

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 36. No. 20.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 25, 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.

(XXII)

As these articles began with the predicament of Medicine under the impact of the results of centralised hypnotic political influences, however more particularly we might express them, so they may suitably end with the same ancient profession.

Hippocrates, according to tradition, was born in the Aegean island of Cos about 460 B.C. An oath attributed to him has persisted continuously, at first in a pagan form, later in a Christian and truncated form and, since 1868, in a form more consistent with the modern legalistic aspiration to complete the subjection of the individual to the universal Rule of Law, a declaration under the Promissory Oaths Act, which conveniently rid the lawyers of *Deum Omnipotentem!* Oaths are to God.

Inconsistent with the determination of insurance companies to cash in on what race-course terminology would scarcely elevate to the rank of even a *third* party risk, the old Oath, in any form, has fallen into disuse in England; but not yet, I believe, in Scotland, where, nevertheless, it is rather boggy ground on which to take a stand. Loyalty to it would wipe out at a single stroke every state service, much of current practice, professional and political, and the "British" Medical Association altogether. The old form is as follows, the single omission being a surgical passage stated by Dr. Arthur Brock to be probably an interpolation:—

I swear by Apollo, the Healer and by Aesculapius, by Hygeia and Panacea, and by all the gods and goddesses, making them my witnesses that I will fulfil according to my power and judgment this oath and this covenant. I will look upon him who taught me this art as I do on my own parents [the profession of Medicine was not a closed profession, nor initiation into it separative], and will share with him my livelihood. If he be in need, I will give him money. [He was to have more money than was enough for his own needs: the profession was self-supporting.] I will hold his offspring as my own brethren, and will teach them this art, if they wish to learn it [not if the 'State' wishes them to learn it,] without fee or written bond. I will give instruction by precept and by lecture and by every other mode to my sons, to the sons of him who taught me, and to those pupils who have taken the covenant and sworn the physicians' oath [but this is the

oath and covenant], and to none other besides. According to my power and judgment, I will prescribe regimen in order to benefit the sick, and not to do them injury or wrong [cp. political regimen of the British Medical Association, et al.]. I will neither give on demand any deadly drug, nor prompt to any such course, nor, similarly, will I give a destructive pessary to a woman. In holiness and righteousness I will pass my life and practise my art. . . . Into whatever houses I enter, my entrance shall be for the benefit of the sick [not of the State], and shall be void of all intentional injustice or wrongdoing, especially of carnal knowledge of woman or man, bond or free. And whatsoever, either in my practice or apart from it in daily life, I see or hear which should not be spoken of outside, thereon will I keep silence, judging such silence sacred. If then I fulfil this oath and do not violate it, may I enjoy my life and art and be held in honour among all men for ever; but if I transgress and prove false to my oath, then may the contrary befall me.

When the Houses of Parliament listen to variations on the theme of the high traditions of the medical profession, these are the high traditions.

The current oath, omitting the *Testor Deum omnipotentem* of its Christian parent, is:—"I do solemnly and sincerely declare that . . . I will exercise the several parts of my profession, to the best of my knowledge and abilities, for the good, safety, and welfare of all persons committing themselves, or committed [an innovation] to my care and direction [another innovation]; and that I will not knowingly or intentionally do anything or administer anything to them to their hurt or prejudice, for any consideration, or from any motive whatsoever. And I further declare, that I will keep silence as to anything I have seen or heard while visiting the sick which it would be improper to divulge."

The last open battle was concerning this conflict between the interest of the patient and the State. There was a different limitation to the oath of secrecy in the original.

Each of these declarations enshrines a notion of policy from which modern science has entirely departed. It is simply untrue that the University of Oxford has no policy, or that any other institution has no policy. That modern men of science do not know where they are going may be

(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.

From Week to Week

Through the courtesy of the Secretary of the Anti-Debt League Information Office, of Liverpool, we learn that a pro-British Jordanian Arab translated into Arabic a copy of an analysis of the world situation at the time of the Suez crisis, prepared by the Social Credit Secretariat and circulated amongst Social Crediters affiliated with the Secretariat. We understand that copies of the translation are being circulated throughout Jordan and into Saudi Arabia.

