

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 2.

SATURDAY, MAY 16, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

### The Survival of the Unfittest by Unnatural Selection

by JAMES GUTHRIE

*(Continued)*

#### POLICY

In 1920, when England was a hive of industry, desperately trying to overtake the heavy losses of her "successful war," Montagu Norman, the American-trained banker, was placed in charge of the Bank of England. He immediately withdrew from a large part of British industry permission to carry on. He systematically reduced credit to all industries; the shortage of credit meant of course that some firms got none at all. The result was that many old established firms were destroyed; several million unemployed were standing in queues waiting for a dole. Being in England at this time and seeing the tremendous industrial activity suddenly slowed down for no particular reason, I realised then that scientists and engineers, businessmen and politicians had very little control over our destiny. Later I was to find out that what really counted in the modern world was the policy-makers behind Montagu Norman.

Policy implies a mature decision to move towards a distant goal as opposed to the day-to-day decisions which are mostly adventitious.

Just as the position of one point with respect to another may be due north, yet a ship voyaging between these two points may at various times, to reach its destination, move north, south, east and west. Analogously, events happening in various parts, although presented to us as having no connection with each other, and even presented as indicating the results of opposing policies, may all be directed by the same policy and may all lead to the same destination.

This insistence on the isolated nature of events has been consistently used in peace, as in war, to prevent people taking any precautionary action to protect themselves against coming events. This episodic view of things is the opposite to what is called 'military intelligence.'

"Military intelligence" means accurate information from reliable sources which enables one to make reasonably accurate forecasts of coming events, so giving one time to take adequate protective action. It is obvious that for many generations the British people and their political leaders either had not had any information akin to "military intelligence," or have not been allowed to use it. Accordingly they have been enticed into one trap after another, and have only escaped from ridiculous situations at suicidal cost. What that cost has been nobody has the courage even to guess.

The ordinary man lives from day to day in an environment he does not like nor understand; he lives in the sphere of the contingent—a life in which few important decisions are possible.

When we come to policy we rise above the sphere of the ordinary man; we rise out of the sphere of the contingent to where a philosophy determines not only the day to day decision but a decision aimed to reach a distant goal. Here we see the clash of the giants—the clash between Russia and America, between Communism and Capitalism; nothing could be further from the truth. No information could be more carefully designed to prevent people protecting themselves against coming events.

We are asked to believe that America and Russia are at "daggers drawn"; but the facts are that the Russian Revolution was financed by the wealthiest men in America, and the leaders of both countries agreed that the elimination of the British Empire was the first essential step towards "universal democracy."

When "Americans" state that their policy is anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist they mean, of course, anti-British; and practically every move against the British in the Middle East, India and elsewhere has been heavily backed by "American" propaganda and dollars.

Whether you agree with this policy or not is not my present concern; the point I wish to make is that the British people have been kept in almost complete ignorance of America's consistent policy. Needless to say, the American people are in an almost similar position and, like the British, have no control over their national policy.

In one short life-time the British people have seen destroyed the resources of hundreds of years of brilliant and courageous endeavour. They have been reduced, after two "successful" wars, from the greatest power on earth to a satellite of New York, and their continued existence as a nation left in some doubt. To this day the British people have not the slightest idea how all this came about, or who caused it.

They have been taught to believe that all these tragedies were inevitable, just a "modern trend," a fortuitous combination of "unfortunate circumstances," the operation of "blind forces," a demonstration of the principle of the "survival of the fittest"—Evolution in other words.

We who have had the temerity to point to the long term policy behind this tale of continuous humiliation of a courage-

*(Continued on page 2.)*

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Home and abroad, post free:  
One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.  
Offices—Business and Editorial: 11, GARFIELD STREET, BELFAST.  
Telephone: Belfast 27810.

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel—Advisory Chairman: Dr. Tudor Jones. Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 36, Melbourne Avenue, Deakin, Canberra, Australia. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. (Telephone: EUSon 3893.) Canada: L. Denis Byrne, 7420, Ada Boulevard, Edmonton, Alberta. Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W.

### The Spendthrift State

*The Irish Catholic*, March 17, 1959, published the following letter:

Sir,—In your February 12 issue, Gallowglass, contemplating the poverty of our pensioners, raised the fundamental issue of our personal responsibility and the following week your leading article "The Spendthrift State" underlined the obvious mismanagement of the economy. Gallowglass does not know if the National Balance Sheet is fraudulent, but I can assure him that "public" accountancy is a fake all over the world. The only way to cure this is to put the Parties into competition by insisting on their submitting tenders for their term of office and abolition of the anonymous vote by substituting an open recorded one, with the supporters of the successful Party sharing the proved increase of expenditure or the savings in taxation as the case may be.

