Knock: a study in medical cynicism
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French literature has shown an enduring fascination with the social figure of the doctor. In Jules Romains’ amusing play Knock (1922), and in its later film version (1951), the doctor as deceiver returns to centrestage with a flourish. Molière’s seventeenth-century figures were mostly quacks and mountebanks; Knock is something new: he is a health messiah. By enforcing a mental and social hygiene based on fear, Knock brings a small rural population under his sway. Insouciance is banished by artful consciousness-raising. A society mobilises under the banner of medicine. But who is Dr Knock?

In August 1923, Jules Romains (Louis Henri-Jean Farigoule), PEN activist, friend of Stefan Zweig, and one of France’s most famous and popular writers between the wars, wrote a play in three acts called Knock. It was to prove his most enduring literary creation. In the 1920s Romains was, along with Luigi Pirandello and Bernard Shaw, one of the most staged dramatists in the world, which goes to show that no literary reputation is ever entirely vouchsafed. Perhaps the only other work Romains is remembered for today is the 27 volumes of his colossal “unanimist” fiction Les hommes de bonne volonté, published in instalments between 1932 and 1946, when Romains had returned from war exile in New York and Mexico. It runs to 8,000 pages; Richard Cobb assures us, in his essay Maigret’s Paris, that it contains some finely evocative scenes of the outskirts to the French capital.

Romains first thought of asking the Comédie-Française to stage his piece. That idea came to nothing, but a copy of his play ended up in the hands of the actor Louis Jouvet who was bowled over by its “formal perfection”. A pharmacist before he became an actor, Jouvet was for three decades one of the best-known actors of the Parisian theatre-world, a star of many classic French films, including the famous Hôtel du Nord. With his widow’s peak and suave demeanour, he looks like a svelte version of Jack Nicholson; one of his witticisms has deservedly been anthologised: “there are performances where the public is quite without talent”.

After several rehearsals, Romains insisted that Jouvet play the character close to his own persona, without caricature—“Vous avez une occasion magnifique d’être vous-même”—but with a gloss of courtesy, sarcasm, and self assurance. Jouvet worried that it was going to be too “black” to attract the public. He was wrong. On the first night at the Comédie des Champs-Élysées the play was such a success that André Gide went backstage to congratulate Jouvet on his performance. From then on Jouvet was Knock. He played the role throughout his acting life, and after the war went onstage as Knock at the Théâtre de la Ville in Paris. He returned with Knock to the Champs-Élysées, and the Châtelet; a new version was made; one in 1933, and a better known version, directed by Géry Lefranc, in 1951. Such was Jouvet’s status that he was allowed to supervise casting. In the event, his brilliant performance proved to be the ultimate film record of a remarkable acting career: he died on stage rehearsing Graham Greene’s The Power and the Glory in 1951 just months after the film’s release.

THE FARCE AND THE FARCEUR

The film opens in the early years of the 20th century with Knock, the aspirant to a medical practice, sitting in the back of an old jalopy—what the French used to call a torpédo—with Doctor Parpalaid and his wife. Knock has just purchased Dr Parpalaid’s practice in the small town of Saint-Maurice, which, from the references to hilly country and the nearby presence of Lyon, would seem to indicate a sleepy hollow somewhere in the French Alps. Somewhere deep in dear old France. All the business has—unusually—been concluded in advance by letter, and Knock is exercising his right to be introduced to the clientele. Dr. Parpalaid is a decent old duffer—an homme de l’art as the French used to say of their doctors, or a man of “good intent” in Romains’s term; his wife a formidable matron with a better sense of business than her husband. They have decided, after careful consideration, to move on to better things in Lyon—she has rheumatism and his husband “swore he would finish his career in a big city”. Urban aspirations notwithstanding, they extol the virtues of the canton to Knock: a railway far enough away for the clientele to stay put, no competitor, a chemist who doesn’t try to do the doctor’s job, no major overheads. Knock seems uncommonly interested in what kind of diseases his prospective clients might suffer from, and is put out to discover that the local people generally come “only for a single consultation”. There are no regular patients: it’s not like the baker or the butcher, exclaims Madame Parpalaid, who takes him for a bit wet around the ears. Knock is forty; Faust’s age; though he admits attempting to fleece him—but when did a doctor ever buy a patient? He doesn’t know the church feast days, not even Michaelmas, which is when Dr Parpalaid’s patients are in the habit of paying him. (Dr Parpalaid has ruefully sold the practice just after this date, thus giving Knock grounds for accusing Parpalaid of attempting to fleece him—but when did a doctor ever buy a practice without seeing it first?) As a child he was apparently an avid and precocious reader of the information slips tucked around bottles of pills: at nine he could recite entire pharmacopoeias of side effects. He has already been a ship’s doctor, he informs Madame Parpalaid, and for the duration of the voyage had crew and passengers confined to the sick bay: only the expediency of a roster kept the ship manned and the engines running. In short, Knock has a vocation and no ordinary one at that; and he has a “method”.

