an order and the sanctions which sustained it; the different, but notable, achievements of the nineteenth century, and the chaos which has succeeded that short-lived adventure, are plainly the outcome of another. The problem is often stated by the use of the word "sovereignty"; and we have an indication of that identity in the title of the gold coin which ruled the nineteenth century, the English sovereign, as well as in the declared intention to remove national sovereignty to an international centre.

The essence of Mediaevalism (often, it may be noted, referred to as the Mediaeval Order) was the existence of the Church as a sanction, as an organisation for making effective certain checks and balances upon the use of physical force to carry an order from its utterance to its execution. The Church claimed to be, and was to quite a considerable extent, a living body of Superior Law, not different in intention but far higher in conception, to the Constitution of the United States. And it is important to notice that the breakdown of nineteenth century English prosperity can be seen in retrospect to be contemporaneous with the decadence in social prestige of the village parson.

Now the nature of the problem presented to political economy, as distinct from ideology, by an order, is simply this: Either Brown gives orders on his own behalf, or Mr. Pink-Geranium gives them for him. That someone has to give orders on Brown's behalf is not in dispute. And the decision between these two courses is *ultimately* dependent on which source of authority succeeds in making results most accurately and rapidly eventuate from orders, in reasonable identity between specification and product. And the problem is complicated for Mr. Pink-Geranium by the fact that he has no-one but Mr. Brown to whom to give orders, and Mr. Brown is convinced that it is more blessed to give than to receive.

There was a period, say between 1850 and 1914, in which the *economic* aspect of this problem was in a fair way to solution. The gold sovereign was a complete order system. Mr. Brown had only to tender his yellow warrant of sovereignty and he got what he wanted. He set in motion the most marvellous train of self acting psychological sanctions. Factories sprang to life, trains ran, and ships sailed, all concerned not merely to do his will, but to do it better than anyone else. It is quite irrelevant to this particular argument that a large and increasing number of Mr. Browns had no sovereigns; it is a fact of history that the man who had one always wanted two, and, in consequence, if every Mr. Brown had possessed a sovereign it would still have been effective. It is perhaps unnecessary to observe

that the virtue of the gold sovereign lay not in its material but in its sanctions.

Now the *political* equivalent of the gold sovereign is the vote, and the merest glance at our life and times is sufficient to establish the conclusion that it fails to work. There is nothing in the possession of a vote which remotely approximates to the power of choice and the certainty of delivery enjoyed by Mr. Brown with his golden sovereign in the latter days of the nineteenth century, no-one outside the walls of a mental hospital would contend that the individual voter gets what he votes for, or voted for, what he is getting. So obvious is this that the greatest difficulty is experienced in getting people to vote at all. The vote costs nothing; and it is worth precisely what it costs. If it cost ten shillings to vote, how many votes would be registered?

But the matter does not end there. While the political vote is valueless to the individual, it enables the Satanic Powers to claim a mandate which it in fact does not confer, and which it is powerless to enforce. This situation is so satisfactory that the ballot-box is a cardinal provision of the World State, and it is clear for any ordinarily intelligent person to see that it is the intention—and in "Britain" the rapidly developing fact—that the economic vote will be destroyed in its nineteenth century effectiveness, and substituted by the political vote as exercised in Russia.

It is urgently necessary to realise these matters because they dominate our future. British Governments now hold office by a trick; no British Government has any genuine mandate. Our whole political system is not merely irrational, it is a fraud and a usurpation. We have allowed the vicious nonsense which derided the values established by a thousand years of unique political experience to destroy in our name every safeguard against tyranny provided by historic continuity in the Three Estates, and we welcome the people who spawn this nonsense when they desert the Europe they have wrecked. Nothing can save us but a drastic de-hypnotisation. It is coming; but it may kill us.

The Basic Struggle

"The Church has known three great periods so far, each fantastically unlike its predecessor, and each giving place to something very different . . . the governing pre-occupation is going to be not, as it was in the Dark and Middle Ages, how to achieve sufficient order, but the opposite, how to protect human life from the excessive pressure of highly organised political power controlling all the means of intercourse and persuasion and seeking to make of the human material within its power the kind of servants for which it has most use. This is the basic struggle, not economic but political, before this generation; and in it the Church has an essential part to play, a new role, not less decisive and beneficial to mankind than her earlier role as the maker and moulder of Christendom." (*The Tablet*.)

