

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 39. No. 15.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 1959.

Postage, 2d.

6d. Fortnightly.

Medical Politics

THE CANBERRA POST-GRADUATE COURSE ORATION, GIVEN IN APRIL, 1958, BY DR. BRYAN W. MONAHAN WAS PRIMARILY INTENDED FOR THE MEDICAL PROFESSION. HOWEVER, EXTENSIVE EXTRACTS ARE NOW MADE OF THOSE PORTIONS WHICH ARE OF MORE GENERAL INTEREST. THE ORATION WAS PUBLISHED BY THE MEDICAL POLICY ASSOCIATION, 18, HARLEY STREET, LONDON.

... When I was in England during the war, I became associated with a small number of doctors there who were very alarmed at the prospect of being socialised. We formed a small association called the Medical Policy Association, and under its auspices I was asked to speak to a number of meetings of doctors in various places. Now one of the first things I noticed at these meetings was a wide-spread dislike of the idea of associating medicine with "politics," by which was meant, of course, party-politics.

Party politics are, in my opinion, one of the most fiendish swindles ever perpetrated on mankind, and I think a little consideration of why this is so will lead us to a correct conception of what politics, including medical politics, are.

Why do groups of people form associations of various kinds? There is, I think, only one answer to that: it is because they believe that some particular purpose common to all those associating will be better served by working together than by working as individuals. It is, in fact, possible to achieve things by working in association that could not be achieved by separate individual efforts. There is a result over and above the sum of the individual efforts of those working in association, and this result we call "the unearned increment of association."

Sometimes there is a limited and finite purpose calling for associated effort—for example, the co-operation between surgeon, assistant, anaesthetist and theatre-staff in the performance of a surgical operation, or between the passengers in a number of cars in shifting a tree that has fallen across a road. In cases of this kind, there is an association, although it is neither formal nor named, and there is an objective, which is usually self-evident, and a benefit to the participants, which is the unearned increment.

In other cases, associations may have continuing and varying purposes. Our own British Medical Association is an example of the type. And here we come to the heart of politics. The choice made of purposes, or objectives, defines the policy of the association, and the choosing is politics. So medical politics consist in the choosing of an objective in relation to a given set of circumstances affecting members of the medical profession.

Here we come up against a problem which is really the root problem of politics in general, and that is that the greater the number of individuals involved, the more difficult it becomes to define a policy acceptable to all,

because the desires of individuals are not uniform and standardised. What we rather vaguely understand as democracy is an attempt at a solution of this difficulty. I think that the only conception of democracy which makes sense is that it is the choice of objectives which meet the desires of as large a majority of the members of an association as possible, without penalising minorities. If we accept this as a definition, we can see that it has nothing to do with the methods by which choices are made. Different methods are appropriate to various objectives, and to try to make one method cover all contingencies will defeat any true democracy. The essential notion to grasp is the relationship of democracy to policy.

Party politics capitalise disagreements about objectives, and enable interested outsiders to despoil both sides. The present fantastic rates of taxation are sanctioned by the envy of the less well-off. The B.M.A. would not last two years if its affairs were conducted on party-political lines. And I doubt if free society will last another two years if the same methods are continued.

The problem of politics is easier to solve when we realise that there are only two major policies in the world, the policy of freedom of the individual, and the policy of subordination of the individual to the group—the policy of servitude. Particular problems resolve themselves into special cases of those opposed policies, usually in the sense that the premises of a particular problem are, either openly, or more often implicitly, drawn from the objective of freedom or of servitude.

By "freedom" I mean the ability of the individual to choose or reject one thing at a time. In the light of this definition it is clear that in the purely biological sphere, for example, the individual is far from free. We must breathe; we must eat; we must sleep. Nevertheless, it is also clear that man, as compared with the animal and vegetable species generally, has emancipated himself to a higher degree than any other species from the domination of his activities by such fundamental necessities. From our present point of view, the important activity is feeding—or, to put it in a more general and useful form for our purpose, getting a living.

Now the major activity of the greater part of the animal and vegetable world consists in obtaining and consuming

(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 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: EUSton 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

Delivering the 16th Brancker Memorial Lecture to the Institute of Transport in London, Captain E. Rickenbacker, chairman of Eastern Airline, is reported (*The Times*, September 15, 1959) to have predicted that in fifty years space-ships would become commonplace. "The space-ships would have luxurious accommodation for 1,500 to 2,000 passengers, they would use atomic power, and would have practically unlimited range."

