"The Significance of C. P. Snow"

Journalists are essentially mercantilist. They purvey, buy and sell, deal in things they don't (and most invariably cannot and could not) make, for reasons quite unconnected with any consumer interest, unless it is the disposition to 'buy', to be 'sold' something. Ultimately, what they are 'selling' is, as with any other variety of salesman, themselves, not merely their labour. Short of infinity (the ultimate) there is a variety of subordinate 'products', each sacrosanct and jealously guarded in accordance with the ethos of mercantilism. Corporately, the 'press' tries to effect a 'corner' in opinion, in order first to adulterate it, to eviscerate it and then to sell it (at a profit to someone). Trespass on this field is resented, and, if possible, punished. "Control of credit and control of the news are concentric" and the centre is a monopoly, The Times Literary Supplement, the by-product of this immense organisation, is its political department par excellence. Not directly implicated in the Leavis dispute, it informs the "literary" men, who find it convenient to know more, if only a little more, than the people for whom they write, what they may safely say without incurring the displeasure of the Great Panjandrum. This service is political, not literary.

The barely concealed rage of several newspapers at what they deem to be the attempt of Dr. F. R. Leavis of Downing College, Cambridge, to cramp their style in the matter of the Richmond Lecture in the hall of the college on February 28 is fully intelligible in the light of the foregoing paragraph. Sympathetic vibrations may be already detected in (a) the broadcast interview with Professor Lancelot Hogben in the Welsh Home Service on March 12 and (b) in the "New Daily Herald" advertisement-interview with Sir C. P. Snow, published by The Times on March 13.

What is said to be the full text of Dr. Leavis's address was published by The Spectator on March 9,* and our publishers have a limited number of copies of that journal for sale at cost to enquirers.

*In amplification of what is said in the first paragraph above, we may report that The Spectator for March 16, on its front page, carries an impressionist panel in red ink (which for all we know, might represent "Rome Burning") and a reference by name to seven out of seventeen contributors of comments in the Snow-Leavis episode. We have heard the names of two only of these, those of Lord Boothby and Dame Edith Sitwell. All the seventeen are the "quick and copious" reaction pro-Snow. "It will be appreciated", says the journal, "that a great deal has had to be held over."

An "examination question" to Social Crediters: How should Dr. Leavis have acted to secure wider publicity for his views than the Downing College lecture afforded?

Liberty and Licence

The perversion of language continues apace, quickly enough to deceive the "very elect". The demands for "Peace" or "Justice" now make the most gullible smell a rat, but few are immune from the call for "Liberty" in the mouth of a dusky chieftain. What the chieftain wants is Power for himself, and, more dangerous still, his backers are well content that he should have the semblance of power while they snatch the substance.

A widely travelled lay reader, Mr. W. F. N. Churchill, writes as follows from Malaya: "A very few Malays and Europeans ruled, lawfully under the system obtaining, many Malays and a few Chinese, and not one of us worried that we were not 'elected'. We knew that 'democracy' was coming. Men of every race hoped that it would be inaugurated carefully and slowly. Many, many Malays wanted to be 'British forever'. Shocking these days, isn't it? Malcolm MacDonald was very rude to them!"

In his travels, after retiring from Malaya, Mr. Churchill, writes as follows from Malaya: "A very few Malays and Europeans ruled, lawfully under the system obtaining, many Malays and a few Chinese, and not one of us worried that we were not 'elected'. We knew that 'democracy' was coming. Men of every race hoped that it would be inaugurated carefully and slowly. Many, many Malays wanted to be 'British forever'. Shocking these days, isn't it? Malcolm MacDonald was very rude to them!"

"There were troubles apart from Communism—e.g. floods,—but the laughing faces of the hordes of children everywhere showed a very happy country. Christianity was rare. Muslim 'priests' were most friendly to Asians and Europeans and 100% with the Government, and brown and white soldiers and police—in fighting communists—enthusiastically so."

In his travels, after retiring from Malaya, Mr. Churchill is much disturbed about the attitude of many Christian clergy and bodies towards the spread of communism, and warns: "Watch the revolutionary anti-white Christians in Africa."

