

# THE SOCIAL CREDITOR

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Volume 42, No. 1.

SATURDAY, APRIL 28, 1962.

6d. Fortnightly.

### More About "The Significance of C. P. Snow"

It appears that *The Spectator* for March 9th, containing the text of Dr. F. R. Leavis's Richmond Lecture at Cambridge, is difficult to obtain. A copy has therefore been placed in the Library and may be seen by arrangement. For these reasons, we may return to the subject by providing the following additional information:—

Entitled *Attack on the 'Two Cultures' of C. P. Snow*, a report "From Our University Correspondent" of the lecture, given in the Hall of Downing College on February 28th, 1962, appeared in *The Times* of March 1. The full text of the Lecture appeared in *The Spectator* of March 9th, 1962, prefaced by Dr. Leavis: "The lecture was private and representatives of the press who inquired were informed that there was no admission and that no reporting was to be permitted . . ." The Lecture occupies five pages.

#### (1) From *The Times*—

"Dr. F. R. Leavis, invited by the undergraduates of Downing College, Cambridge, to give their annual Richmond Lecture, chose as his subject 'The Two Cultures?—The Significance of C. P. Snow.' The main text was Sir Charles Snow's Rede lecture of 1959, but his novels did not escape.

"The first two-thirds of Dr. Leavis's lecture were devoted to abuse, the burden of which was that Snow was of significance only because he had been erected into a sage on both sides of the Atlantic, a 'British Council classic,' whose influence was traceable even in the essays of scholarship candidates. Snow had claimed to unite in himself his 'Two Cultures,' and his lecture had been characterised by a confidence that only genius could have justified (Snow might have an answer to that one). He dealt in basic clichés, or in meaningless assertions such as, that scientists 'have the future in their bones.' His culture was, in fact, that of the *New Statesman* and the Sunday papers. And in asserting that the traditional culture of 'natural Luddites' had not noticed the Industrial Revolution, he had ignored the great creative writers ranking from Dickens to Lawrence. In his novels Lewis Eliot inhabited the corridors of power, from which he looked down on such creatures as Cambridge dons; and the only evidence of scientific ability was a certain knowledge-ability.

#### 'Social Hope'

"So far the lecture consisted mainly of criticism by dogmatic and unqualified assertion. The last 20 minutes were much more specific and constructive. When Snow said 'We die alone,' he was only expressing in a sensational way the commonplace of human tragedy, 'We live alone'; but he added 'But there is still social hope,' and upon this Dr. Leavis fastened.

" 'Social hope,' elsewhere referred to as 'jam,' could not in any way cancel the individual condition. D. H. Lawrence in *Women in Love* had diagnosed the confusion of the modern world, to which all creative writers were hostile. Great literature brought us up against the questions 'What do men live for? What do they live by?' not against a Weilsian preoccupation with standards of living.

"Finally, a university should not be merely a conglomeration of specialised faculties. Its basic work was on the creation of the human world, including language. A poem, for instance, was a meeting of minds. Dr. Leavis saw in a vital English School the potential centre of the University."

(1) The following report of the Lecture is *not* from *The Times*.

The annual Richmond Lecture, given at the invitation of the undergraduates of Downing College, Cambridge, by Dr. F. R. Leavis, was entitled "The Two Cultures?—The Significance of C. P. Snow."

Using the internal evidence of Sir Charles's Rede Lecture of 1959, and a critical appraisal of Sir Charles's novels (Sir Charles had explained that it had always been his vocation to be a writer), Dr. Leavis devotes the first two-thirds of his lecture to a searching, and frequently caustic, examination of Sir Charles's fundamental qualifications to stand in judgment of either of the two 'cultures.' Dealing first with Snow's novels, Dr. Leavis gives his opinion that Snow "can't be said to know what a novel is . . . he can't do any of the things the power to do which makes a novelist." He considers that Snow lacks the power to make his characters live, and that if he *had* had the power, "the characters are . . . impoverished in the interests they are supposed to have and to represent."