That this sort of forecast could be taken seriously enough to be reported suggests that mass hypnosis has effectively abolished the critical faculty. The "atomic" power required to accelerate a "luxury space-ship" would be the equivalent of an atomic bomb at take-off. The oxygen requirements of 2,000 people with the modest demands of luxury living amount to about 100,000 litres per hour, and a similar quantity of carbon dioxide must be disposed of. The acceleration to cruising speed requires special physical training and elaborate apparatus to enable humans to withstand it, while at cruising speed in a straight line there is no gravitation, so that normal locomotion is impossible.

In *The Transformations of Man** Lewis Mumford describes what Roderick Seidenberg calls "post-historic man." "Coming from fantasy to actual projects now under way, we find scientific ideation and technical skill of no mean order at the mercy of an infantile scheme of life, seeking extravagant supermechanisms of escape from the problems that mature men and mature society must face . . . But no one can pretend that existence on a space satellite or on the barren face of the moon would bear any resemblance to human life. . . ."

" . . . This is the final goal of post-historic man: the farthest reach of anything that could be called desire, the justification of his every sacrifice. His end is to turn himself into an artificial homunculus in a self-propelling capsule, travelling at maximum speed, and depressing to the point of extinction his natural gifts, above all, eliminating any spontaneous trace of spirit. . . ."

*George Allen and Unwin: 1957.

The extinction of Spirit. That is a purely Satanic objective, and to all appearances we are following it. We are in the grip of a Satanic policy; and as readers of this review (but, it seems, few others) are aware, proximate control of policy resides in finance.

Financial policy, of course, is the policy of financiers. It is not likely that the controlling financiers desire for themselves the fate Mr. Mumford predicts for mankind, and for which we are so plainly headed. Much more likely is it that they believe that they can go so far in the construction of a machine incorporating the greater part of mankind as to ensure their perpetual control, and then stabilise the process. If so, they overlook the law of momentum. If they do not give up their paranoid schemes of centralisation, catastrophe for them as well as for us is a mathematical certainty.

Related to the extraordinary credulity which permits the materialisation of fantasy is the decay of the University under the influence of "science." In a paper, *Modern Humanities in the Technological Age*, presented to the meeting of the Association of Heads of French Departments on 25th March, 1957, P. Mansell Jones, Professor Emeritus in the University of Manchester, notes that "the purpose of the modern University movement is being characteristically, though not yet exclusively, identified with the advancement of Science," while "the humanities are discredited and rejected. They are being attacked openly *de front*, while those who should defend them remain silent and inactive, and they are being undermined from within."

This may, of course, be regarded as a "trend" of the time. But again, we believe it is an outcome of policy. The inner ring of financiers can produce whatever "trend" suits their purposes, and the credulous technician—"scientist" which is increasingly the product of modern education evidently suits their purposes very well.

"In short, power and order, pushed to their final limit, lead to their self-destructive inversion; disorganisation, violence, mental aberration, subjective chaos. The tendency is already expressed in America through the motion picture, the television screen, and children's picture books. These forms of amusement are all increasingly committed to acts of cold-blooded brutality and physical violence: *pedagogical preparations for the practical use of homicide and genocide. . . .*"

—Lewis Mumford, *Op. cit.* Our emphasis.
 You have been warned—repeatedly.

"Liberty, Equality, Fraternity"

"The words of the Liberal, which are in effect the words of our masonic watch word, namely 'Liberty, Equality, Fraternity' will, when we come into our kingdom, be changed into an expression of idealism, namely 'The right of liberty, the duty of equality, the ideal of brotherhood.'"
 —Protocol 9 of *The Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion.*

MEDICAL POLITICS— (continued from page 1.)

food. From one point of view, progress in the evolutionary sense means cutting down the amount of time and effort spent in this activity. I do not want to enlarge on the biological aspects of this matter. What is important is that it shows the direction of evolution, which is towards freedom.

On the biological level, man shares with many species of animals—notably the carnivores—the ability to satisfy his nutritional requirements in a fraction of his available time. But in the case of man, organisation of effort through association has reduced this fraction still further. This fact is disguised because his aesthetic requirements have been more complicated; but this, in principle, is a matter of choice. If we would be satisfied with a simple life, the business of getting a living could be satisfied with a very small part of our available time; and in the case of highly industrialised communities, with a very insignificant part.

