

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 5.

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### The Medicine Man

*Primarily for the benefit of newer readers, although it will bear re-reading by those who have followed our "sign-posts" throughout the years, we reprint the following review from our issue for November 15, 1941:*

Alexis Carrel wrote a book called *Man, The Unknown*, and published it in 1935. Carrel was born at Sainte Foy les Lyon in 1873, the son of Alexis and Anna (Ricard) Carrel. In the preface to his book, Carrel says he has spent most of his time in the Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research in America. There he 'contemplated the phenomena of life while they were analysed by incomparable experts such as Meltzer, Jacques Loeb, Noguchi and many others'. That the study of living things has been undertaken at the Rockefeller Institute 'with a broadness of vision so far unequalled' Carrel attributes to the 'genius of Flexner'. Presumably he means Simon Flexner, a Trustee of the Rockefeller Foundation. There are three Flexners. Abraham, described by *Who's Who in America* as an 'educator'. He has written about medical education in Europe and in America and about prostitution in Europe. Bernard was Counsel to the Zionist delegation to the Peace Conference in 1918. The three are brothers, sons of Moses and Esther (Abraham) Flexner.

Loeb is probably as well-known as any of the others. He is a mechanistic physiologist who deems consciousness to be 'an illusion' of sensation. But the purpose of this article is not to assess the importance of these personalities. It is not even to analyse the process or the results of centralisation of 'scientific' enquiry in conjunction with the development of 'big-business' policy, or any other policy. It is merely to draw attention, in the setting in which it occurs, to something curious, almost inexplicable.

"Human beings," says Carrel, "are not found anywhere in nature. There are only individuals. The individual differs from the human being because he is a concrete event. He is the only one who acts, loves, suffers, fights, and dies. On the contrary, the human being is a Platonic Idea living in our minds and in our books. He consists of the abstractions studied by physiologists, psychologists, and sociologists. His characteristics are expressed by Universals. To-day we are again facing a problem which engrossed the philosophical minds of the Middle Ages, the problem of the reality of general ideas." He goes on to say that we live in two different worlds—the world of facts and that of their symbols. Carrel was awarded the Nobel prize (he is primarily a surgeon) for his work in transplanting tissues from one animal to another. It is not, however, a common trait in the character of surgeons to want to make the best of two worlds. Usually they strive to make the best of one of them. Carrel won't have the division between 'the realists who believed in the exist-

ence of Universals and the nominalists who did not believe in it'. Anselm v. Abélard.) They "were equally right". "Scientists accustomed to the techniques of mechanics, chemistry, physics, and physiology, and unfamiliar with philosophy and intellectual culture, are liable to mingle the concepts of the different disciplines. . . . Education, medicine and sociology are concerned with the individual. They are guilty of a disastrous error when they look upon him only as a symbol . . . individuality is fundamental in man. . . . Each individual is conscious of being unique . . . . We are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man. And still less his potentialities. . . . Most of us are unaware of our own aptitudes. The tests applied to school children and students by inexperienced psychologists have no great significance. They give an illusory confidence to those unacquainted with psychology. In fact, they should be accorded less importance. Psychology is not yet a science. . . . Physicians . . . . are asked to realise the impossible feat of building up a science of the particular. . . ."

Carrel has now made the best he can of World No. 1. "Each of us is certainly far larger and more diffuse than his own body . . . . Love and hatred are realities . . . . If we could visualise . . . . immaterial links, human beings [not individuals?] would assume new and strange aspects. Some would hardly extend beyond their anatomical limits [although 'we are not even capable of discovering the essential characteristics of a given man']. Others would stretch out as far as a safe in a bank . . . . Others would appear immense. They would expand in long tentacles. . . . Leaders of nations, great philanthropists, saints, would look like fairy-tale giants, spreading their multiple arms over a country, a continent, the entire world . . . . Caesar, Napoleon, Mussolini, all great leaders of nations, grow beyond human stature . . . . Between certain individuals and nature there are subtle and obscure relations . . . . Each man is bound to those who precede and follow him . . . . Individuality is doubtless [sic!] real. But it is much less definite than we believe. And the independence of each individual from the others and from the cosmos is an illusion . . . . Modern society ignores the individual."