In the *Times Literary Supplement* dated February 27, an editorial is devoted to "Political Scepticism" which tries to tell us the truth without being offensive and concludes in these words "It is part of the essence of the system, and is likely to remain so, that it is conducted behind the façade of an orthodoxy universally recognised to be false." The writer also expresses the opinion that, if there were discovered a true explanation of how the British political system works, and forming an adequate basis for a philosophy of politics, it would certainly never be given institutional expression or any kind of political acknowledgement.

Two questions follow from these observations. How is it that so many people professing the highest principles continue to co-operate in a procedure "universally" recognised as a swindle? And secondly: Is it true that no adequate basis for a philosophy of politics has been uncovered by Belloc-Chesterton and C. H. Douglas? None-the-less we are faced by the barefaced confidence of the writer that even so, a corporate organized recognition of revealed truth is impossible—which, of course, is nonsense.

It would appear sound tactics for the individual to contract-out of the irresponsible, anonymous ballot box and reserve his action until the procedure makes increased expendi-

ture a penalty shared by the supporters of the Party in power and any savings in taxation their reward whilst the Party was in power.

W. P. LANGMAID.

114, Ashlawn Road,  
Rugby.

### Progress

The Home Secretary has assured the Law Society that in future if a conversation between a solicitor and his client is tapped by any of the State's hidden ears it will not be disclosed for the purpose of legal proceedings, as Lord Tenby did once when he was Home Secretary.

Very gracious of the Home Secretary. But its a pity we can't know how much of this telephone tapping goes on. Much more, I suspect, than most people imagine.

I have heard it estimated that the secret watchers and listeners keep up-to-date dossiers covering the every-day doings of about 2,000,000 British citizens. Rather a dangerous hidden power, don't you think?

—John Gordon, in *The Sunday Express*, March 15, 1959.

### Stock-taking

The following corrections should be noted in Mr. L. D. Byrne's notes published serially during February and March:

Part IV. (*T.S.C.* Vol. 38, No. 22), para. 4, line 10: "the new social heresy. . ."

Part V. (*T.S.C.* Vol. 38, No. 23), para. beginning, "The second contribution . . ." The second sentence should read, "In these broadcasts he develops very plainly the fundamental difference in the social philosophy which dominated civilisation up to the Reformation. . ."

Part V. (*T.S.C.* Vol. 38, No. 23), para. commencing "Dr. Grant contends. . ." Fourth sentence should read: "This, he asserts, was the essential element in Hebraic philosophy which was carried into Christian teaching and remained as a disruptive influence within the Church. . ."

### THE SURVIVAL OF THE UNFITTEST BY UNNATURAL SELECTION—(continued from page 1.)

ous people, have been treated with contempt and ridicule. Had there been a tale of continuous success and prosperity, some British statesmen would have come forward and claimed that he and his party were responsible for the policy which made such desirable conditions possible. But to suggest a long term policy behind continuous disaster, that is different. That would point to criminal intent, to some destructive purpose achieved, to some criminal mind behind the policy. This sounds "too diabolic"; this sounds "evil"; and "there is no such thing as evil in the material or animal world." In evolution there is no place for evil. Now you can understand why Darwinism now being absorbed under the mystic title of Progress, meaning of course automatic progress, became so amazingly popular in those quarters which alone had the power to make it universally popular.

(To be continued.)

## Boris Pasternak

WE ARE INDEBTED TO *AMERICAN OPINION* FOR THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPHS FROM THE "IF YOU WANT IT STRAIGHT . . ." FEATURE IN THEIR FEBRUARY, 1959, ISSUE. RE-PUBLICATION IS MADE WITH THE KIND PERMISSION OF THEIR EDITOR.

We must remind our readers once more that the Communists have now gone about two-thirds of the way towards their goal of ruling the world. One reason for this success has been the unceasing readiness of non-Communists and even anti-Communists (always nudged along and guided by secret Communists, of course) to accept at face value whatever carefully concocted story the inveterate liars of the Kremlin's propaganda machine might offer to the world. The current ballyhoo over Boris Pasternak and his novel, *Doctor Zhivago*, is just one more painful illustration of a fact we cannot refrain from printing again and again: That the fundamentally decent American mind simply will not grasp the kind of enemy with which it has to deal.