Dr. Leavis next examines Snow's *The Affair* "for internal evidence that science has ever existed for Snow in any important inward way," since Snow has evidently given up science for fiction. Dr. Leavis concludes that "Of qualities that one might set to the credit of a scientific training there are none. As far as the internal evidence goes, the lecture was conceived and written by someone who had not had the advantage of an intellectual discipline of any kind." He quotes Sir Charles: "This culture (i.e., science) contains a great deal of argument, usually much more rigorous, and almost always at a higher conceptual level than literary persons' argument"—as evidence that Snow treats science only as "a matter of external reference."

(continued on Page 4).

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat 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:** 9 AVENUE ROAD, STRATFORD-ON-AVON. Telephone: Stratford-on-Avon 3976.

**Editorial:** PENRHYN LODGE, GLOUCESTER GATE, LONDON N.W.1. Telephone: EUSon 3893.

### IN AUSTRALIA—

**Business—**Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne.

**Editorial—**Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, Australia (Editorial Head Office).

### 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.

## From Week to Week

A few weeks ago, an A.B.C. news-broadcast reported Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, as having referred to the Soviet Union's agreement to collaborate with the U.S. in the problems and exploration of outer space as an event which would probably prove to be a turning point in history. Not a great deal of attention appears to have been paid to Mr. Kennedy's enthusiasm in this regard, but we believe it is a matter to be looked at more closely.

Major Douglas came—reluctantly, but in the light of his penetrating analysis of the evidence—more obscure in his day than in ours—to the conclusion that the worsening condition of the world was the outcome of a definite and conscious policy. He finally stated his opinion, quite unequivocally, that major war was not contemplated by the inner policy-makers, but that at a suitable time some form of amalgamation between the 'U.S.' and the 'U.S.S.R.' would take place or be announced, there being nothing that the rest of the world could do about it.

It is quite clear now that the rest of the world is much less able to do anything about it than was the case fifteen, ten, or even five years ago. The British Empire has been reduced to a dismembered 'Commonwealth' of which the 'wealth' is increasingly at the mercy of open or potential enemies. And even in 1918 Douglas knew that others knew that the British Empire was the greatest barrier to World Government.

In view of this general situation, the enthusiasm of Mr. Kennedy (or of his advisers—those who tell him what to think) for an instrument of U.S.-U.S.S.R. collaboration is not difficult to understand. The outer-space project is a perfect screen for the collaboration of the, shall we say, intercontinental back-room boys—a collaboration which may well be the

beginning of the practical enforcement of overt World-Government. And if we don't like ordinary police-state methods, there will always be an orbiting super-megaton explosive satellite ready at the push of a button to hurtle to a selected area of the earth's surface.

The motherly attitude of the Indian and Indonesian governments towards their children in 'enclaves' and other territories prompts our concern over the treatment of the Red Indians in their native land. Even if it is not an inevitable trend of history, it is surely high time that U.S. whites (and blacks) were fully integrated with the Red Indians? Even in Australia, some pressure is being put on the Government to integrate the whites with the aborigines. Something is lacking somewhere.

Another examination question for Social Crediters: Assuming the correctness of the conspiracy theory of international catastrophe, outline possible alternative methods for the consummation of the conspiracy.

And another: What would be the reaction of 'free-world' public opinion (i.e. genuine public opinion) in the face of monolithic unity between "Moscow and Peking," and what would the U.S. government do in the face of such opinion?

We have received the text of a speech by the Prime Minister of Portugal, Dr. Salazar, delivered during the session of the National Assembly held on January 3rd, 1962. This, in our opinion, is an international document of first class importance. It is issued by the Secretariado Nacional da Informacao, and we hope it will be fully studied in those quarters able to appreciate its significance. Dr. Salazar's conclusions are very grave.

## Axioms and Rope

(From a letter of thanks, dated March 19, 1962, for literature sent by the Anti-Common Market League, London.)

Concerning the objections to Great Britain's joining the so-called European Common Market, I have very little doubt that they are, in the main, correctly based.