www.medicalhumanities.com
Knock arranges for the other members of the cabal, the teacher and the pharmacist, to visit him. His language is fulsomely ambiguous. He conveys to the surgeon Mr Cutler Walpole in George Bernard Shaw’s play The Doctor’s Dilemma (1906), “The description of God’s works is on a level with semiology. While flattering Mousquet’s ... and fraternity had been established. Diseases would be classified; statistics collated; clinics built. Pasteur is emblematic because he embodies so well the due process of the positivist revolution. No other scientific figure stands with such emblematic clarity in republican France’s sense of itself as the bacteriologist Louis Pasteur—“le bienfaiteur de l’humanité”. It was after all the French Revolution which gave rise to the belief that where a physician worked his miracles there could be no clergy, and that illness was a matter for the common weal. The evil of profiteering doctors would disappear once equality, freedom, and fraternity had been established. Diseases would be classified; statistics collated; clinics built. Pasteur is emblematic because he embodies so well the due process of the positivist formula: theoretical research plus application of acquired knowledge makes for general wellbeing.

Medicine, for the nineteenth-century French, was the advance post of Progress. Such was its prestige that Zola made his novels case-histories: he anticipates one of Knock’s lines in his novel Lourdes with the query: “Supposing that after all there is a Power greater than that of men, higher than that of science? It is the instinctive handkerchief after the Lie which created this human credulity.” In Zola’s literary world, pharmacy is on a level with semiology. While flattering Mousquet, the only chemist in town, Knock astutely promises to triple his income within a year. Besides, aren’t they partners in the great fight against disease? When Mousquet points out that people have to fall ill first, Knock retorts with a policy statement: “Fall ill”—that’s an old-fashioned idea! It has been completely outmoded by modern scientific medicine. Health is a word which could just as well be struck from the dictionary. What I see are people variously affected by a variety of diseases of varying virulence. Of course, if you insist on telling them they’re well, they’ll be only too happy to believe you. But you’re leading them on. Your only excuse can be that you already have too many patients to take on new ones.”

Knock: a study in medical cynicism

Knock’s use of “big words” to terrorise the Lady in Violet is one of the oldest medical tricks: think of Molière’s cod Latin-sputing Sganarelle in the most famous predecessor farce le Médecin Malgré Lui (1666), or the nuciform sac, a structure unknown to any anatomy textbook but wielded to good effect by the surgeon Mr Cutler Walpole in George Bernard Shaw’s play The Doctor’s Dilemma (1906). The description of W. Somerset Maugham’s stage directions even resembles Jouve’s portrayal of Knock in the film: his face, according to Shaw in his stage directions, looks “machine-made and beeswaxed; but his scrutinising, daring eyes give it life and force. He never seems at a loss, never in doubt; one feels that if he made a mistake he would make it thoroughly and firmly...”. It may be scandalous to admit it, but dissembling has long been part of medicine’s therapeutic arsenal: Knock profers big words, not for the sake of the cure, but for the rather more pertinent issue of reinforcing his authority.

