

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 19.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1958.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

Modern Science

By TUDOR JONES, Sc.D., M.D., F.R.S.E.

A REVISION OF THIS ESSAY, ORIGINALLY PUBLISHED IN THESE PAGES IN THE LATTER PART OF 1943 AND EARLY 1944, HAS FOUND NO MAJOR ALTERATIONS NECESSARY. DR. JONES HAS, HOWEVER, ADDED A NUMBER OF FOOTNOTES AND A POSTSCRIPT.

(XXI)

However wayward and fitful these paragraphs may appear, there was nothing desultory about the *policies* behind the movements they are intended to describe. Sombart, the historian of Socialism, has somewhere indicated his belief that there are two, and only two, motive forces in history: love and power. The trouble about such words is that every sane person knows what they mean—and from infirmity of faith proceeds to argue that they mean something else. There is no need to quote Juliet,

I have forgot why I did call thee back.

to remind ourselves of all we have ever known about the one, nor Lady Macbeth to know all about the other. What this had to do with Sombart's theme I can't imagine, and I have not his book beside me to find out. I cannot argue about *kinds* of love, or *kinds* of power; because they are, to me, like earth and sky, and whatever winds may blow, the earth is always the earth, and whatever mists obscure its face, the sky is the sky. My dictionary says that passion is the 'state of the soul when receiving an impression' which is, for me, a different and an opposite thing from the state of the soul in forcing an impression to be made on something else, or somebody else. In Society we both make and receive impressions, and most of the difficulties arise from the failure of our determination, collectively, to see that a just relationship is established between the giving and receiving. The just price for making impressions is personal responsibility. It is this price which has got to be *paid*. Nature does not seem to have a fixed price for our receiving, and the perception (not altogether dim) of this fact of universal experience, enshrined in the New Testament, is more than the oriental mind can stand. The difference is the difference between Shakespeare and the Song of Solomon. There is something sinister about the conspiracy (and that is what it seems to me) to label the 'dark' ages dark, and keep 'em dark!

The threads which dragged Europe from the so-called 'dark' ages were threads of power, not of love. The 'modern' struggle began with the crucifixion, if not before. It has got thoroughly into its stride with Frederick II, "first of the moderns." On both sides the forces are mixed. The belief that this vast struggle is now coming to an issue, together with the conviction that its inconclusive or unsatisfactory settlement would be catastrophic in the most comprehensive sense, is more and more widely entertained.

The history of the universities is the story of this struggle at the top, and (for the present) the monstrous deformity called 'modern science' is the outcome—but there are others. The progressive decay of a healthy human instinct in every sphere in which instinct operates—and what is instinct but policy with unconsciousness of the roots of policy?—is perhaps one other and a most terrifying. The university is the totalitarian answer to the college and the library and the monastery and the school. There is all the difference in the world between a gathering together of *men*, of their own will and intention, which is what 'collegium' means, and a collection of books, which is what a library is, and a school, which is a place of instruction, and a university. Like fascism, the word university went from Italy, where it meant a trade guild, to Germany where the idea expanded to that of the whole corporate city, which was as near as they could get in the twelfth century to the corporate state. What it *is*, however mixed with other ingredients, is an attempt to establish a monopoly of the intelligence, or a monarchy of intellect. Being composed, necessarily, of men of ideas, the centralisation of ideas, though feasible *sub rosa*, was not its long suit. It centralised *reputation*. We see one result in our "reputable" economists. Their peculiarities are not special: they are merely thrown into relief by current events.

I picture what happened in England (this fortunate isle) as the collision between the headstrong waters of the east and the earlier and kindlier wave reflected from the west. Rashdall's editors, "with omissions," devote twelve and a half pages of academic altercation to an appendix on *The Migration from Paris*, and, with the author of their text, apparently succeed in mentioning everything, without however, disclosing anything. Historians seemingly do not understand that they are *political* experts or nothing; although it has to be conceded that they may be most expert when their art most conceals their art; *i.e.* when, as among freemasons, their politics (their policy) is to have no politics (policy).

You can measure a bar of iron with a foot rule; but you cannot measure the amount of iron in an ore with a foot rule. And so you cannot assess which side a combatant is on without first knowing what sides there are for him to be on, and what characterises those sides. You

(Continued on page 3.)

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 Development of World Dominion

During the period of the Socialist Administration in Great Britain, following the end of World War II, *The Social Crediter* analysed the activities of that administration in our progress to disaster; and emphasised over and over that a change of administration would not mean a change of policy. The Constitutional issue, philosophy, politics, economics and strategy were examined in the notes under the heading "From Week to Week." Written or inspired by the late C. H. Douglas, these notes are a permanent and invaluable addition to our understanding of the policies of opposed philosophies, and we propose to re-publish a considerable selection of them, both for their relevance to a situation which has developed but not otherwise altered under a 'new' Administration, and for the benefit of new readers of this journal to whom otherwise they are not readily available.