(continued on page 97)
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From Week to Week

The following paragraphs originally appeared in these pages in 1955.

What was the original objective of what are now known as the Social Credit proposals? It is stated quite explicitly in Douglas's first book on the subject, Economic Democracy: to provide the conditions in which each man might pursue freely his own self-development. And if Christianity is anything but "a set of interesting opinions," those are the conditions necessary for Christian development.

By the beginning of this century, the physical basis of this essential freedom had developed sufficiently to make its wide distribution practicable; and the evolution of the Anglo-Saxon character and institutions, in particular, had developed in a direction on the whole favourable to a fresh flowering of human personality. The 1914-18 war was a devastating blow, but even so, the Social Credit proposals of 1920 had every chance of effecting an orientation towards a better world.

It is most probable that the application of the original proposals now would make a bad situation fatal. Two generations since then have been systematically mentally poisoned by propaganda and experience. There is no doubt that the 'man-on-the-street' now has an entirely different mentality and outlook from the man who returned from the war in 1918. The attitude to property, to work, to responsibility, to morality and to Nature has changed completely and disastrously.

Now while it is true that a bad economic system is making things worse day by day, and that a system at least arithmetically correct is a prerequisite to recovery, the vital necessity for the Social Credit Movement is to ally itself with and fortify whatever cultural forces exist from which a restoration of a genuine culture may germinate, or else to be such a cultural force. Mere technics will not save us.

At the present time, any Government, even a 'Social Credit' one, would be simply the manager of a managed economy and not its director. What is necessary now cannot come from Government. Social Credit was designed for free Society but we have the Welfare State. And until men, and their institutions, disengage themselves from the Welfare State, of which, at present, they are increasingly mere functions, there cannot be Social Credit, or freedom.

We cannot (at least in our more charitable moments) make out why it is that Social Crediters so often act as though they believed that Douglas's not infrequent hints concerning manners and behaviour refer exclusively to our opponents, or (if commendatory) exclusively to Social Crediters. Take, for example, the very last paragraph of The Big Idea—

"And the root of the matter is—mind your own business, and allow no man to make a business of finding you. Listen, in reason, to what advice seems to be backed by proper experience and ability, and pay no attention to windy idealism. And then—mind your own business. It is in sore need of your attention."

Surely, if that is sound advice at all (as we believe), it is just as good advice to 'the other fellow' as it is to you, and to you as it is to 'the other fellow'? Perhaps, like many other things, it is easy enough in theory but difficult to practise. Douglas, by the bye, did not found the Social Credit Secretariat to mind other people's business but to mind its own. There were several negative indications, equally applicable, defining the nature of the business it was to mind. "We", he said—that is himself and the Secretariat (and the Secretariat's supporters)—"We are not Ishmaelites." (Who would believe it?) Again, "We are not reformists," and there were other definitions of what we are not. What are we?

That astonishing portent, M. Gustave Thibon, has a footnote to a short paragraph of his chapter, "Christianity and the Democratic Mystique" in his book Back to Reality, which is interesting in contrast to the moronic reactions of even the intelligent non-voter in this country whenever we call "A Light Horse" is mentioned. It is this:

"This corruption of the religious sense is the only explanation of institutions so absurd as universal suffrage, in its present abstract and inorganic form. We have been so used to the thing that we find it hard to measure its extravagance. It is obvious that political wisdom—quite as much as medicine, for instance, or philosophy—calls for personal qualities, long study and even longer experience; it is therefore accessible only to a tiny minority. Yet, unlike anything dreamed of for other branches of human knowledge, people act as though every man possessed it in perfection. My neighbour, a man of excellent sense, would be seriously offended if he were asked his opinion on the advantages of collapsing the lung in the treatment of advanced tuberculosis, but he takes it as a matter of course when electoral appeals consult him on the control of currencies or on whether alliance with the Soviet is opportune. How does this come about? How is it that the institution did not collapse at the outset under the weight of general ridicule? There is only one answer. Universal suffrage, however absurd it appears in principle and results
came to birth and remains in being because it corresponds to one of those secret necessities in the face of which logic is utterly powerless: it is the inevitable result of the religious sentiment degenerating into politics. It is in fact of the essence of religion that it can be taught by all and lived by all; every man is a priori ‘capable of God’, none is excluded from the divine banquet. But now that the State has absorbed God, none is excluded from the political banquet! The caricature of a reply to the universal appeal of God is the basic cause of the appearance and survival of universal suffrage.”