The nuciform sac turns up in another guise in Axel Munthe’s hugely successful if self-regarding volume of reminiscences from the same decade, The Story of San Michele (1929), in which he tells how, when working in private prac-
So effective is Knock in medicalising the town that when Dr Parpalaid returns three months later to collect the outstanding payment for the sale of the practice, he finds the local Hôtel de la Clef full of patients. The chambermaid (now nurse assistant) fails to recognise Dr Parpalaid and innocently insults him by adding that she hadn’t known there was a doctor in town before Dr Knock. Mousquet is run off his feet with work, and loving it: “It’s not the old cabbage patch life of the old days”. Mr Bernard, the schoolteacher, has moved on to giving illustrated public lectures on the need for perpetual readiness against the menace of the microbe. Public health was a major concern in the Fance that had lost ten per cent of its male population to the first world war; even Louis-Ferdinand Céline—aka Dr Destouches, urban nihilist and Proust’s closest rival for the title of the greatest French novelist of the century—did his stint to support the stock of future schoolchildren, “va-t-en, va-t-en microbe!” to the tune of “Il pleut, il pleut, bergère.” (These campaigns against the unseen menace in the midst of the French population evidently had an effect, as can be surmised from the habits of an unquestionably intelligent middle-class family of the period: Simone Weil’s biographer reports that her entire family, in the 1910s, lived in fear of microbes, obsessively washing hands, opening doors with elbows and generally shunning physical contact.)

Knock astounds his predecessor with his figures for the last three months, and not just the consultation rates: he knows of patients, but in the interests of that third

 Knock is acting not in his own good, he tells Parpalaid, nor even that of his patients, but in the interests of that third thing: la médecine. Parpalaid is struck dumb, bereft of argument. There can be only one possible conclusion: soon the old doctor, who has already had to suffer the ignominy of his less than rapturous welcome by the hotel/hospital staff, and who would seem the person best armed through his culture and experience to recognise Knock for what he is—an agent of the great lie—and thereby resist his blandishments, is being invited by his successor to take a rest cure himself. Knock’s medicalisation of the canton is complete.

Progress has come to Saint-Maurice, so it believes, and it is a collective progress which nobody has the power to resist, not even Dr Parpalaid. A self-contained society forms as the spectator watches; it shares the same hopes and fears, its solidarity is such, even after three months, as to repulse Dr Parpalaid when he comes to collect the remainder of the payment on his old practice. Whatever fails to fit this world-as-interpreted-by-medicine is suppressed or rejected: medicine for the inhabitants of Saint Maurice becomes the very content of their lives. They offer Knock a seller’s market. He leans on what he is expert in inducing: fear; a contrived dart of panic among the cast that can make laughter from the auditorium sound oddly complicit or uneasy. The inhabitants of St Maurice might be suffering from maladies imaginaires, but Knock is a master at the art of reinforcing that particular form of fright. His strategy is simple but effective: he defines the bad, and dictates the good. He invokes a cosmic principle, subjecting the horizontal society of supposedly autonomous subjects to the vertical idea—of divinity. Perhaps he is a latter-day Dr Mesmer, a mesmeriser who puts the instruments of reason to the ministry of what is essentially a prospect of salvation, plumbing that part of the mind that is ineducable, a metaphorical but no less fatal terrains incognitae the French psychologist Pierre Janet termed “the subconscious” five years before Freud.

HYGIENE AND POLITICS

What gives pause in Romain’s brilliant farce is that, in the 1930s, that politicised and polarised decade, Knock was interpreted as a parable about demagogues able to capture the public imagination and mould entire populations to their will. Knock was a type of Great Dictator, the politician without principles: 1922, the year before the play was written, was also the year “Il Duce” came to power in Italy.