... At the same time, even if you succeeded in getting the present Government to reverse its policy, you may be quite sure some other party, whether Labour or Liberal, would do what is required of it. Public argument about the pros and cons merely serves to give a spurious appearance of choice or election to a policy already decided—which way I don't know. You don't either, although it seems from the available evidence that it tends in the direction neither of us likes.

... The essence of measles isn't the spots at all, but something much deeper. Whether you know it or not, the immense pressure which is being exerted to force us into the European Common Market merely focusses a pencil of light on one of the "spots." It is the source of the pressure which is the disease—quite possibly a fatal disease so far as we are concerned.

What are the source and also the nature and objective of this pressure?

By addressing yourselves to the "spot" instead of to the "measles," it seems to me that you provide evidence that you have not considered this. What is a 'market' for, in any case?

To sell things? What things? To whom? The answers to these questions are less obvious than is currently taken for granted. With a ferocity reminiscent of the clamour for 'Algerie Francaise' in Algeria, one hears dinned into one's ears on all hands the lie (for it is a lie) expressed by Sir James Hutchison in *The Times* for December 9th last that "personal incomes can only increase in real value if the productivity of the workers of all categories in the country increases first." This statement is false. It is like saying that the energy available through a pipe one inch in diameter can be increased only by increasing the area of the lake supplying the pipe. Try it! Economics (and politics) are bedevilled by these false axioms. The electors have (by fraud and deceit) been sold the story that the objective of life is employment—'full employment'—not wealth in any form, merely a means, properly directed, of getting wealth. The whole export trade is a ramp—it is a way of voiding excessive production and of inflating the prices of what consumable goods are permitted to be produced, so that the carrot is kept at the right distance in front of the nose of the "worker."

Our whole economy is fraudulent, and so is the publicity which supports it.

It was Montesquieu who said long ago, "Finance supports the State as a rope supports the hanged man." Very well, if they don't hang Great Britain (pre-eminently Great Britain, because it once had a genuine culture) with a Common Market rope, they will hang it with some other rope—until men such as yourselves, doubtless well-intentioned, wake up and inspect the axioms upon which current agitation is based. When they begin to do this, something spectacular will happen, but not before . . .

### U.N.O.

(With permission from the Australian Broadcasting Commission, to whom we give thanks, we publish the following from their "Notes on the News" by Sir Raphael Cilento, broadcast from 4QR Brisbane on January 11th 1962).

Mr. Macmillan of the United Kingdom and Mr. Kennedy of the United States met recently in Bermuda, and at present there are meetings of Ministers in Washington to consider whether it is worth while continuing what I consider the present farcical situation of United Nations or, whether anything can be saved from the wreck that double-talk and double-dealing have made of a great ideal.

Someone once said that the trouble about Christianity was that it had failed and the reply was that it had not failed, that it had never really been tried. The same applies to the United Nations—it has not failed—there never has been any such body. The pathetic mess of intrigue and compromise that has gone from bad to worse at New York for 16 years, has never been an assembly, as specified, of *peace-loving countries*—just think for a moment of what countries it contains! Those of us who were among its first senior officers and close enough to the top to see its inner workings, realised with a shock, even in 1946, that the face held up to the world by propaganda was purely a mask and that the ideals on which it was founded were pious promises that disguised its real purpose. Its real purpose was not world union but world control, and in the contest for it the U.S.A. was locked in a struggle with the U.S.S.R. with no holds barred.

In 1943 and again in 1945 at the very outset—Stalin and Roosevelt found themselves agreed, *on one thing*—

Europe, and its whole economic and colonial system must go. Each of them considered he could out-wit and out-gamble the other. The United States began with every advantage but the Soviets played their cards with genius and have never lost a point.

They have successfully presented to the world, a picture of the United States as an overfed and selfish plutocracy with only two real gods: Mammon and Momma. They claim that the Mammon of greed makes everything subservient to the dollar, and the Momma-dominance makes America a paper tiger at any moment of decision that might end in war, and to every emergent so-called nation, this seems true—from Korea and Hungary to Laos and South Vietnam to the Congo and Indonesia.