On the other hand, it is the personal experience of all of us that getting a living is very nearly a full-time occupation. Is this entirely because of the complexity of our requirements? I shall give a categorical answer to that question: it is, "No."

I said, or implied, earlier, that the policy of freedom was opposed by the policy of servitude, or compulsion. This is not merely an abstract consideration: it is the crux of politics. Put in concrete terms, the position is this; we in Australia could enjoy the standard of living we do in fact enjoy, working say not more than a quarter of the time we do at present work, and very probably less than that. But we are compelled to spend our potentially free time working. This affects us as doctors just as much as it affects labourers, and everyone else, and so is a problem of medical politics.

Where there is an over-riding compulsion of this sort, we are in the presence of a system of government, and, if we do not want to acquiesce in the compulsion, our task is to identify that government. What is it that compels us to spend what should be our free time working? The answer to this becomes obvious when we realise that we work for a living, and that in a community such as ours, the access to living is through money. Put succinctly, the conditions under which we can obtain money, which is virtually our only access to the necessities of life, are a system of government.

We cannot here go into the economics of this situation, important though they are. But to an audience of this kind, I think the truth and importance of a few broad observations should be apparent. The first is this: the value of useful effort is highly diluted by useless effort. By useless I mean that it does not enlarge the cake which has to be shared by the whole community. I think you would all agree, for example, that the greater part of the "work" done by the bureaucracy, so far from enlarging the cake, acts as a deterrent to the efforts of those who are making the cake. Similarly, virtually nothing but the rigid requirements of book-keeping for financial purposes employs enormous numbers of "workers" who produce nothing but marks on pieces of paper.

We had better assume, I think, that doctors play some essential part in making the cake; but as we all know, an increasing part of our work consists in treating conditions,

mostly mental, but physical as well, which arise from the stresses associated with getting a living. In relation to things as they could and ought to be, this represents wasteful effort, and is a source of stress for doctors.

Another diluent of useful effort is the over-production of capital equipment, and the production of goods for export in excess of imports. I shall not go into the former, which involves some rather technical arguments, but I assure you as one who has gone closely into the matter that there is much over-production; in the terms we have been using, we are making too many basins, beaters and ovens for the size of the cake we are making. As regards exports—we export a large slice of the cake in order to get money, not in order to enlarge the cake.

I hope what I have said gives you a broad picture of the nature of our economic activity, and if it does, you will see that it is, from our point of view, a largely senseless activity. But from the point of view of anyone who wishes to compel the individual into subordination to group activity, it is ideal.

By way of a return to medical politics, let us look at the mechanism of compulsion from another angle. There can be no doubt that under modern conditions, the activities of all but a chosen few are dominated by the necessity of obtaining money, and this is true of a higher proportion of the population than it was 150 years ago. Do not be confused by the fact, if it is a fact, that the standard of living of the majority is higher than it was then. It is my carefully considered opinion that the degree of independence is much less than it was 150, and even twenty years ago. The essential point to bear in mind is that whatever the standard of living, the degree of subordination of the individual to the system by which he obtains that living is increasing. And the mechanism of that subordination is very simple.

Despite the ever-increasing network of Government regulations, anyone who can obtain an independent income—that is, an income he does not have to earn—is comparatively, and to a large degree (providing he does not offend against regulations and laws) absolutely free. He can spend his time as he chooses. But the man who is dependent for his income on work is not free. In almost every case, his particular "standard of living" appears necessary to him, and he will be found to spend eight hours a day, or more, earning the money to obtain it. And that this is a state of affairs, deliberately conceived and brought about is proved, I believe, by the absolutely confiscatory nature of taxation under a Government of any Party, and by persistence in monetary inflation. The objective of this is to deprive everyone of "savings" of an amount sufficient to produce independence.

Whenever I go into a business centre, it always gives me the impression of a system designed to deprive everyone of his money as fast as he earns it. When I say "designed," I do not mean consciously designed; the design has grown from the purpose. But of the purpose there is no doubt. Shops exist from their own point of view to get money out of the public; the fact that they supply individual needs and wants merely enables them to get this money; and every effort is made artificially to stimulate wants and needs. The huge, wasteful apparatus of advert-

ising has no other purpose, and itself has to be paid for, again without enlarging the cake.