The Communists do not wait for opportunities. They create their own. Since they can make progress by knowing exactly where they want to go in the midst of strife and argument, turmoil and bitterness which confuse their enemies, they bring about such conditions deliberately—at whatever cost to themselves may be required. Since they fish best and most profitably in muddy waters, they have not the slightest hesitation about plunging into any dark stream, and getting themselves as dirty as may be necessary, in order to stir up the muddy mess that suits their needs. But the gullible Americanist then says: "Gee, the Communists could not intentionally have had anything to do with that commotion, and must have hated it. For look at all of the mud it spattered on them. So we can accept this dark swirling condition as a natural phenomenon, and believe the conclusions which we draw from studying it." Those conclusions, of course, are exactly the ones the Communists wanted to have drawn when they planned the whole affair.

Boris Pasternak is a Soviet citizen who has made his living for decades as a writer. It seems that some thirty years ago he was briefly and indecisively chided for having produced something which showed an "unsociable" attitude. Since then, it is clear, he has been willing to trim his philosophical sails at all times to catch enough favourable wind from the Kremlin to keep him in the writing profession. Now he has turned out a novel, *Doctor Zhivago*, which "portrays the poignant drama of the Soviet individual pitted against the nightmare world of Marxism." It was published abroad, but not in Russia. For this novel he was awarded the 1958 Nobel Prize in literature.

The Kremlin refused to allow Pasternak to accept the prize, supposedly because such acceptance would make inevitable the publication of this subversive book within Russia itself. But the world-wide publicity thus given *Doctor Zhivago*, with the help of the liberal press, caused its readership and sales to soar everywhere. In the United States, in the month of November, 1958, alone, 160,000 copies were sold. The publishers announced an additional advertising appropriation of twenty-five thousand dollars, and boasted that further sales were limited only by the speed with which the printers and binders could produce

more copies. Pasternak's courage is praised to the skies in the editorial pages of metropolitan dailies, whose book-review sections glow with enthusiasm for the literary greatness of his work. And the Kremlin, supposedly horrified and helpless, sees all of this tremendous damage done to the Communist cause throughout the world, by one of its own rebellious subjects who dared to speak out against its crimes. Do tell!

But at any rate that's the "pitch." And are the suckers falling for it! The formula at work here is almost identical with the one used in connection with *The New Class* by Milovan Djilas. But since a novel has a much wider appeal than any essay on sociology—no matter how cleverly the essay is promoted by all of the cloak-and-dagger atmosphere blown up around it—*Doctor Zhivago* is expected to have its impact on the literate millions. *The New Class*, on the other hand, was aimed primarily at heavy thinkers, like those who read *Harper's Magazine*, *The Reporter*, *The Atlantic Monthly*, and Walter Lippmann. The ideological objective in both cases seems to be roughly the same. Before examining what the Communists are trying to accomplish, however let's look briefly at the insulting absurdity of the play-acting we are expected to accept as reality.

In the first place, as every realist knows, the present tremendous sale of *Doctor Zhivago* in the United States would be utterly impossible if the Kremlin, and its allies and dupes in this country, didn't actually *want* the book to sell. Few novels of our generation have so stirred the interest and admiration of its readers as has *The Pentagon Case*. And, as Dr. Daniel Poling says, "it has all the suspense elements of a topflight detective story." But the stranglehold of Communist influences on our book-reviewing and book-distributing channels is so strong and complete that *The Pentagon Case* has had to depend almost entirely on the mail-order purchase, by patriotic readers, of multiple copies for distribution to their friends. The total sales, a year after publication, have run to only a few tens of thousands of copies; and the large book-reviewing media have seen to it that almost none of those sales were through regular bookstore channels.

Taylor Caldwell had proved herself—before the Communists set out to destroy her—to be one of the most popular novelists America has ever produced. Her books sold in millions. But if Taylor Caldwell today should write a novel combining all of the appeal, and with none of the defects, of *Gone With The Wind*, *In His Steps*, *Les Misérables*, and *Vanity Fair*—and if that book honestly and clearly opposed the current Communist line and purposes—it wouldn't sell fifty thousand copies. Although there is no doubt that Ayn Rand's *Atlas Shrugged* is a greater and more lasting work than *Doctor Zhivago*, we would be surprised to learn that Ayn Rand's book had sold forty thousand copies in two years. Yet *Doctor Zhivago* sold four times that amount in one month! The thing speaks for itself—or would, if Americans, even of the right wing, would stop

being soft in the head about this whole conspiracy.

In the second place, has everybody forgotten that, at least since 1950, the three Nobel Prize committees have become practically indistinguishable from Soviet propaganda agencies? Or that, while probably few of the recipients of Nobel Prizes have been Communists, almost nobody has received a Nobel Prize of late years whose words or work—whether intentionally or otherwise—had not in some way supported the Communist line or served Communist purposes? Or that Dag Hammarskjöld is a member of the Swedish Academy which acts as the Nobel Prize Committee for literature, and was known to have been consulted with regard to the 1958 award? Any thought that this committee would give any prize to anybody over the known or expected opposition of the Kremlin is naive beyond reason. That it would award such a prize *for literature, to a Soviet citizen living in Russia*, without the Kremlin's approval, is as likely as that the United Nations would come out in support of free enterprise.

