

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 9.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 21, 1957.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage: At home 2d., abroad 1d.

6d. Weekly

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.

(I)

A Bulletin just issued by the Medical Policy Association, London, a body doubtless referred to by *The Times* when it complained of 'irresponsible pamphleteering' (*The Times* is responsible to 'the Right Hands,' in which it more and more uncomfortably and irascibly reposes) connects the present movement in and out of Parliament for 100 per cent. enforcement of 'health' on the insurable public (*i.e.*, in intention, all of it) and 'service' on the doctors, with the institution of civil sick parades on 'service' lines and consequent loss of property rights in instruments, premises, *etc.*, *etc.*, by doctors. Thus the 'professional revolution' is to complete the industrial revolution; the doctor is to take his place beside the weaver as a factory hand, and the 'product' becomes a machine-made mass product, in which the 'machinery' is part by-product of 'big' chemicals and part bureaucracy. The criticism is quite sound, like most other things coming from a remarkable body, whose success, up to the present, has been phenomenal, and specially interesting to readers of this paper because it confirms the technique employed as being the only one available to deal with the prevailing situation. So much is demonstrated even in the absence of a final victory over the planners, who, although shaken, believe themselves to have 'the situation well in hand.'

When last the money power voiced a like confidence in its resources (during the inter-war depression), it was right. There was at that time no world-wide body of informed and equipped opinion deriving its inspiration and knowledge from Douglas. The M.P.A. is, however, not a body of Social Crediters: it is merely a body of doctors equipped with a correct technique in social dynamics. Dangers confront it, and the larger and more powerful its agency becomes, the more complex and difficult these dangers may become, not from anything inherent in the situation, excepting the natural fact that quality and quantity usually coexist in accordance with an inverse rule of proportion. The lines of attack upon the freedom-loving doctors can be foreseen to some extent, and should be provided for.

The more obvious need not be mentioned; they are well-known gambits. The less obvious derive their usefulness from the fact that the opposition to a free order of society habitually charge the circumstances they have themselves created to the account of the injured party.

The Beveridge idea is characterised by complete detachment from reality in that it only brings the individual in in order to subordinate him to an abstraction. This detachment from reality is nowhere clearer than in Sir William Beveridge's attitude to the commodity (or whatever it is: he does not know what it is, and quite possibly he does not care) 'purveyed' by doctors: to him it's just so much 'health' as measured by insurance company standards.

If anyone should ask me for my opinion concerning the present position of medical education, practice and research, I should say, with, I hope, a due sense of responsibility, that, in my opinion, and generally, excepting a few particulars affecting the practice of surgery, in which a very high level of skill attained fairly recently is already showing signs of waning, the art and practice of medicine had rarely, in its long history, been at a lower ebb than at present. When you are really in trouble and want the services of a doctor in any other capacity than that of an exceptionally highly-skilled and successful carpenter and joiner of human tissues, it is very hard to find one to suit your purpose. That an attempt is afoot to make it still harder is also my opinion. I need not pursue the topic: it has, I am sure, some aspects which are important beyond estimation for Social Credit, and others the public exhibition of which is merely an invitation to blind prejudice. The point is that there is something here which can definitely be labelled 'wrong,' and that something is the notion that medical knowledge and skill are things which increase automatically, go on increasing, and constitute, at any given moment, a fixed and certain quantity which only awaits the issue of a government white paper, or some other piece of paper by another office boy in 'authority' to secure the 'right' quantity of 'health' to every member of the community. This notion is false, and everything built upon this foundation is false too. If the sound elements of the medical profession should win their victory over P.E.P. and the British Medical Association (and Mr. Brown* if he is with them) they will go far to remove this false foundation, not for themselves alone, but for their patients—*i.e.*, at one time or another the entire community.

Now it is true too, in my estimation, that this under-

(continued on page 4.)

* For footnote see 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.

Perversion

(Repeated from our issue of September 22, 1945)

The cleavage between the policy advocated in these pages, and that of the Planners (leaving all questions of motive apart) is that which separates the organic from the mechanistic, and it is curious and significant that the real argument centres round perversion.

No one in his senses would suggest that Waterloo Bridge should have been built without planning. No one in his senses would suggest that the doubtless well-meaning planning of the Forestry Commission, which seems to derive its inspiration from the coiffure *en brosse* of a German shopkeeper, is really an improvement on the Caledonian Forest.