The Americans who had, during my five years there, a majority of 46 to 7 in United Nations began to lose friends in proportion to their blatant control of the agenda. They sought new supporters. The Soviets vetoed each one. Then came the period of the so-called package deals, when several pro-Western new States were let in on the agreement that an equal number of pro-Soviet States were also admitted.

The position *now*, is that, with 104 members, the non-white members (tutored by the Soviets) *can* and *do* out-vote the West on any important issue. The real crisis came over Goa, in India and is continued by the situation regarding Indonesia and Katanga. Mr. Nehru's grab at Portuguese territory to take the minds of his opponents at home off the declining economy of India, was a gross violation of the Charter which says "*No member shall use force or the threat of force against the territory or independence of any State in any manner not consistent with the purposes of the United Nations.*"

But when referred to United Nations, a protest against this gross act was defeated and Lord Hume commented "A number of countries today have voted publicly and without shame in favour of the use of force to achieve a *national end*."

It seems to me that every so-called new nation, seeing the support given to Nehru's illegal act of violence, began to feel and act as though the time was ripe not to *rival* but to *rob* the western powers wherever they had the numbers and the weapons. So far as Indonesia is concerned, it was said that in the event of any fighting the United States 'would make motions of distress in the United Nations, but would not engage militarily in defence of the Dutch,' while the Indonesian Ambassador to Canada (L. N. Palar) added belligerently, that if any other nation intervened or if Indonesia attacked Dutch New Guinea and the campaign bogged down, they would probably call on the Soviet Union for help. He referred specifically to Australia.

Strangely enough this gives new significance to the establishment of the Australian Institute for Aboriginal Studies yesterday. In 1951 it was reported by the back-room boys that there was a move to attack Australian control of Eastern New Guinea through the United Nations by demanding an enquiry into Australia's treatment of its own aborigines.

It was anticipated that this would be refused on the ground that it was a domestic problem. This refusal, however, was to be used to attack Australia's Trusteeship of New Guinea on the ground that we were unfit to govern any other race, if we were unwilling to allow our neglect of our own aborigines, to be exposed. At the time, no one paid any attention to this seemingly remote threat. Today it is a very live one, or so it seems to me. The setting up of the Institute of Aboriginal Studies, therefore is long overdue, but better late than never. People will, however, wonder why it is set up at Canberra where there are *no* aborigines, just as there

are none in Tasmania, where the last one died in 1876, while Victoria and South Australia have very few indeed, and when the State that has done most and has perhaps greater experience in the problem than any other State—Queensland—is not represented on the board at all. Seclusion in an ivory tower at Canberra so easily becomes a habit, and so readily reduces reality to academic report status. But in the very lively days now dawning in our immediate north, academic reports will be far from enough to meet any challenge from a United Nations, controlled by non-whites activated by a sense of grievance, allied to an intoxicating sense of newly-found power.

### To Readers in North America

Additional copies of current numbers of *The Social Crediter* can be obtained from Mr. Roy Ashby, 6608 Capilano Crescent, Edmonton, Alberta, at ten cents a copy or one dollar a dozen copies post paid.

#### MORE ABOUT "THE SIGNIFICANCE OF C. P. SNOW"

(continued from Page 1).

Sir Charles regards Science as one culture, and "the Literary Culture" as another. Dr. Leavis reviews Snow's familiarity with what Snow calls either "literary culture" or "traditional culture"—an identification which Dr. Leavis points to as evidence that Sir Charles does not really grasp the meaning of culture. As a further example, he quotes Snow: "The traditional culture he tells us, with reference to the Industrial Revolution, 'didn't notice: or when it did notice, didn't like what it saw.'" Again quoting Sir Charles, "the scientific culture really is a culture, not only in an intellectual, but also in an anthropological sense," Dr. Leavis comments "The offered justification for that 'anthropological' is given, we find if we examine the context, in this sentence: 'Without thinking about it, they respond alike.'" And further on, Dr. Leavis quotes Sir Charles, speaking of scientists, as saying: "they have the future in their bones." This Dr. Leavis classifies as not being explainable as a meaningful proposition, "and in that sense it has no meaning."