From the point of recognising the relativity of individuals, which is a biological as well as a social fact, Carrel proceeds to stress the damage done to individuals by standardisation and our ignorance of 'the constitution of the human being'. It is to be noticed that the damage has been done to the real thing; but emphasis is now to be transferred to the abstraction, the human being. Carrel has already defined the province of science—'the abstractions studied by scientists. Carrel is a scientist. (There's nothing like leather.)

(continued on page 4)

## THE SOCIAL CREDITER

### FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which was founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas.

The Social Credit Secretariat 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 45/-, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices: Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11.

Telephone: 01-534 7395

Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1

Telephone: 01-387 3893

IN AUSTRALIA —

Business: Box 2318V, G.P.O., Melbourne, Victoria 3001

Editorial: Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001

(Editorial Head Office)

### THE SOCIAL CREDIT SECRETARIAT

Personnel — Chairman: Dr. B. W. Monahan, 4 Torres Street, Red Hill, Canberra, Australia 2603. Deputy Chairman: British Isles: Dr. Basil L. Steele, Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Telephone: 01-387 3893. Liaison Officer for Canada: Monsieur Louis Even, Maison Saint-Michel, Rougemont, P.Q., Secretary: H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

### FROM WEEK TO WEEK

It is not really credible that there is a significant difference in the 'competence' of Mr. Heath as against Mr. Wilson, or of Mr. Rippon ('Shadow' Defence Minister) as against Mr. Healey. As regards defence any difference between the Parties is fundamentally a difference of policy, which in turn is the expression of belief. At the end of the Second World War, Great Britain was a first class Power—caught in a financial trap, it is true, and dependent on imports of vital raw materials—but still the linchpin of a world-wide Empire capable of supplying the needs of all its component parts. A modified 'Common Market' policy for the Empire would have ensured a rising prosperity for all its peoples, exactly as it has done in the case of Portugal and the Overseas Territories. It should not be forgotten that during the war Mr. Churchill stated publicly that he had not become His Majesty's First Minister in order to preside over the liquidation of the British Empire, which was a clear indication that such a policy was already in evidence.

But the Conservatives were defeated in the ensuing election; and the Socialists set about dismantling the Empire with such effect that Mr. Wilson was able to boast that under Attlee, "a thousand years of British history went out the window". Meanwhile Stalin consolidated his European position and took up the slack as the *structure* of the Empire crumbled. The result of all this has been the reversal of the strategic situation. In an article on Conservative defence policy in the *Daily Telegraph*, April 23, 1970, Mr. Rippon states: "Today [British] strategy is based on the assumption that nuclear escalation will be the only alternative to surrender in Europe in the event of a major Soviet attack". Is nuclear escalation a *real* alternative? Would anyone *really* push that button? And if not, is anyone going to fight a 'conventional' war of which the *predicated* outcome is surrender, with all the penalties of having fought and lost, and thereby become subject to reparations? In short, Russia holds the whip hand. Will she sit quietly by while the Conservatives, over the next five or ten years, restore the balance of 'conventional' forces? This is dream-world stuff.

Mr. Rippon further says: "The starting point of Conservative defence policy is that the first duty of any Government is to secure, within the context of its alliances, the safety

of the nation and the maintenance of its commitments throughout the world". And later, he says: "Our failure has been in the deliberate run-down of our professional forces, naval, army and air; the reduction of the reserves to a level where they are barely adequate to bring B A O R up to war-time strength; the disbandment of the Territorial Army in its old form; and the virtual abandonment, by us alone of all Western European nations, of any form of home defence". And he writes of partially rectifying this situation "over a period of ten years"! More dream-world stuff; does he really believe it is practical politics? It is as if the leader in a world champion ten-mile race were to sit down a quarter of a mile from the winning-post to let his competitors catch up and make a sprint for the last lap. In fact, the Communists (and Socialists) have been spraying broken glass on the track behind them.