It may be purely co-incidental, but side by side with the exploits of the Forestry Commission, the lovely, hardy, and durable British Pine is dying out, together with the high-grown larch. The latter, if properly seasoned, was a valuable and durable timber. The low-ground larch, which grows quickly and is beloved of the Planners, is hardly worth the trouble of planking.

The point we have in mind is simple, but formidable. Planning, in the sense that the word is used by the Socialists and their inspirers and supporters, the International Finance Ring, is not a life process, it is a death process, a petrification. It postulates finality and omniscience. It assumes that the mysterious cosmic process, of which we know less than nothing, can be arrested with advantage, not merely by humanity, but by humanity at this passing moment. A plan which is changed from day to day is not a plan at all, it is a process, and has to be lived, not bureaucratised.

We have little doubt that the admonitions "Take no thought for tomorrow," "Sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof" and many others of a like nature meant just this. To interfere in an organic process without even recognising that it exists, can only have one outcome.

FOOTNOTE TO "MODERN SCIENCE" (vide page 1)

* A British Cabinet Minister of 1943. If Mr. Brown is still alive to complain of the transience of fame in the political field, he may take comfort from the fact that one objective of present policies is to abolish fame as it has been understood for many centuries. If the present craze for the 'restoration' of famous paintings is pleaded as contradiction, it should be borne in mind that it has also been advanced against the practice that paintings die a natural death if left alone, and should be allowed to do so. The 'great estates' should be broken up. Potential in the individual's hands should be drained.

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.

• • •

It must now be evident generally, as we have been doing our best to proclaim for twenty-five years, that it is absurd to challenge the logic of modern politics and economics, which are irrefragable. It is the so-called "axioms" which demand examination. In what time may remain to us, we propose, at intervals, and as objectively as possible to examine these "axioms."

Fifty years ago, a Conservative Member of Parliament replying to a criticism made at a private dinner-party, said, "Well, you know, politics is a dirty business, always has been a dirty business, and always will be a dirty business."

We have here, a *fact*, which is stated as an *axiom*.

Fifty years ago, politics were far cleaner than they are to-day—probably at their cleanest. The explanation of this is simple—they were less professional. The average Member of Parliament was a man of private means and diverse interests. It was not a matter of life and death to him to retain his seat, and there were limits beyond which he was not prepared to go to retain it. The Member just quoted was of this type, yet he did retain his seat, and he admitted that he was employed in a dirty business. If he had troubled to justify himself, he would no doubt have said, "Politics is the art of the possible."

It is not necessary to look very far for an explanation of the *fact*. It is stated with admirable clarity in the *Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion*, and is of course, the basis of Machiavellianism. The real reason that the *Protocols* have roused such furious denunciation is precisely this—that they explain the divergence between public and private honesty. Protocol I, XI reads: "The political has nothing in common with the moral. The ruler who is governed by the moral is not a skilled politician, and is therefore unstable on his throne. He who wishes to rule must have recourse both to cunning and to make-believe. Great national [*sic*] qualities, like frankness and honesty, are vices in politics . . ." Compare "Full Employment," "Public Ownership," "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," "*Liberté, Egalité, Fraternité*," etc.

At this point, we are clearly confronted with a difficulty. Have moral qualities any real existence and justification, or as the Socialists contend, are they merely a trick to make the mob easier to control? Socialist politics, while only a few steps further on the road, are obviously not hampered by any doubts on this point—they are completely a-moral. Their objective is the supremacy of the bureaucrat so long as he obeys orders. Nothing else.

Fortunately, we are not thrown back upon authoritarianism for an answer to this vital question—it can be obtained from one of the most thoroughgoing exponents of the empirical technique—Gustave le Bon. *A mob has no morality; an individual depends for his individuality on his morality.* Lying and corruption disintegrate a man. No society can survive a-moral leadership.

In consequence, a Collectivist Government is inevitably the most corrupt form and must lead to a tyranny unredeemed by any virtues.

(Sept. 15, 1945.)

“Axioms” of Society. No. 2 “Trades Unions are necessary and desirable, and are an indication of a progressive community.” (Trades-Unions, in the British sense have been abolished in Russia, the Socialist paradise.)