It seems evident that since the British Cabinet caved in before the threats of the New York-Moscow axis, the powers behind the scenes have decided that their plans can be brought to finality "under the threat of war." Under cover of the Great Deterrent, the world is rapidly being organised into a slave-factory to produce unlimited exports into nearer space. Social Crediters have always believed that the sheer impossibility of finding unlimited export markets would put a final barrier to the lunacy of our economic system. But clearly the Devil is looking after his own. It does not appear in the least accidental that "Russia" put out the first satellite, nor that "America" fumbled. It provides the perfect opportunity to turn universal "education" into universal technical training. We are within a generation of slaves who do not know what slavery is.

The "Capitalist" Spirit

"Professor Wernher Sombart was led to investigate the origin of the 'Capitalist' spirit, and in course of analysing Max Weber's theory of the relationship between Puritanism and the development of Capitalism, came to the conclusion that all the elements of Puritanism which really contributed to the growth of the Capitalist spirit were drawn from the Jewish religion. With the realism of the modern German savant, Sombart lays down the principle that the man of business can have no other object than the making of profit." [Money profit—Editor.] "System, expediency, and calculation are his three guides. These fundamental postulates of Capitalism are to be found in the Jewish religion. The relationship of the Jew to Jehovah is not a filial or a loving relationship. Judaism, in its essence, contains no trace of belief in Divine grace, and no mysticism, properly so called. The intercourse of Jews with their Deity is sober, mechanical, and business like; all their acts are believed to be entered in a celestial ledger, the good deeds on the credit, the bad deeds on the debit side. Even interest is reckoned. The Old Testament scarcely

mentions other reward for righteousness or punishment for unrighteousness, than the gain or loss of temporal goods. . . The body of economico-political doctrine known as 'Liberalism' [capital initial] was largely built up by Jewish, crypto-Jewish, or pro-Jewish writers . . . and to-day (1913) half the Socialist Party in the German Reichstag is composed of Jews."

—*The Hapsburg Monarchy*, Wickham Steed, p. 151 et seq.

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.

• • •

That the antagonism between Judaism and Social Credit is fundamental and religious could hardly be better expressed than it is in the following quotation from a review of Wernher Sombart by Dr. Jacob Fromer, in *Die Zukunft* for October 28, 1911, p. 113:—

"Nothing in the Jewish religion is done for nothing; everything has its reason and object. This original trait of cool-headed piety runs from the Patriarchs by way of Mosaism and Talmudism uninterrupted down to the present day. There are no essential differences between the service of Abraham to Jehovah and the religiosity of the pious men who predominate in the Ghetto. Both are based on a *do ut des* system, and are diametrically opposed to the Christian Doctrine of unearned grace."

Now graft a national dividend, or the theory of unearned increment, on that stem. (May 26, 1945.)

• • •

Most of us, because we have been conditioned to think that way, have a natural reluctance to accept "occultism" as a considerable force in world affairs. There could hardly be a greater error—it is the primary adversary of Christian civilisation. The forces of which it disposes are probably amoral; but the intention of those most evidently in possession of them is Satanic. The Jewish Cabala is one of its main roots. (March 13, 1948.)

• • •

In uttering "a note of warning" to the Planners, by which the context indicates that the more or less honest dupes of the Plotters are indicated, Sir Frank Mears shows the first signs of awareness in public life of the technical

fallacy involved in "Large Scale Planning" (we use the phrase beloved of Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and P.E.P.).

Premising once again that the fundamental object of Planning is Monopoly, a political not a technical aim, we must recognise that the second-rate technocrat is easily persuaded that exactly the opposite is the case. Very few technicians in these days have the opportunity to gain a wide outlook (in the golden days of the development of the Empire, the specialist was not nearly so prevalent), and the man or woman who "succeeds" in the current world has reasonable excuse for believing that the talents he daily applies to "planning" a collar stud, a tablecloth, or a valve-gear, are so indispensable to a satisfactory outcome of "social engineering" that only a half-wit could think otherwise.

The fallacy is diabolically subtle, but it is absolute, and perhaps the quickest way to grasp this truth is to realise that a Plan is the graveyard of an Idea. Everything begins in the imagination, *not in reason*; and when the rational processes legitimately begin, creative processes, in the real sense, cease. "Large Scale Planning" assumes that we have come to the end of the story.

Much the same principle is exemplified in the profound remark that "*Le mieux est l'ennemi du bien.*" But not merely is the best plan the enemy of a good plan: *any plan is the enemy of any subsequent plan.*

Now if the Plan merely comprehends collar-studs, it will probably retard the arrival of the best collar-stud, but will not, *per se*, prevent the use of buttons. But if it is a really "large scale Planning" ("viewing the problem as a whole, you know, my dear fellow") and you don't approve of the nationalised, or Monopoly, collar-stud, that will be just too bad. (January 7, 1950.)