In speaking of "our" failure Mr. Rippon seems to imply Conservative complicity in the deliberate "run-down", which makes it difficult to apportion responsibility for the most dangerous situation "the nation" has ever faced. As Peter Simple says in the same issue of the *Daily Telegraph*, "Our country is riddled with treason; our laws, institutions, the very name of patriotism—all are being made into an ingenious joke".

The fact of the matter now is that a conventional defence strategy is quite out of court. Ten years ago something might have been done to reverse the "deliberate"—*deliberate*—run-down of conventional forces. Those ten years are down the drain. The Communists now can call a build-up of conventional forces an act of potential aggression, and issue an ultimatum to which, as Mr. Rippon admits, the answer can only be surrender or 'escalating' nuclear warfare (the escalation, presumably, occupying anything from four to forty-eight hours).

Nevertheless, behind the grim conventional strategic situation there lies a fundamental substructure of bluff and deceit. *Of course*, as Peter Simple has observed several times recently, Britain is riddled with treason. If that treason were denounced in due form in Parliament, and from the hustings, the bluff might be called. If Mr. Rippon is speaking for the Opposition, and means "deliberate", then the Opposition should make treason the issue. Clearly, if it is necessary to re-arm Britain because of the potential threat of invasion by Russia, we are potentially at war with Russia, and activities which "deliberately" disarm Britain in advance of a potential threat are just as treasonable as activities in aid of the enemy in the course of actual warfare. But in fact the Communists regard themselves as engaged in war with the aim of achieving a bloodless victory—i.e., the Russians are making the strategic moves appropriate to the actual conduct of war—advanced bases and logistic supplies in Europe and the Mediterranean, and a world-wide deployment of naval forces—while the Conservatives are talking about building up forces over a ten-year period which, however, would leave themselves virtually without bases. After all, eventually everyone became convinced that the only way to "stop Hitler" was to declare war; at what point, and how, do we "stop the Russians"? Are they (Mr. Rippon implies they are) a potential enemy, or are they merely somewhat unruly friends, so that we should spend millions on defence "over a ten year period" just to play the game and humour them?

However the much more immediate danger to Britain lies in the 're-unification' of Germany in collusion with Russia. There is no difference other than in name between Naziism and Communism as a *system* of government: it is centralised Social Democracy backed by armed might to maintain centralisation; and it means the end of nationhood. The easiest route to the final objective of World Government (or World Communism, as Brezhnev prefers to call it) is *via* the Common Market, peacefully; otherwise . . . by whatever appropriate means. And that is the reality behind the "deliberate" run-down of our professional forces, the disbandment of the Territorial Army, and the abandonment of any form of home defence. And if the Conservatives are in the seats of power when the crash comes, let them look out.

### Frustration as a Technique

(Originally published in *The Social Crediter*, Nov. 8, 1941)

Recent investigation has shown that even rats, confronted with a situation which they must solve, but to which their sense and experience only give replies which leave them still caught, fall, under the shock of complete frustration, into mental collapse.

Nervous exhaustion—whether in rat or man—renders the individual submissive and easy to control and is the product of the manipulation of conditions, of which the wirework of a trap is only one variant. The technique of the reduction of human beings to centralised control has very many forms, but rests upon a basis which is simple: individuals are placed in positions where they can attempt to secure desired objectives only by means which will not provide them.

Bureaucracy, for example, let loose to organise the efforts of a nation willing enough to go the limit, effectually prevents it from doing so; for bureaucracy postpones decisions, conceals responsibility, destroys initiative and so fails to provide the all out push which most of us wish to see. Democracy, in the debased verbal currency which obtains, means the Party System, and Freedom merely the absence of physical constraint. Such objectives unless defined and reduced to concrete objectives, are dust in the eyes.

It is often argued that obstructions such as these, which are placed between us and the fulfilment of our desires, are only the outcome of stupidity. Without going so far as to deny that attribute to our bureaucrats, it is certainly not the quality which distinguishes the releasers of bureaucracy; they are far too clever to give themselves away. And if you should doubt that you are recommended to uncover the reason why M. Lapoint refused to allow an enquiry into secret societies, because that was a matter of *policy*. And why do our own ministers persistently refuse to discuss the Bank of "England" in Parliament?