And in the third place, the Kremlin's refusal to allow *Doctor Zhivago* to be published in Russia is so tinselled and conspicuous a piece of bait offered to critics of the Soviets that any alert critic ought to be suspicious at once. Has everybody forgotten how the Kremlin really handles such matters? Even when Stalin was winning his struggle against Trotsky for supreme power in Russia, through the very fact that Stalin was in complete charge of all the media of mass communication, he did not refuse to allow anything by, or favourable to, Trotsky to be published. Oh no. He merely saw to it that tens or hundreds of thousands of any pamphlet condemning Trotsky were made available all over Russia, while similar pamphlets praising Trotsky were held to a printing and a circulation of only a few thousand—on the ground that there was no larger demand for them. This is a pattern now well and long established in Communist procedures and pro-Communist practices, and by imitators thereof everywhere (including the Fund For The Republic in our own country).

It would have been very easy for the Kremlin, and of considerable advantage, to have made quite a grandstand play of letting Pasternak receive his Nobel Prize, and of then letting his book to be "published" in Russia, to show its tolerance of criticism—while taking pains to ensure that the number of copies made available didn't reach far enough for the criticism to do any harm. But this would probably have allowed *Doctor Zhivago* to die in the rest of the world at the same sputtering sales level as whatever Bertrand Russell got the prize for in 1950 or Ernest Hemingway in 1954. And the Soviet bosses had more important propaganda fish to fry.

The easiest way to identify one of the fish is to recall a story which was quite prevalent in the corridors of American sales conventions a generation ago. The salesman in this story found, or imagined, that with certain customers he could ingratiate himself, and makes his sales "pitch" more convincing, by telling the customer what a louse the salesman's "big boss" was, back at the home office. But being afraid that some word of this criticism would get back to the boss, the salesman went in himself and explained what he was doing and why. This boss had as little regard for decency, or his own honour, as do the Communists

today. "Look, John," he reassured the salesman, "if calling me names will help you to get the order, you call me every kind of SOB you can think of. Never mind my feelings or reputation. Your job is to sell the goods."

The "goods" which the Kremlin is so terribly anxious to sell the world, and especially the American people, today, is that socialism itself is both inevitable and wonderful; and that the only thing wrong with socialism is the kind of bosses who are running it in some countries. The Kremlin doesn't care how revoltingly Pasternak pictures the brutalities of the Bolsheviks in the years immediately following the Revolution in 1917. That, they expect you to understand, was a necessity of the movement. ("You can't make an omelet without breaking eggs.") The Kremlin doesn't care how black Pasternak might paint the character of Joseph Stalin; it took the lead in this dialectic maneuver itself, at the 20th Communist Congress. Nor would the Kremlin care how convincingly Pasternak might revile the present Soviet bosses, if that revilement helped him to "get the order."

For Pasternak possesses no sticks and stones which can break their bones, but only words which cannot hurt them. And the present bosses will soon pass anyway. Even now the plans may be blueprinted as to every detail, even the timing, for a phoney but carefully stage-managed *coup* whereby Malenkov, Kaganovitch, Molotov, and Shepilov displace Khrushchev and return to power. The current increase of invectives by Khrushchev against these "anti-party" stalwarts, and the renewed emphasis of his hostility to them, may itself be a part of the preparation for their ultimate return. For Malenkov and his associates would then publicise themselves as the really "good boys" of the Communist hierarchy, and would use the bitter and supposedly unfair hatred of themselves, by the murderous Khrushchev, as evidence of their own intentions having all along been in the opposite and more civilised direction. But in the meantime the socialist "firm" which they will come to manage will have advanced its "line" tremendously, through the efforts of such salesmen of the "let's-call-the-boss-names school" as Milovan Djilas and Boris Pasternak.

(To be continued.)

### The Meaning of Meaning

"The true meaning of a term is to be found by observing what a man does with it, not what he says about it."

—*The Logic of Modern Physics*, Bridgman.

• • •

"A controversy is normally an exploitation of a set of misunderstandings for warlike purposes."

—*The Meaning of Meaning*, Ogden and Richards.

Now available

**CHRISTIANITY AND WORLD GOVERNMENT**

by HENRY S. SWABEY.

Price 1/-.

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,  
11, Garfield Street, Belfast, N. Ireland.

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