The date of original publication is given in brackets after each item.

There can be no doubt that the subject of Finance is, in many senses, guarded by Black Magic. Intrinsically, nothing could be simpler. You bake a loaf of bread; you give someone a white pebble; next day the white pebble is offered to you, and you accept it in exchange for the loaf, and everyone is happy. A more complex system is demanded by a more complex economy, but the fundamental principle that money ought to be simply an accounting demand system never changes, but is never observed.

After years of controversy, the A + B theorem, which indicated the necessity for a national dividend in some or several forms, was grudgingly admitted. But, said the cavillers, it is a matter of little importance; hardly worth attention. That a price-drop of 2 per cent. over the whole range of consumable goods is a national dividend of 2 per cent. on a capital of about twenty thousand million pounds is just something they cannot grasp.

Either "the progress of the industrial arts" is a colossal delusion: or the present price level is a colossal fraud. Anyone who cannot see that there is no other alternative has not even learnt the elements of financial dynamics.

The Plymouth Brethren (we think it was) used to have a saying that any religion short of absolute conversion was like unto filthy rags. It has been proved to demonstration in the last few years that anything short of a comprehensive grasp of financial dynamics is far more dangerous than

complete ignorance. Witness the deadly nonsense regarding the "sole right of the State to issue Money."

The *Times-Herald* (Washington, D.C.), in its leading article of November 30, exhibits that sense of financial reality which appears to have deserted the London press. Its technical arguments are far from flawless; but it does state quite clearly that "fiat money," the American term for a managed currency, is worse, far worse, than what was correctly termed "a fraudulent standard" i.e., one which claimed to pay gold currency on demand.

What seems so difficult to get into the heads of all these centralisers, conscious or unconscious, is that when a nineteenth century Englishman had ten golden sovereigns in his pocket, he was a tiny centre of credit. The fraud was not in the gold currency; it was in the stealthy setting up of a second, but much more extensive, credit system which filched the credit by raising the price-level. The virtue was not in the gold currency either; it was in the ability of the ordinary man to break the bank.

The whole conception of a managed currency is both fundamentally dishonest and pragmatically deceptive. The late Lord Keynes rendered some service to the cause of so-called monetary science more particularly in his earlier writings; but this service was more than cancelled by his lip-service to a conception with which he cannot have been in intellectual agreement. (December 31, 1949.)

It is a curious, and we believe a not accidental development of modern publicity that if you can quote someone else as saying something, the statement will carry more weight than if you make it yourself. In spite of the profoundly true remark that "what the soldier said isn't evidence," a mass of "documentation" makes an impression out of all proportion to the intrinsic value of the sources quoted.

Nevertheless, we may pay attention, for many reasons, to the connection between the steady, unrelenting attack on the prestige and credit (they are interconnected) of the British Empire, and the conclusion of a speech by J. J. Hill, the Wall Street railway buccaneer, at Chicago on October 7, 1908:

"Search history and see what has been the fate of every nation that abused its credit. It is the same, only more awful in its magnitude and its consequences, as that of the spendthrift individual. And it will profit us nothing to conserve what we have remaining of the great national resources that were the dower of this continent, unless we preserve the national credit as more precious than them all. When it shall be exhausted, the heart of the nation will cease to beat."

It is perhaps unnecessary to say that Mr. Hill's ideas on the use and preservation of credit are not ours. But his recognition of its significance at that date is informative.

(August 21, 1948.)

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"

by

C. H. Douglas.

5/- Post Free.

K.R.P. Publications, Ltd., 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.

MODERN SCIENCE— (continued from page 1).

cannot measure a policy without first having yourself a clear notion of a policy.

"Up to 1167-70," according to Rashdall, "there were many schools which were as famous as we have reason for supposing Oxford to have been. None of these developed into a *studium generale*; Oxford did so, and that with startling rapidity." Again, "The suddenness of the transition suggests a cause operating somewhat [*sic*] suddenly." What was it that was sudden in the twelfth century? For one thing, the incursion of 'modern science': "the art of seeking, without ever finding the truth," according to an Abbot of Clairvaux quoted by Lingard,* who used the phrase to describe the system of the disciples of Arabian masters, the 'modern scientists' of all time.

