The Survival of the Unfittest by Unnatural Selection
by JAMES GUTHRIE

When men speak of evolution, "the march of events," "the trend in world affairs," or say, "You can't stop progress," they are referring to the relentless onward march of some impersonal force, some gigantic machine, which they have been taught to believe cannot be stopped, altered or criticised.

There is magic in such words as Evolution and Progress which endows them with a mystical power which can be evoked as a kind of balm, or tranquilizer, to quieten the fears and suspicions of men as they stand helplessly by, watching the rapid destruction of familiar land marks.

If people are induced to believe that progress is inevitable, and that evolution is always towards higher levels, then any change, however disastrous it may appear at the present time, can, under the name of this magic formula, be made acceptable (like a surgical operation) as being probably good in the long run, and any person who doubts this official view is looked upon as a "reactionary," "unscientific," and as possessing a "vested interest." It is very obvious that the words Progress and Evolution can be and are being used by those in control of governments to justify and cover up the ruthless elimination of any minority, institution or nation.

The reason why I am writing about progress at all is because I strongly believe that the Industrial Revolution placed into the hands of large sections of the population the possibility of very real and epoch-making progress, as opposed to the pseudo "progress" which is being foisted on a regimented population.

I believe that real progress, in terms of human satisfaction, human freedom and human dignity, is being deliberately held up, and a spurious "progress" of gadgetry, novelty and sensation is being foisted on a public specially educated to swallow it whole.

Progress in the industrial arts appears to be automatic—that is if you ignore the flash of genius which illuminates a new world and gives birth to each new development. This progress is easily noticed and approved, especially if it is accompanied by an increase in the standard of living.

People believe that the spectacular results achieved in the industrial arts will be duplicated in other spheres of activity. This belief is justified if it is based on the assumption that the vast amount of time, energy and ingenuity invested in labour-saving machinery should pay a dividend in the form of some release from unnecessary and regimented drudgery, and should give men time to look after their own affairs and develop their own personalities.

The reason why so little has been achieved in human satisfaction from what men call Progress is because the industrial giant, from which most of the benefits were to be received, is heavily chained to something called Policy.

In modern society no large scale operation can take place without the use of money. "Money is the starting point of every action which requires either the co-operation of the community or the use of its assets."

The money power which controls the issues of credit has a policy which is made known to the public as "Full Employment."

Full Employment means that our civilisation is being deliberately turned into an ant-heap, where every man and his family is compelled to leave home each day and punch a clock in some place of employment. The fact is that a great deal of the alleged work is unnecessary, especially in the larger organisations; a great deal of it is merely making useless labour for other people, and to speak of the "dignity of labour" about much of this work would be facetious.

Full Employment is only being tolerated because it is the only means known to the public for obtaining the necessary money to buy the goods already in existence. When employment stops, the money flowing into the community in the form of wages stops, so that in an age where an increasing amount of work is done by machines men can only be kept in employment by sabotage on a large scale. "The simplest form of this process is that of 'making work'; the elaboration of every action in life so as to involve the maximum quantity and the minimum efficiency in human effort."*

The best known method of forcing people to leave their homes each day and take part in uncongenial and unprofitable labour is to keep them poor, keep them continuously in debt, that is continuously behind in their payments. The banking system, by creating debts faster than it issues the means of liquidating the debts, can keep the people and their governments permanently in debt. This means the people are robbed of their legitimate reserves. Without reserves a man is robbed of initiative, and the power to make decisions; he is not a free man, no matter how well he is housed and fed.

Manufacturers come under the same limitations, and are compelled to limit their activities so as to fit into a financial system which has not been altered in essential details since the days of handcraft industries, when overhead charges for machinery were negligible.

From Week to Week

-American Mercury (March, 1959) quotes an editorial from Indianapolis Star (date not stated), which in turn quotes the Wall St. Journal (again date not stated), as follows:

“Now we reluctantly go to the summit. Things being as they are, it is probably a better course. But plainly it is a chastening reminder that ‘what we do next’ must be tempered, if not shaped, by foreign offices of other nations.