Perhaps few subjects are so little understood by the general public, and even by trades-unionists themselves, as trades-unionism. Its activities may be classified as (1) Intimidation of non-Trades-Unionists. (2) The exaction of tribute. In America that amounts to sheer blackmail accompanied by threats and violence, both to employers and employed. (3) The provision of a rapidly increasing number of well-paid bureaucratic offices. (4) The restriction of output to bolster up a large labour-force and maintain political power. (5) The transfer of the independent status of the craftsman to the Trades-Unions. (6) The raising of the commodity-price of labour at the expense of the public. (7) The robbery of private property, jointly with the Financial-International Cartels, and its transfer to the Trades-Unions. The first steps in this final item are forecast in the present Government programme.

A Trades Union is simply a labour monopoly, and is subject to the same over-riding criticism as any other monopoly, the object of which is to obtain absolute power over the thing monopolised. “All power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely.” It is arguable—it is by no means axiomatic—that the early craft-unions were beneficial.

Like so many other aspects of the machine-age, this argument is almost always taken out of its context, two features of which are the progress of the industrial arts and the structure of the price system, which simply means that increases of wages must go into prices, and so are paid by the consumer, who is in many cases also the Trades-Unionist. It is probable that a fixed money wage, accompanied by a continuous fall in the price level, would have benefitted the wage-earner far more than the collective wage-rate increases exacted by trades-unions. The naive idea that wage increases have come out of the employers' profits, while it is still used for propaganda purposes, is not seriously believed by the Trades-Union official. The argument of the industrialist that falling prices mean trade

stagnation is of course childish, and is only justified by the existence of the monopoly of credit.

The whole of the activities of the Trades Unions are now a dead loss to the community in the same way that the Beveridge Scheme involved the collection of larger sums in premiums than could be distributed in benefits, because, *inter alia*, of administration expenses. But, of course, the political situation created by the conspiracy between the Labour Cartel and the International Financial and Industrial Cartels is the primary menace to civilisation.

As must be the case with monopolies, which are essentially egalitarian, trades unionism tends to stifle initiative, encourage stagnation, and to substitute political action for competitive improvement.

The domination of the British Constitution by Labour, if it existed, would be pure, genuine Fascism-Government-by function. Labour is no more, and no less, than a function, and has no more, and no less, claim to consideration than any other function, such as sleep. But of course Socialism merely uses “Labour” to obtain a Parliamentary franchise for an over-riding monopoly—if it were feasible to capitalise sleep for this purpose, it would serve even better.

One of the first practical necessities of the situation is to disrupt and disintegrate Trades-Unionism in its monopolistic form. The really Satanic forces behind politics at the present time realised years ago that a great war was their last chance to force sufficient people into factories to enable them to create a false identity between “Labour” and the general population; force this population into the Trades-Unions even temporarily, so as to give time to pass legislation to keep them there permanently, and to sweep away any other class but the proletariat.

The idea that the Trades-Union Congress shall take over, and pass on to a vicious type of secretly-controlled organisation modelled on the “B.”B.C. and the London Passenger Transport Board, all the transport of the country—an organisation against which the individual or even the House of Commons would have no redress whatever, is so fundamentally tyrannical that it must be assumed that every evil force is behind the Trades-Unions in the proposals it is making. Such a measure would be, as quite possibly it is intended to be a preliminary step to the disappearance, as a separate entity, of the British people. It is part of the policy so obligingly disclosed by Dr. Toynbee of the “Royal” Institute of International Affairs, founded by the Financial Experts who wrecked the Treaty of Versailles; “We are working secretly, but with all our might, to undermine the sovereignty of our respective nations.” “Chatham House” will attend to the business of divesting the nation of sovereignty while Socialism divests the individual of freedom. Transport House and Imperial Chemical Industries-I. I. G. Farben-Dupont-Canadian Industries, Ltd., are all one happy family.

(Sept. 22, 1945.)

“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.)

lying error of conception does not concern medicine alone but the whole of what is termed 'science' in our time. Not merely to disengage a contentious topic from an embarrassing connection, therefore, but to secure a wider application, I propose to deal in a brief series of articles with the existing *organisation* of 'science,' and to record, in a setting in which something practical may come of them, observations by competent observers which have not reached, and are not likely to reach, the general public primarily concerned through any other channel.