There are parallels. The more daringly absolute Knock’s demands on the Saint-Mauriciens—he even gets the Lady in Black, who exudes “peasant avarice and constellation”, to renounce what is clearly her only real passion in life, la bouffe—the more certain they are of his authority to impose such strictures upon them. Their microcosm, even though it is rural, has no socially cohesive institution to counteract medicine’s explaining power (hence Knock’s interest in Act I in discovering whether the townspeople go regularly to Mass, white or black). Knock lacks any sense of scruple or limit, though he repeatedly claims he is the servant of a higher morality. He plays up to his patients’ amour propre, while drastically curtailing their freedom. Sacrifices there will have to be. Soon his patients are running after something they already have. Mark Twain noted, with his usual pithy humour, how little of substance is actually offered by health messiahs: “There are people who strictly deprive themselves of each and every eatable, drinkable and smokeable which has in any way acquired a shady reputation. They pay this price for health. And health is all they get out of it. How strange it is. It is like paying out your whole fortune for a cow that has gone dry:” Or it could be that Knock is in thrall to an impersonal will-to-diagnosis: in the last scene of the play he tells Dr Parpalaid that his “involuntary diagnosis-making” has become so highly developed he dare not look in the mirror. Not, at any rate, with his tongue in his cheek.

Romain was surely aware of Nietzsche’s visionary portrait of the “great deceivers”, written forty years before his play.
"The point of honesty in deception: In all great deceivers there takes place a remarkable process to which they owe their power. In the very act of deception with all its preparations, the dreadful voice and face and gestures, amid the whole effective scenario, the belief in themselves overcomes them; and it is this belief which then speaks so miraculously, so persuasively, to their audience... For men believe in the truth of all that is seen to be firmly believed."  

In 1923, Knock's claims to effectiveness were mostly laughable. The farce was still a game. Medicine lacked sufficient prestige for its authority to be recognised as a law of nature, as Simone Veil, pointed out in her essay The Power of Words. She comments specifically on the power of institutions to "secrete" abstractions: "This particular kind of secretion is wonderfully effective scenario, the belief in themselves overcomes them; and it is this belief which then speaks so miraculously, so persuasively, to their audience... For men believe in the truth of all that is seen to be firmly believed."  

Not so far. Exactly a decade later German doctors were among the most enthusiastic supporters of the social mutations of Hitler's New Republic, servants of a Medicine whose aims were ideological, over and above the interest of individuals. Doctors were feted as warriors in white coats, for National Socialism was nothing else but "applied biology". The Nazi ethos was actually based on a sacred biology, its internal logic consistent with the Nazi belief that the party had been ordained to shape the world's destiny, a destiny which itself would be biological. Science wrote the libretto, Wagner provided the orchestration. Robert Proctor's recent study of public health policies during that period categorises Nazism as "a v ast hygienic experiment designed to bring about an exclusionist sanitary utopia": paranoia about contamination and pollution wasn't just metaphorical, but served as a literal spur to concerted attempts at engineering the health of the German population. Studies were launched into environmental hazards, and efforts were made to improve the German diet and reduce alcoholism. Hitler, as everyone knows, was a non-smoking teetotaller. The Nazi example is extreme, but it reveals the thinness of the line between individual liberty and public compulsion: in a sense, public health is medicine's "original sin", subverting its proper concern with the individual that has come down from Hippocrates.  

But would we be without public health and decent living conditions? A Times editorial of 1854 thundered at John Snow's attempts to introduce better quality drinking water and sanitation in the Broad Street area of 19th century London: "We prefer to take our chance with cholera than be bullied into health." How many club members folded up their newspapers, one wonders, and wandered down through Soho to Broad Street so that they might take a drink directly from the source?  

KNOCK AND THE FUTURE  

After the war, Romains's prescience about the great dictators was acknowledged in the breach, though any comfort it might have brought him—vilified in the collaborationist press, witness to the disgrace of France and deprived of the moral support of his friend Stefan Zweig, who committed suicide in 1942 in Brazil—must have been slight. Cold-war Europe was no longer the continent he had striven to save. He ended his days, some of them at least, in that famous retirement home for distinguished Frenchmen, the Académie Française.  