“The fact is that, whatever it may be, we are no longer masters of our own foreign policy!”

We do not share the surprise of the Indianapolis Star at this passage. Just such directives appeared in The Times and The Economist as a prelude to the dismemberment of the British Empire. Signs are not wanting that the U.S.A. has served its turn as the leading world power, and is now billed to disappear as such.

National Socialist Germany was clearly, if belatedly, recognised as a military menace rather than as an ideological one, and military preparations—inadequate, it is true—were made to meet the threat. There were a few outright traitors in Great Britain in Germany’s employ, and a few dupes in her “ideology.”

But to hundreds of thousands in every country, Russia symbolises a “system”—“scientific socialism”—and to adhere to this is merely a sign of freedom of thought. This fact has been exploited to the full by the Communist conspiracy, so that people who in the case of Germany would have been shot or imprisoned as traitors carry on their espionage and subversion unhindered.

It becomes more and more apparent that all this is leading to a fatal shift in the balance of power: then, for the first time in history, there will be a monopoly of armed power to enforce every other Monopoly. Then it will be safe for the Monopolists to expose themselves.

In The U.S.A. Today

As the Soviet war of nerves steps up in the Berlin corridor, foreign emissaries in Washington’s diplomatic quarter lift their hands in surprise at what they dub the “near blackout” of news and comment, in the American press, on a historic development across the Atlantic. These diplomats find it difficult to understand why America, which twice went to war in Europe because of the age-old conflict of Germany and France, now virtually ignores the new rapprochement between the Fifth French Republic, under General De Gaulle, and the West German Republic, under Chancellor Adenauer—in the face of Soviet threats of aggression on Berlin.

Yet, the American press—so remark these diplomats—devotes reams of speculation to whether the new Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator Fulbright, will pressure Secretary Dulles to compromise on the Berlin situation. The papers here devote little space to the firm attitude of Bonn and Paris, instead stressing the power of a favoured Senator who strikes an appeasement note.

—-Human Events, February 11, 1959.

Legal lightning flashed in Chicago last week, as the American Bar Association went on record with an unprecedented rebuke to the leftward-plunging U.S. Supreme Court.

After a brief tug-of-war over the wording of the report, the A.B.A. convention adopted a full-scale blast against 24 decisions of the Supreme Court concerning the internal Communist threat. The report said: “Many cases have been decided in such a manner as to encourage an increase in Communist activity in the United States through the invalidation of state sedition statutes and limitation of state and Federal investigating powers in the field of sub-version, although these cases might readily have been disposed of without so broadly limiting national and state security efforts. The dissenting opinions of certain Supreme Court justices have been crystal clear in charting the effect of the failure of the majority to recognise the underground forces that are at work and to appreciate how these decisions affect our internal security.”

—-Human Events, March 4, 1959.

The Leadership Principle

The pagan milk—to use some of Miles Hyatt’s words—on which we are suckled throughout our life of education may be defined as the “Leadership Principle.” It is of the very Devil, for it includes what was the greatest temptation of Christ, the offer of power to remould things.

In actual fact the Leadership Principle, constitutes a moral and intellectual slavery of mankind to a few, probably well-intentioned but nevertheless self-satisfied individuals.

We think it was Sir Patrick Hastings who said that every great leader had been a curse to the human race.