It is so readily taken for granted that the epidemic of 'learning' spread largely by Jewish agents in the West while the gentry of western Europe were busy contracting the vices of the East was something inherently superior to the indigenous brand that it may be well to preserve a sense of perspective even here. "Thus we learn from Athelheard, that if he had studied among the Moors the causes of earthquakes, eclipses, and tides, he had also been employed in investigating the reasons why plants cannot be produced in fire, why the nose is made to hang over the mouth, why horns are not generated on the human forehead, whether the stars are animals, whether in that hypothesis they have any appetite, with many other questions equally singular and important." (Footnote concerning Athelheard's *Quæstiones naturales perdifficiles*, Lingard, p. 58.) I have already remarked that one of the essentials of a poisoned well is that it should contain water; but anyone who takes in his hand a glass of that water, with the intention of drinking from it had better concern himself with the poison rather than with the water. The historians are for ever busy telling us about the arrangement of the molecules of the water, and when, to show off their erudition, they discourse of the poison it is invariably in terms of embellishment. Thus Rashdall distributes his colouring matter, which leaves the story tuppence coloured the same as the penny plain. With the introduction of "the art of ever seeking without finding the truth" were laid the foundations of an 'order' which is the complete and final V-for-Victory of death over life: not Life Everlasting and More Abundant, but life permanently subject to a thwarting principle: to a process of Crucifixion: organism constantly being replaced by mechanism. *Bella et seditiones ubique fervent; Mercuriales adeo depressi sunt ut Francia, omnium mitissima et civilissima nationum alienigenas scholares abergerit*—"Everywhere war and sedition rage: the Mercuriales [?] are so depressed that France, of all nations the mildest and most civilised, has expelled the alien scholars." This was in 1167, and it is certain that for many years before and for many years afterwards Europe was split from top to bottom. There were even two Popes, Alexander III, who "found it prudent to quit Italy," and Victor IV. "The emperor Frederick supported with all his influence the cause of his creature Victor" (Lingard). Other things are just as certain. Not by any means last, I should be inclined to mention systematised substitution of words in the place of ideas: "multiplied and unmeaning

distinctions bewildered the understanding" (Lingard).

Ignorance? Widespread "educational destitution?" Oh, no! We need not go to the "Romance" tales for news of national cultures. They are merely evidence, in a corrupt idiom, of something corruptible upon which their 'culture' supervened. It is not alone Gerald the Welshman, born ?1147, "the father of comparative philology"; "one of the most learned men of a learned age"; and "the universal scholar" (Freedman's *Norman Conquest*), who testifies to the literacy of the "savages" of twelfth century Wales. Defending the thesis that Oxford had a university earlier than the 'migration,' Mr. A. F. Leach quotes a constitution of Henry II expelling Welshmen from *schools* in England, which, says Leach, could not have been English grammar schools "because they had plenty at home." They must have been Oxford University. Every encroachment of the centralisers, every perversion which they effect, is painted as a marvellous invention, 'brand new,' bringing undreamed-of blessings to a world "destitute" hitherto. Beveridge and Butler and Woolton are heralds of the modern brew. St. Patrick "commenced his labours in the year 432, and after a life of indefatigable exertion, died at an advanced age in 472. His disciples appear to have inherited the spirit of their teacher; churches and monasteries were successively founded; and every species of learning known at the time was assiduously cultivated. It was the peculiar happiness of these ecclesiastics to escape the visits of the barbarians, who in the fifth and sixth centuries depopulated and dismembered the Western empire. When science was almost extinguished on the continent, it still emitted a faint light from the remote shores of Erin; strangers from Britain, Gaul and Germany, resorted to the Irish schools; and Irish missionaries established monasteries and imparted instruction on the banks of the Danube and amid the snows of the Apennines. During this period, and under such masters, the natives were gradually reclaimed from the ignorance and pursuits of savage life; but their civilisation was retarded by the opposite influence of their national institutions; it was finally arrested by the invasions of the Northmen. . . . The national institutions to which I have just alluded as hostile to the progress of civilisation, were tanistry and gavelkind* . . ."

Then, if not a 'sudden' dawn of enlightenment what was the incursion into Oxford? And (to repeat a pertinent, yet unanswered question of Rashdall's) why Oxford? Oxford, it seems, had been, if not razed to the ground by Stephen in the autumn of 1142, at least set on fire. What was there at Oxford? "To its position . . . must be ascribed the rapid increase in the commercial importance of Oxford after the final cessation of Danish devastations and especially after the beginning of the twelfth century. Its early selection by Jews as a business centre marks this development." (I have seen neither Neubauer's essay on the Jews in Oxford (O.H.S.) nor Friedman's *Robert Grosseteste and the Jews*.) It seems, therefore, certain that the Jews were there *first*. The Dominicans "made their appearance in 1221, soon after their first landing in England" and "established themselves in the heart of Oxford on the east side

* The passage is from Lingard's *History*. The institutions cited are of particular interest at the present moment, since they embodied principles of inheritance and land tenure inimical to the establishment of a continuously prosperous order in Lingard's opinion, for reasons which he details.