(II)

The Scotsman on October 18, 1943, began its leading article by saying that Great Britain suffered her scientific research to undergo a marked decline in the years between the wars. The reason was not lack of 'capable and competent men of science.' We provided 'scant incentive,' perhaps because of 'a period of stagnation,' or because we were 'traditionally parsimonious towards men of science,' or for 'certain psychological or sociological reasons.' A Report had called for 'reinvigoration' of our scientific and technological institutions by the grant of substantial funds. Other newspapers, doubtless inspired by the same 'report' have taken up the theme. G. M. Young, in the *Sunday Times* of October 24, 1943, asks whether, if the function of a university is to 'gather the springs of ability into a pool' there is 'an unlimited, untapped, supply waiting to be released and set to profitable use.' What is the volume of capacity behind the 'springs'? Mr. Young doubts the sufficiency of the spring, and calls for rationing along familiar lines. He calls the customers A, E and I, 'leaving O for Outcasts, and U for the Unfit.' A stands for the 'Administrators, who say what should be done; E the Executants, who run about and see that it is done; and I the Industrialists, who do it.' We gather that the function of universities is, in Mr. Young's opinion to produce A's. The professions, industries, branches of commerce, *etc., etc.* would 'indent' for them through the Government Grants Committee. I need not pause to say of this notion what Social Crediters can say much less dispassionately for themselves. If the world has gone mad that does not necessarily mean that dangerous lunatics have ceased to be dangerous. I am familiar with the notion that university men should say what should be done (except in universities). I think the answer to Mr. Young (with acknowledgements to him for his ingenious terminology) is I.O.U.

The handling of questions of social organisation in public journals is now swinging so far from any sense of realism that I am beginning not to take it seriously. Missiles flung so far and so fast as our marksmen's concern another planet, not ours, and we need not bother ourselves about them. Yet it is apparent that clothed in the language of absurdity is an intention: not an intention, perhaps, to mean something; but an intention to do something. And it is also apparent that those who cherish this intention have not the slightest understanding of the things they are dealing with. Are science and education of any importance at all? The more persuaded I become that the things which pass for these are not of much consequence, the more convinced I become

that *something else* is important, and that some, possibly an extensive understanding of it is essential to the future conduct of society, and that it (or they) will ensure, and to some extent constitute the future conduct of society. For a considerable time, science has seemed to me to be the most empty of abstractions, and so-called 'modern' science nothing more than a character in a work of pure fiction—"all the characters in this book are fictitious and," *etc., etc.*—I asked a not very young scientist lately if he could mention any theory of 'science' which, in his opinion, was established beyond dispute. He answered readily. "Oh, yes, many." He did not keep his word. Something of which there was never very much in quantity, yet something which was immense in quality, seems to have passed from our world; yet not altogether. When one thinks of it, one thinks of *men*, not of things, and not of functions. Here are the words of one: "Years ago I discovered that it was not possible nowadays for me to obtain a hearing in scientific journals, being drowned in the avalanche of voluminous research." Another: "We are both alike convinced that if civilisation is to survive, education must be rescued from the clutches of research." Larmor held the Lucasian Professorship (Isaac Newton's chair) at Cambridge for nearly thirty years. He died last year. The sentences were in letters from him to D'Arcy Thompson at St. Andrew's. Whose are 'the clutches of research'? Here is still another quotation: this time from *The Social Crediter*, and a more pregnant paragraph has not appeared there:—

"It is clear that the Scientific Method on which the nineteenth century placed a reliance which is now seen to be a little pathetic, is itself subject to the Law of Diminishing Returns. The great discoveries which lend themselves to the operational test of validity, the steam engine, the galvanic battery, the dynamo, the Siemens-Martin and Bessemer steel processes, were the work of a mere handful of investigators. For each of these, working with crude apparatus and little or no financial backing, there are millions turned out by the Universities and technical schools of every country having at their disposal every device that ingenuity can suggest or money can buy. The outcome, apart from logical development and refinement of the main basic discoveries, is a mass of abstract theories most of which are discarded a few years after they are announced as epoch-making. Probably, of all the mass of 'applied science' products with which the world has been deluged in the last thirty years, stainless steel cutlery, vacuum cleaners, and very doubtfully, wireless broadcasting, alone have much more than gadget value.†

"Of course, this does not mean that the Scientific Method is not a beautiful instrument in the right hands. Far from it. It merely means that bad workmen do bad work with any tools, and in addition, spoil good tools."

These words are 'science.'

(To be continued)

† The 'clean' bomb (*vide* Eisenhower) does seem an out-size in gadgets; but this does not invalidate the criticism recorded, which is fundamentally one of policies.