This takes Dr. Leavis on to a discussion of cliché and the significance of its use, and he combines this with a subtle analysis of what modern 'culture' is.

Next follows Dr. Leavis's own critical analysis of what genuine culture is, and of the function of criticism in relation to it. "For those preoccupied with the problems Snow confronts us with, unintentionally, literature has its immediate and crucial relevance because of the kind of writer who asks, who lives in his art and makes *us* live." And he contrasts this conception with Snow's, saying: "Pressing on this ancient university his sense of the urgency of the effort to which we must give ourselves, he says: 'Yet' (in spite, that is, of the 'horror' which, he says, 'is hard to look at straight') 'yet they've proved that common men can show astonishing fortitude is chasing jam tomorrow. Jam today, and men aren't at their most exciting: jam tomorrow, and one often sees them at their noblest. The transformations have also proved something which only the scientific culture can take in its stride. Yet when we don't take it in our stride, it makes us look silly.'" On this, Dr. Leavis comments: "The callously

ugly insensitiveness of expression is wholly significant."

Having concluded his critical analysis of the Rede Lecture, Dr. Leavis proceeded in the last twenty minutes of his lecture with a critical review of contemporary culture and its products.

"I am not preaching that we should defy, or try to reverse, the accelerating movement of external civilisation (the phrase sufficiently explains itself, I hope) that is determined by advancing technology. Nor am I suggesting that Snow, in so far as he is advocating improvements in scientific education, is wrong (I suspect he isn't very original). What I am saying is that such a concern is not enough—disastrously not enough. Snow himself is proof of that, product as he is of the initial cultural consequences of the kind of rapid change he wants to see accelerated to the utmost and assimilating all the world, bringing (he is convinced), providing we are foresighted enough to perceive that no one now will long consent to be without abundant jam, salvation and lasting felicity to all mankind."

Dr. Leavis describes Snow's "social hope": "... the vision of our imminent tomorrow in today's America: the energy, the triumphant technology, the productivity, the high standard of living and the life-impoverishment—the human emptiness; emptiness and boredom craving alcohol—of one kind or another. Who will assert that the average member of a modern society is more fully human, or more alive than a Bushman, an Indian peasant, or a member of one of those poignantly surviving primitive peoples, with their marvellous art and skills and vital intelligence?"

Dr. Leavis's own statement of the contemporary social problem is: "... the advance of science and technology means a human future of change so rapid and of such kinds, of tests and challenges so unprecedented, of decisions and possible non-decisions so momentous and insidious in their consequences, that mankind—this is surely clear—will need to be in full intelligent possession of its full humanity (and 'possession' here means, not confident ownership of that which belongs to us—our property, but a basic living deference towards that to which, opening as it does into the unknown and itself unmeasurable, we know we belong). . . . What we need and shall continue to need not less, is something with the livingness of the deepest vital instinct; as intelligence, a power—rooted, strong in experience, and supremely human—of creative response to the new challenges of time; something that is alien to either of Snow's cultures."

There is the contemporary problem. Dr. Leavis sees it clearly, and his central criticism of Sir Charles is that the latter does not—more, that because of the stultifying effect of contemporary 'culture'—what Dr. Leavis calls the culture of the Sunday papers—, he is incapable of seeing it or of knowing of his incapacity to see it.

And Dr. Leavis states his own conviction: "... for the sake of our humanity—our humanness, for the sake of a human future—we must do, with intelligent resolution and with faith, all we can to maintain the full life in the present—and life is growth—of our transmitted culture . . . I am concerned to make (the university) really a university, something (that is) more than a collocation of specialist departments—to make it a centre of human consciousness: perception, knowledge, judgment and responsibility . . ."