**LIBERTY AND LICENCE**

(continued from page 1)

who “never seem to notice terrorism and subversion.” He notes the arrival for the meeting in New Delhi of the World Council of Churches of a large delegation of the Russian Orthodox Church, which body had recently demanded the end of the ‘criminal colonial system’.

The fallacy underlying the weakness and disloyalty of office holders and religious bodies is evidently to mistake noise for numbers. They utterly disregard the large number of moderates and bow to the wishes—or self-seeking—of a few extremists. Lord Beaverbrook, writing in the *Sunday Express* (February 11, 1962) against the Common Market, said: “We will fight, but if we lose this struggle against folly and wickedness, then our last hope is that Canada may be willing to take up the leadership of the Empire that the British Government is determined to abdicate.”

In the general desire to avoid constructive thinking, people accept labels without criticism, whether these are ‘Left’ and ‘Right’, or ‘White’ and ‘Black’, and if ‘Whites’ are cast as the villains of the piece, then everything ‘White’ must be villainous and everything ‘Black’ must be heroic. And many church leaders evidently are displaying indecent haste to jump on the ‘Left-Black’ bandwagon.

However, Peter Simple writes in the *Daily Telegraph* (February 13, 1962) suggesting that this headlong progress may have its set-backs. He says, “African politicians are losing their innocence very rapidly, far too rapidly for Left-wing doctrinaires. Delegates to the Kenya constitutional conference, having tumbled to the fact that not all oppressors have white skins, oppose the centralization of the country under Mr. Kenyatta. For this they are peevishly dismissed by the commentators of the Left as ‘stooges’.”

The column is headed, “Definitions”, and the writer defines “stooge” as, “in progressive nomenclature, a politician who puts the interests of his own people first.” There is evidently little fear of many British politicians earning this title. In fact, as a title for the ruins of a once orderly and promising heritage, “Murder Pays Dividends” might well be found suitable.

—H.S.

**Common Market and Common Law**

In a letter to *The Times* (February 15, 1962), Sir Henry Slessor, a former Lord Justice of Appeal, points out a consequence of the proposed Federation of Europe (to include Great Britain) which appeared to have received little public consideration. He refers to the great difference there has always been between the system of Jurisprudence prevailing on the Continent, which is founded upon the Byzantine Roman Law, and the customary Common Law of England (a distinction less clear, admittedly, in Scotland). He instances several attempts in the past to influence English Law by assumptions deriving from the Civilians, but says, “they were always countered by the native instinct: *Nolumus Leges Angliae mutare.*”

**Automation**

In its issue of January 30, 1962, *The Times* published a report from its Washington Correspondent on a study of the effect of computers and automation undertaken by the Centre for the Study of Democratic Institutions. Mr. Donald Mitchell at the Centre’s request, has recorded the findings in *Cybernation: The Silent Conquest.* The word Cybernation is derived from Cybernetics, relating to processes of communication and control in men and machines.

*The Times* correspondent says that the study concludes that the widespread use of computers and automation “may create vast unemployment and social unrest, which could seriously weaken the foundations of free society and lead to new Luddite wars. The danger that Government may become ‘computerised’, and its policies and decisions more difficult for the public to understand, is also foreseen.”

The correspondent’s message is illuminating concerning the state of awareness in the U.S.A. While cybernation is regarded as inevitable, it is foreseen that unemployment will be widespread among the managerial class, the service industries and the manufacturing industries. It may also occur widely among untrained adolescents, with almost inevitable delinquency, contributing to further social disruption.