* Lingard: *History of England*, 1849, Vol. II, p. 58.

of the street called the Jewry. Though the conversion of the Jews was a prominent part of their work, they early connected themselves with the university by opening a school in which theology was taught by a 'converted' doctor [Jewish?] of divinity, Robert Bacon." (Rashdall.) But Oxford University never would have much to do with the orders of the Church. It cold-shouldered the Franciscans. So we can even prove that the traditional technique of playing both ends against the middle was a possibility; and pass on to the two ends! One was, of course, the familiar. In 1240, Bishop Grosseteste instituted a system of loans to students without interest, "no doubt a wise and useful form of charity at a time when the Jews were the only money-lenders, and when it was necessary to prevent the Jews of Oxford from charging over forty-three per cent. as annual interest on loans to scholars." (Rashdall.) In 1244 we see both ends in play: then "the first important extension of the chancellor's jurisdiction took place." A raid was made upon the Jewry; forty-five scholars were imprisoned, and Grosseteste had difficulty in producing their surrender. The Jews, as the King's chattels, were exempt from the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts; and it is curious that the jurisdiction of the chancellor was, for the first time, exactly defined in 1290, the year of the expulsion of the Jews from England! When this happened, the Jewish Synagogue in Oxford "with other adjoining buildings," was bought by the Archdeacon of Wells and turned into a hall for students—Burnell's Inn. It came into the possession of Balliol College in 1307.

The fuel for the fire of centralisation was unquestionably supplied by the Jews in the first instance. In the first years of the reign of Edward I there were "very serious disturbances." The habit once implanted, persisted. Characteristically, there were two answers: Centralisation and Decentralisation. It is important to recognise that of eleven Oxford Colleges, only three, and of six monastic institutions only three, and all of these barely, came into existence before the Expulsion. But "over a great part of Europe university teaching was more or less superseded by college teaching before *the close* of the mediaeval period." (Rashdall: my italics.)

It was not the 'great architypal universities' of Rashdall's imagining that introduced a plan to gather all studies under *protection*, impartially, to synthesise them. Centralisation and protection are not the same thing: they are antagonistic principles, embodying antagonistic policies. Why must we be ridden by the notion that, having once allowed an enemy to plant a upas tree in our garden, everything is possible; but what is *not* possible is to pull the tree out with its roots and burn it? If this notion is right, then the most extreme conservatism ever envisaged is completely justified, and we should on no account depart by a hairsbreadth from the most rigid observance of each and every established practice, in the hope that each bringing forth fruit according to its kind, the fruit of things living will live and there will be an end to all else.

With great respect, I think that Newman (whose family name was Neumann) erred when, in contrasting science with poetry,—science whose mission it is "to destroy ignorance, doubt, surmise, suspense, illusions, fears, deceptions, according to the '*Felix qui potuit rerum cognoscere causas*' of the Poet"—he wrote of the poetical frame of mind that

it "demands, as its primary condition, that we should not put ourselves above the objects in which it [the poetical] resides, but at their feet; that we should feel them to be above and beyond us, that we should look up to them, and that, instead of fancying that we can comprehend them, we should take for granted that we are surrounded and comprehended by them ourselves. It implies that . . . at best we are only forming conjectures about them, not conclusions. . . . Poetry does not address the reason, but the imagination and affections; it leads to admiration, enthusiasm, devotion, love. . . . Hence it is that a child's mind is so full of poetry, because he knows so little; and an old man of the world so devoid of poetry, because his experience of facts is so wide. . . . I think that this is, in the main, right as well as magniloquent; but what I question is, that it correctly defines an antithesis or diagnoses a point of antagonism. Newman himself quotes a string of witnesses to the practical genius of the Benedictines: "The monks were much the best husbandmen, and the only gardeners." "None ever improved their lands and possessions more than the monks." "We owe the agricultural restoration of great part of Europe to the monks." In the procession of the seasons of the personality, which is seed time and which harvest? Policy is engendered in solitude; power in society.

(To be continued.)

Macdonough's Song

Whether the State can loose and bind
In Heaven as well as on Earth:
If it be wiser to kill mankind
Before or after birth—
These are matters of high concern
Where State-kept schoolmen are;
But Holy State (we have lived to learn)
Endeth in Holy War.

• • •

Whatsoever, for any cause,
Seeketh to take or give,
Power above or beyond the Laws,
Suffer it not to live!
Holy State or Holy King—
Or Holy People's Will—
Have no truck with the senseless thing.
Order the guns and kill!

—Rudyard Kipling (1912)

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution	8/6
"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"	5/-
Social Credit	3/6
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of The Church of England.....	8d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	8d.

From 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.