One final aspect of the policy of compulsion. Governments are *agents* of this policy, not, I think, by first intention, but because they accept and are dependent on the postulates of the financial system. Governments have to obtain money, and therefore they obey the rules governing access to money.

The conclusion, then, is that the real government of the world is in the hands of the controllers of the monetary system; that the policy of these controllers is to retain and make impregnable their government; and that the method is by keeping everyone in "full employment," and deprived of economic independence.

This is the background of medical politics. In common with everyone else, doctors face the problems of freedom or compulsion, and the particular problems of medical politics are nearly all special cases of that general problem. . . .

Medical politics, in my opinion, transcend in importance the mere interests of the profession. This, unfortunately, is less true now than it was in the immediate post-war period. I believe that a centrally controlled medical profession is an essential element of the so-called Welfare State, just as I believe that the Welfare State is the transitional stage to the Slave State. Had the profession in Britain successfully resisted central control and—very important—proclaimed its reasons for resistance, the Welfare State might not have materialised. There are other ways of providing Social Services than those in force in the Welfare State, and if the attempt to impose a plan on Society had failed, those other methods would have been applied sooner or later.

When I speak of a Slave State, I do not want to convey the picture of a gang of sweating natives controlled by a boss with the lash. Methods of control have been mechanised and automated since those days. A slave is someone with no control over his own destiny. What has changed in modern times is not the status of the slave, but the methods of control. The insertion of the wage system between what a man does to get his living, and what his living consists of, makes it possible to bamboozle him by all sorts of abstract considerations, which are the current abracadabra of so-called economics. A man's well-being is supposed to be measured not by the number of blades of corn he can raise in his own garden, but by the performance of the latest fancy bomber his country can produce.

Every single modern bomber costs hundreds of thousands of pounds. The aggregate expenditure on bombers and other means of 'defence' is astronomical. Now suppose that that amount of money were distributed amongst the members of the community, and that bombers, etc., were built on a subscription basis. It seems to me a self-evident truth that the armaments industry would perish almost instantaneously if it were supported on such a voluntary basis. The fact is that not one-tenth of one per cent. of the world's population wants war, particularly atomic war. But that a considerable proportion of the industrialised world's population is engaged in making the means of war is surely proof that the individuals involved do not control their own destiny. That is the modern form of slavery.

Australia is small fry. I regret to say that I foresee the success of the attempt to bring about a world Police

State, in which case, of course, the medical profession in Australia will do as it is told. But if this attempt is to be defeated, it will be defeated by the demonstration that security is possible with freedom, instead of, as in the Welfare State, at the cost of freedom. So that I think the medical profession, not only on the grounds of self-interest, should take a conscious and determined stand on the policy of freedom for doctors as individuals. The deadliest thing a free Society is up against is the continuous, insidious, subtle propaganda—brain-washing—to the effect that loss of freedom is inevitable because of the increasing complexity of modern living. It is a calculated lie. That propaganda seemingly makes it impossible for more and more people to grasp that the natural and proper result of labour-saving machinery is labour saved, and that labour saved should mean leisure and freedom.

About fifty years ago the world faced the imminent prospect of an absolutely unheard of Age of Leisure, prosperity, and individual freedom. Now it stands on the brink of a new, and quite probably permanent, Dark Age—the Age foreseen by George Orwell in his despairing book, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. If this is to be averted it will be by the determined exercise of such liberty as remains.

The Literary World and World Revolution

"The French Revolution did not arise merely out of conditions or ideas peculiar to the eighteenth century, nor the Bolshevik Revolution out of political and social conditions in Russia or the teaching of Karl Marx. Both these explosions were produced by forces which, making use of popular suffering and discontent, had long been gathering strength for an onslaught not only on Christianity, but on all social and moral order.

"It is of immense significance to notice with what resentment this point of view is met in certain quarters. When I first began to write on revolution a well-known London publisher said to me, 'Remember that if you take an anti-revolutionary line you will have the whole literary world against you.' This appeared to me extraordinary. Why should the literary world sympathise with a movement which from the French Revolution onwards has always been directed against literature, art, and science, and has openly proclaimed its aim to exalt the manual worker over the intelligentsia?"

—Nesta Webster in *Secret Societies and Subversive Movements*.

THE MONOPOLY OF CREDIT

by C. H. DOUGLAS

12/6 plus 1/6 postage

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.