By the kindness of a friend in America, we have received a copy of the magazine *Liberty* for March 24, 1945. Incidentally, we notice on the initial letter of the title, a minute Star of David, almost invisible without a magnifying glass. You may have seen it on the jeeps.

The feature article, advertised on the cover, is entitled "America Needs a Strong Britain" [*sic*].

We need not pay too much attention to the obvious suggestion that if America didn't need "Britain" it wouldn't matter what became of her. A more important assumption is that "America," by which is meant the United States, is so obviously in the forefront of civilisation that her leadership is not merely unquestionable, but that it is almost blasphemous to question it.

We are confident that this proposition is one which will have to be faced. But in the meantime, we publish without comment the following extract from an article in the *Ottawa Journal*, which by an odd coincidence, reached us from an entirely different source by the same post:

"'New York, New York, it's a helluva town' is the opening line of the opening song of the newest musical show. . . .

"It is a helluva town these days. The war has got it down. New York is crowded, ill-humoured, and selfish; it is tired of pushing and shoving, and it is expressing that

discontent by more pushing and shoving. . . . There is a belligerency abroad in New York, and to a lesser extent in Boston, and perhaps in all large American cities, that puzzles a visitor. There are few smiles. The elevator man . . . stands there sullenly, lying in wait for the forgetful one who doesn't call out his number . . . that all this should happen in this great land of liberty is perhaps not accidental. A Chicagoan tells me that Chicago people are about as bad. It seems that the process of freedom or American democracy is going through a phase of mistrust and contempt, made more acute by the strains of war."

(May 26, 1945.)

MODERN SCIENCE—

(continued from page 1.)

true; but in any case the allegation is not about science, which is an abstraction, but about some men. A good name for anything is what it *does*. Science and education are instruments of policy, and we can discern the nature of that policy if not its authors from the effects of the instruments. To anyone who becomes conversant with ideas—with the infinite diversity of ideas, their range and scope,—and, in addition, has a grasp of the meaning of *policy*, the question of error must assume a new perspective. Everything that is said from a university chair might, in a restricted sense, be true, and everything published from a scientific laboratory valid. Yet all might politically be wrong. Measured as the difference between the capital value of an untrained and a trained member of the middle-classes, the universities of Great Britain produce annually a capital value of £36,000,000, at a cost of £6,000,000. This takes no account of the capital value of discoveries. Thus on an average each university teacher produces the equivalent of a plot of land (which usually someone else than the owner has to till) of £9,000 value. The 'expanding universe.' I am not suggesting that £9,000 *per annum* should be paid into the bank account of every university teacher. This is the value, approximately, at pre-war prices, of the young graduand's 'plot,' which he has to 'till.' It has become a habit of Vice-Chancellors to lecture him periodically on the immorality of his even living on this 'plot,' unless under such a sense of sin as to induce him to comply with any and every exaction and extortion and compulsion devised by the order to which chancellors belong. Such suggestions are highly improper; but they recur with increasing frequency and impudence. To secure freedom you must endow men not institutions.

There is, quite evidently, no body of ideas in history, not even excepting Christian ideas, more objectionable to the Planners than the body of ideas which has spread from Douglas. That admirable Canadian journal *Vers Demain* has been quoted for the remark of a Dean of Faculty in Canada that "he would be out of his job in eight hours and his place filled by one of our enemies if he openly sided with us." While I can well believe that, particularly if sensitive to suggestion, any member of a university staff, in any country, might hold such an opinion, and be guided by it (the worst falls are almost always at a low fence), to my personal knowledge it took not eight hours but two years to prevent the appointment of a Social Crediter to one of the more important chairs (not the chair of Economics) in the University of McGill because he was a Social Crediter.

Two distinct sets of recommendations concerning him from at least three 'experts' acting independently of one another had to be secured by transatlantic correspondence, even before it was deemed expedient to place the material before anything so awkward as a committee, if it ever was placed before a committee. Even so, hesitation somewhere prolonged delay. It seems that, at least up to the beginnings of the present phase of the World War, a reputation for incorruptibility was still deemed to be necessary to the universities, and this could not have been preserved if open challenge of opinion had been made. If there is now a doubt about it, the answer is "try and see." The methods of control are intangible and long range. And the remedy? It is clear in the old saying often quoted by Douglas: "The power of the Crown has increased, is increasing, and ought to be diminished." Substitute whatever it is that has usurped or is usurping or will usurp the prerogatives of the Crown, and you have got it! It is relatively immaterial how the essential diminution or curtailment or redistribution or decentralisation of that power is effected, provided it is effected.