"Put a wet towel round your head and think that one out!"

—H.E.

**THE USURPERS**  
The Men Who Rule America  
By MEDFORD EVANS  
9/6 posted  
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.

### Russia

"In Russia we have a vast, dumb people dwelling under the discipline of a conscripted army in war-time; a people suffering in years of peace the rigours and privations of the worst campaigns; a people ruled by terror, fanaticisms, and the Secret Police. Here we have a state whose subjects are so happy, that they have to be forbidden to quit its bounds under the direst penalties; whose diplomatists and agencies sent on foreign missions, have often to leave their wives and children at home as hostages to ensure their eventual return. Here we have a system whose social achievements crowd five or six persons in a single room; whose wages hardly compare in purchasing power with the British dole; where life is unsafe; where liberty is unknown; where grace and culture are dying; and where armaments and preparations for war are rife. Here is a land where God is blasphemed, and man, plunged in this world's misery, is denied the hope of mercy on both sides of the grave, his soul in the striking, protesting phrase of Robespierre, 'no more than a genial breeze dying away at the mouth of the tomb!' Here we have a power actively and ceaselessly engaged in trying to overturn existing civilisations by stealth, by propaganda, and when it dares by bloody force. Here we have a state, three millions of whose citizens are languishing in foreign exile, whose intelligentsia have been methodically destroyed; a state nearly half-a-million of whose citizens, reduced to servitude for their political opinions, are rotting and freezing through the Arctic night; toiling to death in forests, mines and quarries, many for no more than indulging in that freedom of thought which has gradually raised man above the beast."

—Winston Churchill in *Great Contemporaries*, published in 1937.

### Irrationalities of the Age

"This century despite its alleged scientific outlook has seen a remarkable growth of strange irrational sects and religious substitutes, Theosophy, Christian Science, British Israel, Spiritualism, and Jehovah's Witnesses. Sunday-paper astrology is popular, lucky mascots are booming, *episcopi vagantes* and charlatan faith-healers multiply. Many weird superstitions flourish. And their very irrationality is almost a source of strength to them, for they are too absurd and often too vaguely nebulous for reasoned criticism, and therefore they escape it. It is like exploring a country in an impenetrable fog, made up of a mist of vague occultism thickened by a persistent drizzle of sentimentality sometimes masquerading as Christian . . . .

"And if I am reminded of the large number of people who today run after superstitions', writes Fr. Bede Frost in a singularly penetrating attack on some irrationalities of the age, 'I shall reply. What else do you expect when for half a century this professing Christian country has allowed its children to be brought up without any definite Christian teaching in its schools? For you may rest assured that what is called "Bible Teaching" is more often than not anything but Christian'."

—Rev. Walton Hannah in *Christian by Degrees*.

## Modern Education

The root evil of modern education, says Mortimer Smith in *And Madly Teach*, is to be located in its philosophical basis. The essential tenet of this philosophy is the instrumental-experimental theory of knowing that human intelligence is animalistic, limited in scope to the stimuli of environment. We cannot know anything except what our senses tell us. There are no transcendental yardsticks by which to measure the "truth" of our observations.

This, of course, is John Dewey's pragmatism, the philosophy that holds that what "works" is "true". It follows that the only knowledge that has any value is that which results in concrete, measurable ends. Education, then, must concern itself with the practical and changing conditions of life, without reference to supposedly universal, timeless values. The past is always dead, the new is always changing and the future will reveal itself in its unpredictable dress at the proper time. Loading the student down with the "best that has been thought and said" is to handicap him in his bout with experience, and disciplining him with principles is to put limits on his potential. What he learns from teacher or textbook will never do him any good; only what he learns in his minute-to-minute experiences counts. The only function of education, therefore, is to provide an environment, a laboratory, in which the student's personality (whatever that is; the philosophy does not define it) may find proper expression. . . .