The correspondent says, “No one has seriously proposed what the unemployed in the service industries can be retained to do, to say nothing of training them for jobs that would pay them high enough wages to make them good consumers of the cornucopia of products manufactured by automation. Shorter hours will clearly not solve the problem when the task is eliminated or new tasks need different talents.” Talking of a ‘solution’, while public works programmes are regarded as an obvious solution, the report believes they would not be conducive to maintaining the spirit of a capitalistic economy. “Leisure will also be a problem. Boredom might lead many to take part in radical organisations, while family adjustments for those working thirty-two or fewer hours a week will be added to already inadequate, ambiguous and frustrating personal relationships that typify much of the middle-class family life.”

The government’s increasing use of computers, it is said, will inevitably lead to public ignorance of major issues. “The
idea of the individual may be completely swallowed up in statistics. The planner and those he plans for may become divorced."

The correspondent states that the report includes a section on the possible control of cybernation—"a moratorium is ruled out, and it is suggested that a new set of goals and methods for the country's educational system could be developed. If we do not find the answers to these questions soon we will have a population in the next ten or twenty years more and more out of touch with national and international realities, ever more the victims of insecurity on the one hand and ennui on the other."

The report continues, "If the new standards are inadequate, frustration may evoke a war of desperation ostensibly against some external enemy, but in fact to make the world safe for human beings by destroying most of society's sophisticated technological face."

To readers of The Social Crediter and of C. H. Douglas's works, the subject matter of the above report will be familiar—"Unemployment", "Leisure", "Automation", "Educational System". Douglas penetrated to the very root of such matters and placed them in their proper perspective—as, for example, in The Tragedy of Human Effort.

---

The Credit Squeeze

When import controls were relaxed last year, it was known beforehand that there would be a flood of goods entering Australia and the extra payments required would deplete Australia's overseas reserves. Arrangements were made with those in control of the International Monetary Fund in Washington for a dollar loan. Attached to this loan were two conditions; there was to be no re-imposition of import restrictions and no lifting of the credit squeeze until June of this year.

There has been much official hedging about this extraordinary agreement which virtually handed over the government of this country to a coterie in Washington. There can be no denying the fact that if the Federal Government had had any power to remove the very unpopular and disastrous financial restrictions they would have done so long before the elections in December.

Whether the financial squeeze and the lifting of import restrictions were necessary or not is not here under discussion. What is objected to is the sudden withdrawal of the means of payment from thousands of small businesses, and the withdrawal of the means of existence from over a hundred thousand families without any warning. People are entitled to at least six months' or a year's warning of any such drastic change in their mode of life. When you consider the futile criticism of various commentators you begin to wonder if they knew the following facts which were published in the Australian Press last year.

"The Australian Government has promised Washington to hold Australian credit tight until June 30, 1962."

"This was revealed in the House of Representatives yesterday by the Treasurer (Mr. Holt) following questions by Opposition members early this week about the £A78,125,000 and standby credit of £A45 million released by the International Monetary Fund, Washington.

"Tabling the documents submitted to the International Monetary Fund, Mr. Holt showed that the Secretary to the Treasury (Sir Ronald Wilson) had given an assurance that: 'The Australian monetary authorities intend to keep a firm control over seasonal needs apart, the liquidity position of the banks to limit during the year ending June 1962, the amount of bank advances consistent with financial stability.'

"Australian monetary authorities do not intend to take any action to lower the general level of interest rates. It remains part of the overall responsibility of Australian monetary authorities to discourage, so far as lies within their power any excessive flow of funds into financial institutions other than banks,"

"The Australian Government reaffirmed its intention not to reimpose restrictions on trade except in the event of a very serious balance of payments emergency necessitating a major shift in policy."

---

Books to Read

By C. H. Douglas:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Democracy</th>
<th>These books may be obtained on loan from the Librarian, 67 Glanmore Rd., Slough Bucks.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Power and Democracy</td>
<td>&quot;Whose Service is Perfect Freedom&quot; ................. 5/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warning Democracy</td>
<td>The Brief for the Prosecution ................. 8/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Credit</td>
<td>The Monopoly of Credit ................. 12/6 (Postage 8d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Big Idea ................. 2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Programme for the Third World War ................. 2/-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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