Please turn to page 4:

"THIS COLUMN": OUR EFFORT: YOUR EFFORT.

*Reproduced by courtesy of *The Social Creditor* in whose columns the article appeared on December 15, 1945.

Getting the Right Idea

Writing to *The Daily Telegraph* on March 23, Major Sir Gerald Burrard says:

'Why should M.P.s not have their salaries tied to the general level of taxation? A reduction in this level could then be accompanied by an automatic rise to them. . . .

"Of course the principle would only apply provided that reductions in income and purchase tax were not accompanied by any increase in other forms of taxation."

A few weeks ago a Peer writing to the same paper said that he had long entertained the idea that M.P.s salaries should be fixed in inverse proportion to the rise or fall of the cost of living.

If there is an urgent need for the M.P. to be made legally responsible for the results of his actions in Parliament, as indeed there is, both from the point of view of principle and practice, the argument is just as cogent that the elector should be made responsible for the consequences of his vote. While in a paper of this character there is good reason that methods of enforcing responsibility should be ventilated, because we are writing for a special public, there is no doubt that the principle of putting such a technical question to electors as such is wholly wrong. The only fit and appropriate thing for an electorate to decide on is results, not methods; and to bring home responsibility, those who voted for the party in power should have a greater share of the good or bad results produced.

Automatic?

When opening the Winchester Diocesan Missionary Council's Exhibition on March 12, the Leader of the House of Commons, the Right Hon. Henry Crookshank, said:—

"One of the most striking phrases in the constitution of the United States was where it referred to 'the right of man to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.' These might be taken for high ideals in the secular field. The first word was life, and they knew who was life and should spread this knowledge because it was followed automatically by liberty. Subsequently when they had life and liberty they could fall back on happiness but without those essentials—in other words without God—they could find no happiness."

We hope that readers in Mr. Crookshank's constituency will remind him of some of the liberties denied to individuals by legislative action of the body of which he is the leader, and for which he has a responsibility; and ask him for an explanation of why his actions contradict his words.

The Do-Gooder

"My Lords, the battle for the liberty of the subject has to be renewed and fought in every age. No sooner has one encroachment been swept away than another arises to take its place. The passion to regulate the lives of others is deep-seated and hard to root out. It is most dangerous and insidious when it arises not from motives of personal gain but from the desire to inflict benefit upon others.

"In this era, the greatest danger to human freedom is the specialist or expert, the man who has soaked himself deep in some pattern of conduct which he thinks best. . . ." (Lord Douglas of Barloch in the House of Lords, January 27.)

THIS COLUMN

The article on our front page discusses the question of the liberty of the individual as a spiritual necessity and its practical application in terms of the integrity and responsibility of the individual elector. 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 in this vital matter we have a profound conviction that the future of Christianity, of Truth, of civilisation, of even a tolerable life for individual men and women, is to be determined for a very long time. The Spiritual Authority in this land is silent. Even it appears to spread the poison in society which will destroy it, and to condone the action.

Agreement in theory without action is worse than useless, it is dangerous, because it is deceptive. For saying one thing and doing another there is an ugly word. We believe that it is of the greatest importance that the Bishops and clergy, individually, should come out into the open and give expression to the Christian attitude to liberty, not only as a matter of principle, but as a matter of application. This column is thrown open to them to express their view of what is said in our front page article.

WE ASK OUR READERS TO APPROACH THEIR DIOCESAN LEADERS AND THE LOCAL CLERGY AND INVITE THEM TO STATE THEIR ATTITUDE.

So that we may report on the position we ask all those who do so to write us a *brief* letter giving particulars of all those asked to do this and the response that was forthcoming.

OUR EFFORT: To meet the grave situation which confronts all of us we have taken a new initiative in publishing this paper, placing special emphasis on an approach we believe could bring important results.

TO HELP YOU IN ACTION FOR WHICH WE HAVE APPEALED IN THESE PAGES WE SEND YOU A SPARE COPY OF THE PAPER FOR YOUR USE.

YOUR EFFORT: We ask each of you to get us one new subscriber, or alternatively to pay a trial subscription for half a year (7/6) for one of your acquaintances who might become a regular reader.

VOICE

A JOURNAL OF STRATEGY FOR PERSONAL, POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC FREEDOM.

"Freedom consists in the ability to choose 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:* ROCKHOUSE FARM, LOWER FROYLE, ALTON, HANTS. *Telephone:* Bentley 3182.

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