It was left to Louis Jouvet, in an article published to conclude a conference at the Université des Annales in 1949, to show how well he understood the ambiguous appeal of the play and its eponymous character: "Twenty-five years ago, in a penetrating act of inspiration, Knock revealed the direction a new mentality was going to take... This mentality was Information and its strategies, astounding advances and violent dramatisations; abrupt and terrifying revelations; the invention of new needs, new ways of breakdown; the exaltation of fresh anxieties that humankind would feed upon. Jules Romains anticipated, though we didn't yet know it, the medical mechanisms that were going to rule the world, suggestion and self-suggestion. In Knock, like a prophet at the gates, Jules Romains suddenly shone a light on power, the upsurge of paradoxisms (idées-forces) and collective theories. Humankind is a machine to make gods and every leader of men a creator of myths, Jules Romains, philosopher, moralist and dramatist, provided an admirable advance warning of the modern and all-encompassing mechanism of cohesion and conviction..."  

Romains's play is still read and studied by French schoolchildren, which is pleasing. But it would be an odd little fact as critique on the original experimental society, France is now one of the most highly medicalised countries in the world. The postwar period saw the medicalisation of France in the grand style, a process dramatically accelerated by the events of summer 1968. "Knockisme" has entered the French language, and is used occasionally in medical anthropology as a descriptive term for popular credulity and gullibility. Yet the play is more than a study of dupery: the Italian philologist Guido Cerametti noted that all the old satires on medicine and doctors (and there is no shortage in French literature) look backwards, over their shoulder; Knock, on the other hand, steps confidently into the future. It is a play that capitalises on Marx's idea of tragedy reinstated as farce—except that the farce comes first and the tragedy later. The villain of the piece allows himself a smile just once in the play, while reading the town crier's mind. He has made a discovery, and it isn't medical, but mythic. In the "Big Lie", as Nietzsche has shown, there is always a certain force of credulity. Knock has found a way to deflect hubris. By deflecting it from himself, he obliges Nemesis to visit those who take him at his word. Nemesis is user-friendly and not at all dramatic, ladies and gentlemen, for these are modern times—Nemesis is the realisation that desire is both prerational and manufactured to the highest quality standards. Nemesis is the actor acted upon. Just look around. Despite all our best efforts illness refuses to disappear, it takes on new forms; it turns up where nobody left it; it gets invented by the political and social relations of civilisation itself, which includes the medical profession. Then the misfortunes to which doctors owe their livelihood—illness is, at least, a natural evil—become morally ambiguous. People start to visit the doctor not so much because they are ill, but because they can't be healthy. Soon doctors start to resemble lawyers, who also owe their livelihood to an evil, but not a natural one. And before we know it, we are opening the door on the world of Knock's higher cynicism: with his right hand he accepts the fee for stilling the devil he set loose with his left...  

But that left hand has created a community of interests. Knock treats the people of Saint Maurice coldly, like an anthropologist. He simplifies what he says, then he repeats himself. Isn't it that people ask to be deceived? All right, he will deceive them. Order requires domination, and domination requires a lie or two. So he gives their lives a medical meaning. That is: he extends the bounds of the biological, of whose oracles he is the interpreter, so as to make illness not just a bodily phenomenon but an organising principle for the effective administration of society itself. His argument is life, for that is what a doctor defends. His tools are ideals, seduction, fright, and, if necessary, the threat of violence. His power is his command of language; in that respect nothing has changed since Molière's day: Knock is every bit as much a storyteller, raconteur, bluffer, salesman and "habile homme" as Sganarelle, who was a subservient valet and sham doctor. But who's talking sham? Knock gives everyone the fever. He inoculates his patients with the one idea: self preservation, at all costs. And even more disturbingly, as Nietzsche's insight suggests, he need not be a cynic at all: he might be the Lie in person, someone who lies not, as it were in the detail but in his very mode of existing.
We have to go back to the beginnings of Enlightenment and the twilight of the traditional world from which doctors derive their magical aura as healers to find out why. The first realisation that the equation “knowledge is power”—Knock’s equation—could turn in on itself, through the force of imagination, is to be found in the work of one of the wittiest and most perspicacious philosophers of the Enlightenment, Georg Christoph Lichtenberg (1742–1799). Around the time of the French Revolution, that historical rupture that changed the role and status of the medical profession for better and worse, he wrote a short but pregnant aphorism. “Health”, he told his scrapbook, “is contagious”.
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