

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 10.

SATURDAY, 8 AUGUST, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

(Originally published serially in *The Social Crediter* in 1944)

1. THE DIRECTION OF EVOLUTION

It is quite possible that, left to itself, science would have exhausted its materialistic aspect, as a point of view, in a shorter time than it has — an observation suggested by the increasing signs of present exhaustion, and some consideration of the development of psychology. It has not been left to itself, for science is manifested through scientists, who cannot help retaining those human characteristics which respond to propaganda, however subconsciously. Science is not, of course, a *thing*; it is a method, and materialism is not inherent in that method. On the other hand, science is implicit in materialism, and materialism has been propagandised; materialism, in fact, is probably better conceived as propaganda than as philosophy.

Science as a method was bound to be applied to the study of behaviour, and no doubt must have revealed quite shortly that while a materialistic description is applicable to the mechanical aspect of behaviour, something else is left over, just as in Douglas's analogy there is something that is not comprised in the description of the towers, wires and machines of an electrical power system. Everyone knew that quite well until propaganda distracted their attention from the obvious; nevertheless, psychology soon rediscovered it. Progress from that point might have been rapid and genuine had not Freud's teaching been propagandised, thus diverting attention from the disclosure, and subsequently the satisfactory exoteric and systematic formulation, of a vast field of occult knowledge.

In the present state of our language, largely the result of newspaper "education", it is difficult to give a name to that "something" without suggesting ideas which one does not intend to convey; but there is an aspect of the something which can safely be named, and which is *accessible to the observation of everyone within himself: Purpose*. Quite apart from its manifestations in others, which to some extent lend themselves to mechanistic interpretations, *purpose is also a subjective experience*, the contemplation of which may lead to a comprehension of other aspects of the "something". But whether it does or does not, the perception of purpose alone is sufficient to reveal our bodies as instruments of our purpose.

If one "lines-up" one's *out*-look from this concept, one can perceive a number of relations holding in Reality which perhaps were imperceptible before. Looked at from the point of view of the subservience of mechanism to purpose, the outstanding connection of the facts of organic evolution

leading to Man is the development of what I shall call *libility*. From this point of view, genetic evolution, facts of which have been ascertained, has a different importance from its importance in the purely biological (in the narrow sense) point of view. What is impressive in genetic evolution is the remarkable uniformity of structure, for each species, which is transmitted by its mechanism. Such adaptation to environment as it provides is but slow. But adaptation to environment is a negative concept, from the point of view of purpose, and contrasts with *domination* of environment, which expresses purpose. Purpose thus aims to set the individual free of the necessity of mere passive adaptation at several generations remove.

Underlying the stretch of evolution of which Man is the present product, we see a "catching-up", as it were, of purpose over mechanism. Genetic evolution in the man-line (but not in all evolutionary lines, if in any other) has produced an increasingly labile organism, so far as potentialities of behaviour are concerned. There is hardly an item of behaviour which does not have to be learnt by the developing human individual; indeed, some infants even have to be taught to suckle — *i.e.*, how to make use of their suckling reflex. To say that all men walk alike means little, because walking is one of the least of the things a man can do. The perfection of the acrobat is a measure of what man can achieve in one direction, and the tensor analysis in another.

Evolution means, for man, the setting free of the individual from the slow certainty and sporadic accidents of genetics. Individual purpose has been progressively emancipated by the provision of an increasingly flexible instrument. What a man is and becomes, depends on purpose — his own, or another's. But *this whole trend of evolution can be understood, has meaning, only from the point of view of immanent sovereignty*, whether or not this has a transcendent component; sovereignty of purpose as an aspect of a more comprehensive reality.

The evolution of man, therefore, is almost the opposite of what is generally assumed. The human individual, as born, is hardly adapted to his environment at all; for years he cannot even exist without the assistance of others. Practically speaking, only his vegetative functions work automatically, to begin with; what other abilities he achieves, perfects, and relegates to a condition of relative automaticity ("the unconscious") depend on purpose — his own or another's. It is at this vital (living) point of acquisition of abilities that

(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 45/1, Six months 22/6, Three months 11/6.

Offices—

Business: 245 Cann Hall Road, Leytonstone, London, E.11. Tel. 01-534 7395
Editorial: Penrhyn Lodge, Gloucester Gate, London, N.W.1. Tel. 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, Rougement, P.Q., Secretary, H. A. Scoular, Box 3266, G.P.O., Sydney, N.S.W. 2001.