—From a review by Frank Chodorov in *Human Events*, February 22, 1950.

## The Medicine Man

(continued from page 1)

"The democratic principle [what is that?] has contributed to the collapse of civilisation in opposing the development of an élite . . . . The standardisation of men by the democratic ideal has already determined the predominance of the weak . . . . Like the invalid, the criminal, and the insane, [the weak] attract the sympathy of the public. The myth of equality, the love of the symbol, the contempt for the concrete fact, are, in a large measure, guilty of the collapse of the individual . . . . We know that he cannot adapt himself to the environment created by technology, that such environment brings about his degradation." Technology is an omnibus abstraction; and things are not created by abstractions; but let this pass. "Science and machines are not responsible for his present state. We [who?] alone are guilty. We have not been capable of distinguishing the prohibited from the lawful. We have infringed natural laws . . . . Life always gives an identical answer when asked to trespass on forbidden ground. It weakens and civilisations collapse."

Unconsciously, Carrel has been writing 'science'. He has described what the individual has *become* in terms of his abstractions. He is determined to effect the remaking of man by carrying his abstractions a stage further: to make the best of World No. 2. He says: "As long as the hereditary qualities of the race remain present, the strength and audacity of his forefathers can be resurrected in modern man by his own will. But is he still capable of such an effort?"

Grammatically, 'his' will here is the individual's. Carrel must be ignorant of the notion:—

The pyramidal structure of society gives environment

the maximum control over individuality. The correct objective of any change is to give individuality maximum control over environment.

These words appeared in the first edition of *Economic Democracy*.

Whether 'he' (the individual) is capable of an effort or not, Carrel, apparently is! And this is the form, apparently, which his effort is to take:—

"Medicine [at the Rockefeller Institute] is the most comprehensive of all the sciences concerning man, from anatomy to political economy . . . . Can any individual master anatomy, physiology, biological chemistry, psychology, metaphysics, pathology, medicine, and also have a thorough acquaintance with genetics, nutrition, development, pedagogy, esthetics, morals, religion, sociology, and economics? It seems that such an accomplishment is not impossible. In about twenty-five years of uninterrupted study, one could learn these sciences. At the age of fifty, those who have submitted themselves to this discipline could effectively direct the construction of the human being and of a civilisation based on his true nature. Indeed, the few gifted individuals who dedicate themselves to this work will have to renounce the common modes of existence. They will not be able to play golf and bridge, to go to cinemas, to listen to radios, to make speeches at banquets, to serve on committees, to attend meetings of scientific societies, political conventions and academies, or to cross the ocean and take part in international congresses. They must live like. . . ." Well, never mind: the chief point is that they will still live in the shadow of the genius of Flexner! "Why," asks Carrel, "should not some individuals sacrifice their lives to acquire the science indispensable to the making of man and his environment. . . . There is no more beautiful and dangerous adventure than the renovation of modern man." Dangerous, yes, and not only to the sacrificers; but the answer to this question is, briefly, that some individuals may do what they like, provided they do not merely make a corner in individuality, and are not merely obtaining maximum control for *their* individuality. But that, otherwise, so fatuous a proposal is both useless and unnecessary. Even at the Rockefeller Institute doctors differ. Is it not curious that men can know so much and understand so little? To take up an excellent point which Carrel makes himself, is it *natural*, that men should have to sacrifice their lives for an abstraction, and isn't the renovation of modern man an abstraction? Would it not be more 'natural' if some of our abstractionists sacrificed a few of their abstractions in favour of the real individual, whose 'essential characteristics' they are not 'capable of discovering'? The opinion is Carrel's own.

T.J.

Extra copies of this and all recent issues are available to subscribers at 4d each while stocks last. Contributions towards costs will be appreciated.

### THE UNELECTED By GARY ALLEN

An analysis, reprinted from *American Opinion* (June, 1968), of a number of top Executives in the U.S.A. Administration, giving their affiliations with Communist Fronts and the American Council on Foreign Relations.

5/- posted  
K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LTD.,  
245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.