A movement should be led, not by any leader, but only by its principles.
Hindsight Or Foresight (continued)

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when Secretary of State Bainbridge Colby said on August 10, 1920:

"The existing regime in Russia is based upon the negation of every principle of honor and good faith... The responsible leaders of the regime have frequently and openly boasted that they are willing to sign agreements and undertakings with foreign powers while not having the slightest intention of observing such undertakings or carrying out such agreements... Upon numerous occasions the responsible spokesmen of this power, and its official agencies, have declared that it is their understanding that the very existence of Bolshevism in Russia, the maintenance of their own rule, depends, and must continue to depend, upon the occurrence of revolutions in all other great civilized nations, including the United States, which will overthrow and destroy their governments and set up Bolshevist rule in their stead. They have made it quite plain that they intend to use every means, including, of course, diplomatic agencies, to promote such revolutionary movements in other countries... We cannot recognise, hold official relations with, or give friendly reception to the agents of a government which is determined and bound to conspire against our institutions; whose diplomats will be the agitators of dangerous revolt; whose spokesmen say that they sign agreements with no intention of keeping them."

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when Secretary of State Charles Evans Hughes stated on March 21, 1923:

"We are just as anxious in this Department and in every branch of the administration as you can possibly be, to promote peace in the world, to get rid of hatred, to have a spirit of mutual understanding, but the world we desire is a world not threatened with the destructive propaganda of the Soviet authorities, and one in which there will be good faith and the recognition of obligations and a sound basis of international intercourse."

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when Robert F. Kelley, Chief of the Division of Eastern European Affairs in the Department of State, wrote in a memorandum dated July 27, 1933:

"The fundamental obstacle in the way of the establishment of Russia of the relations usual between nations in diplomatic intercourse is the world revolutionary aims and practices of the rulers of that country. It is obvious that, so long as the Communist regime continues to carry on in other countries activities designed to bring about ultimately the overthrow of the government and institutions of these countries, the establishment of genuine friendly relations between Russia and those countries is out of the question."

It was not hindsight, it was foresight when United States Ambassador to Moscow, Laurence Steinhardt reported, on June 17, 1941:

"My observation of the psychology of the individuals who are conducting Soviet foreign policy has long since convinced me that they do not and cannot be induced to respond to the customary amenities, that it is not possible to create 'international good will' with them, that they will always sacrifice the future in favor of an immediate gain, and that they are not affected by ethical or moral considerations nor guided by the relationships which are customary between individuals of culture and breeding. Their psychology recognises only firmness, power and force, and reflects primitive instincts and reactions entirely devoid of the restraints of civilization. I am of the opinion that they must be dealt with on this basis and on this basis alone."

Former President Herbert Hoover predicted on June 29, 1941:

"The gargantuan jest of all history would be if we should give aid to Stalin in the war... The result would be to spread communism over the world."

IV

Current Fallacies about Communism

So much misinformation is current about Communism that it is appropriate to expose some of the major fallacies.

1. "Communism in the United States is dwindling in power because the party is dwindling in numbers." This popular belief shows a complete misunderstanding of Leninism. Lenin's great contribution to communism was his principle of the dedicated few. He coined the expression "the fewer, the better." He originated the party of professional revolutionaries subject to military discipline. He rejected the idea of a popular party and enunciated the principle that no one should be given party membership unless he was under discipline. This is how Lenin was able to establish communism with only seventeen supporters and to take over Russia with only forty thousand.

It is just as false to measure the strength of Communism in the United States by comparing the small number of party members with the large number of non-Communists, as it would be to measure the seaworthiness of a ship by comparing the area of its holes with the area of its hull. A few strategically placed holes can sink the largest ship.

The real strength of Communism in the United States is the number of non-Communist organisations and individuals who will collaborate with the Communists. For every Communist Party member, there may be one hundred non-Communists who will do the work of the Communists.

The Communists now have six hundred fronts. In addition they have "fronts in front of the fronts." Making use of their fellow travellers and dupes, plus their "united front tactic," the Communists boast they can have fifty
Kremlin remembers that in 1941 the Germans were well-

The Kremlin remembers that Communism came to power
only because the Czar, and then the Kerensky government,
insisted on forcing the people to fight a foreign war. The
Kremlin remembers that in 1941 the Germans were wel-
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