FROM WEEK TO WEEK

If, as has been claimed, the Wilson Administration was incompetent, as in losing, according to figures given by the Economic Research Council, £2,419 million reserves in six years, who is to take the blame? Why, the British public, of course; they voted to put the Socialists in power. And if the Heath Administration cannot restore the reserves in six years — which would mean a “favourable” balance of payments of some £800 million per annum — who is to take the blame? Same answer.

Colin Coote (*Daily Telegraph*, 2 July, 1970) calls inflation “Heath’s Challenge”. Inflation is now a built-in feature of economics, and “better management” will not overcome it. The technical explanation of why this is so has often been put forward in these pages, and its reiteration has been shown to be valueless. The overcoming of inflation involves a challenge to those in control of international finance, and every abridgement of national sovereignty renders such a challenge less possible. That is the fundamental idea behind the Common Market.

Trends

The Episcopal Church in the U.S.A., no less than the Roman Catholic communion there, is being used for dubious ends, for we read (*Church Times*, 12 June, 1970) that “seven unofficial Episcopalian groups intend to apply ‘pressure tactics’ in the hope of forcing the Convention . . . to adopt particular stands on certain issues which they promote”. We do not have much difficulty in guessing what these particular issues are when we read that the seven groups include “the Union of Black Clergy and Laity, the Episcopalian Peace Fellowship, the National Episcopal Students’ Committee, the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity and the Episcopal Churchmen for South Africa”.

Fortunately episcopal churchmen are aware of the infiltration and misuse of the Church—which after all has as its *raison d’être* to be impartial and unpressurised on such issues — and the *Washington Post* reports that “a pocket book revolt among Episcopalians has resulted in the largest money cutback in at least thirty years in the Epis-

copal Church.” The retired bishop of South Florida has commented that pressure-groups have great influence in the leadership of the Church and the Executive Council, adding, “We are no longer playing a more or less friendly game of basketball. This strikes me as warfare, with the destiny of the Church at stake.”

I don’t know whether the bishop appreciates the nature of the war, but Michael Bourdeaux’s report about the reform movement in the Baptist Church in Russia reveals it. The reformers demand the “end of outside interference in Church affairs” and refuse to acquiesce in “the more pliable attitude of the officially-recognised Church”. Georgi Vins, leader of the reform movement, has been rearrested, after less than a year’s freedom following a three-years’ sentence, and there is evidence of “a whole new wave of arrests of Baptists” in other parts of the Soviet Union. Mikhail Khorev, who is nearly blind, was hauled off to prison again, and as his wife was in hospital their young children were left “with no one to look after them”. The same bestialities evidently continue, for Ivan Afonin, aged forty-four, died at a prison camp in November because “he had been forced to work when seriously ill”. So the bishop must know what the pressure groups stand for, under whatever disguise or label.

Even Quintin Hogg was moved to protest strongly against a bishop’s activity, and wrote to *The Times* (29 May, 1970) deploring Bishop Huddleston’s activities which set out “to polarize election voting behaviour on lines of sectionalism and particularly of race and colour . . . Those who seek to mobilize communal antagonisms at election time are playing with fire and have no right to sign their names with the Cross of Christ.”

Human Events (16 May, 1970) commenting on the deaths on Kent State University campus carries an illustration of a student literally playing with fire, for he is hurling a tear gas bomb at national guardsmen at Wisconsin university. It quotes the columnist J. J. Kilpatrick who writes, “a terrible responsibility lies upon the heads of student revolutionaries who have kindled the wild torches of unreason. ‘When in doubt, burn’ urges Jerry Rubin in his recent book”. Sen. Robert Griffin “would point the finger of blame at the hard core of revolutionaries who have been encouraged by a few radical Professors and allowed to run wild by namby-pamby college and university administrators.” Luckily Vice-President Agnew has pronounced that in the first place “the era of appeasement must come to an end”. The Ohio National Guardsmen “summoned reluctantly from homes and jobs in obedience to duty”, tormented and threatened, were many of them 18 and 19 years of age.

The Times, however, did its best for the cause of chaos in a violent attack on Enoch Powell (15 June, 1970) entitled “How Fall’n, How Changed”. It prophesied that the political consequences of his speech “are likely to make it rather easier for the Labour Party to win the election”, but reserved its scorn for his reference to conspiracy at home, sneering that “his new enemies now include the phantom Philbys of the Home Office”, and concluding that “by his unforgivable speeches he has destroyed himself”. Mr. R. M. Bell, Q.C., returned as M.P. for South Buckinghamshire with a handsomely increased majority, replied neatly (*The Times*, 16 June, 1970) that an obituary notice in *The Times* “is the indispensable preliminary to national acceptance,” but complained more seriously that the “central liberal

opinion" for which the newspaper stands, "has written off Britain as a nation of destiny — even as a nation at all."