"I have only taken upon me to ring a bell to call other wits together."

Postscript, 1957

Being invited to revise the foregoing articles before republication, the writer has said that, while much might be amplified, new and usually much larger figures being introduced and new and usually still smaller personalities honoured (or dishonoured as the case may be), there is no apparent change since 1943 to record. It is entirely illusory that a superabundance of instances proves any more than a sufficiency of instances—as though the just presentation of the ideas of Sir Isaac Newton should be brought 'up-to-date' by introducing a prize-winning apple from the National (or International) show into the, probably legendary, story concerning the observation which led Newton to formulate his theory of universal gravitation. What was essential to his demonstration was not a very large apple but a very tiny conception, that of *inertia*. It is from entirely misunderstanding this matter that, on the one hand, the newspapers flog the silly notion that further enquiry into money and credit by a Committee is made desirable by the great changes which have been introduced since the last, and, on the other hand, that some Social Crediters would prefer to see Douglas dressed in their rags and tatters to having their attention politely brought to his ideas in the undisguised raiment proper to them. As there is 'no change' in the direction of the social policy imposed on us, so there is no change in the appropriate description of it.

The quotation at the close of the articles was one suggested by Douglas. For some time the writer could not trace it in the works of Francis Bacon, to whom it was attributed. Indeed, it does not appear in what is commonly understood to be a 'work' of the 'wise and witty' Elizabethan, but in a letter to Playfere. In his notes to Ellis's Preface to the *Novum Organum*, Spedding had written: "The object was to propagate knowledge so that it should grow and spread: the difficulty anticipated was not in excluding auditors, but in finding them." The point at issue was what Bacon intended in those passages

in which he suggested the advantage of reserving to a select audience certain parts of the knowledge he desired to impart. ". . . certainly if we refer to any of the many passages in which he has either enumerated the obstructions which had hitherto hindered the progress of knowledge, or described the qualifications, moral and intellectual, and the order of proceeding, which he considered necessary for the successful prosecution of the new philosophy, we may easily understand why he anticipated more hindrance than help from a popular audience . . . He meant to withhold the publication of his Formula, not 'as a secret of too much value to be lightly revealed,' but as a subject too abstruse to be handled successfully except by the fit and few." That is Spedding's conclusion. Bacon's own words are: "Wherefore since I have only taken upon me to ring a bell to call other wits together, which is the meanest office, it cannot but be consonant to my desire to have that bell heard as far as can be." From the fact that Douglas remembered a remark thus buried in a relatively obscure editorial note, I think that it may justly be inferred that he had studied closely what Bacon had had to say concerning the launching of an idea upon the sea of the public mind. To what extent it influenced his conclusions, or should inform ours is altogether another matter. In no sense is the Social Credit movement 'underground'; but we are acutely aware of the immense hindrance which may be prepared by 'incapable hands' subjecting our idea to 'misuse and mismanagement.' These are Bacon's own phrases.

Another point relevant to the general argument is the recent publication of a book in Chicago by Professor Sorokin: *Fads and Foibles in Modern Sociology*. A more shocking revelation of the level to which 'research' has fallen in the hands of American Sociologists could hardly be penned. At first sight, more than a trace of egocentricity on the author's part may be suspected; but what could he do? If his demonstrations were not founded in first-hand experience, they would have little value. Very curiously, the distinguished author exempts the economists from the discreditable practices of their sociological colleagues. One may well ask what virtue is, if the standard of incorruption is corruption. Read as a 'thriller,' the work should have a sale among the laity. Alas! It is a weighty tome!

(Concluded.)

Corrigenda

Vol. 36, No. 18 for December 28, 1957.

Page 1, column 1, line 14:—
to disclose, yet never do disclose.

Page 1, column 2, paragraph 2, line 14:—
ignominious.

"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"

by
C. H. Douglas.

5/- Post Free.

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

Published by K.R.P. Publications Ltd., at 11, Garfield Street, Belfast.
Printed by J. Hayes & Co., Woolton, Liverpool.