As far as trends have significance, the nation would appear less willing to be written off, and the anti-Common Market Conservative candidate for Holland with Boston raised his majority from 316 to 9,339, despite the fact that some farmers opposed Mr. Body's policy

However, Major-General T. A. Lane, U.S.A. retired, issued a solemn warning recently when he said (*Task Force*, March 1970), "The national apathy suggests that we too are a captive nation".

— H.S.

Rural Economics

We are indebted to Enterprise (June, 1970), organ of the Institute of Economic Democracy, Queensland, for the following text of a reply by their Secretary, Mr. Jeremy Lee, broadcast over the A.B.C. "Country Hour" on 25 May, 1970, to an earlier address on this session by Dr. H. P. Schapper, Reader in Agricultural Economics at the University of Western Australia:

Dr. Schapper's pernicious attack on the booklet *They Want Your Land*, published by the Australian League of Rights, is so misleading that some comment is necessary, although it is unlikely that Australian farmers will be content with the vague and ill-informed criticisms which he has made. Indeed, the enquiries which we have received since the broadcasting of Dr. Schapper's statement have confirmed our view that farmers are not satisfied with the performance of a number of economic advisers, and are going to insist on some much more realistic answers than the dismal "Get Bigger or Get Out" policies propounded by Dr. Schapper and some other advisers.

By far the most offensive of Dr. Schapper's remarks was directed at farmers themselves, rather than the League of Rights. He implies that farmers are incapable of mature judgment, and are falling for "nonsensical ideas". Obviously, if one accepts this sort of suggestion, farmers are unable to decide what policies should be adopted, and must have this done for them by the "experts". It is this academic arrogance, suggesting as it does that experts should be on top, rather than on tap, that threatens the independence of primary producers. It is made all the worse by the fact that the policies being offered are similar to those that have resulted in sixteen million people leaving the land in the United States during the last twenty years, and a similar exodus of farmers from countries in western Europe, the United Kingdom and Canada.

The productive achievements, and enormously increased efficiency of independent farmers working within a free-enterprise system throughout the western world, should logically result in increased security, less debt, more stability and genuine freedom than ever before. The farmer is doing things undreamed of even twenty years ago. His achievements are stupendous.

The financial system, instead of reflecting the obvious physical benefits which should accrue from this productive achievement, has resulted in the exact opposite. Farm debt

has increased by over 800% in Australia in the last ten years. Farms which are economic one year become uneconomic the next. Already the exodus from the rural areas has had tragic implications for many farming families, for small country towns, for businesses and for local Government. Dr. N. Ashton, chairman of the State Planning Authority in New South Wales, was reflecting wide-spread concern when he stated last year that this is one of the most urgent domestic problems with which Australia is confronted.

Rather than taking the objective approach of questioning a financial system which is inducing these problems, and a growth of poverty by no means confined to the farming sectors, during a period of unprecedented and overwhelming abundance in Australia, Dr. Schapper strikes a position in which it is not the system which is at fault, but those whom the system is supposed to serve — in this case the farmers themselves. The problem, he claims, is that we have too many farmers. And so, instead of rectifying a drift from the rural areas which has already had tragic consequences, he suggests that we perpetrate an even greater drift, under some formal reconstruction plan. There should be no compulsion, he says, with a rare brand of humanitarianism, omitting to mention that grinding poverty is probably the most compelling form of all. A recent survey on the north coast of New South Wales indicated quite clearly that the overwhelming majority of country people prefer their way of life to any other. Given any sort of incentive to remain, they would not exchange it for the world. There is nothing voluntary about the reconstruction schemes which Dr. Schapper would like to see, unless alternative-incentives are offered to producers, making it possible for them to retain their independent status and their farms should they so desire.

Why at a period when Australian people in every sector of the economy, through their productive resourcefulness have achieved a range, quality and abundance of consumer goods of every description, never before approached in this country, should we be entering a period of recession, with all the symptoms of inflation, exorbitant taxation, mounting debt, increasing prices, industrial unrest and bankrupt farmers?

It is against the background of this question that the booklet *They Want Your Land* was published by the Australian League of Rights. It gives a factual and documented description of the political determinism which has always surrounded financial policy. To imply, as Dr. Schapper has done, that neither the Fabians nor the Communists are concerned with financial policies is inexcusable. *They Want Your Land* offers some realistic financial policies as an alternative to those currently pursued, which have already had some precedent in Australia. Dr. Schapper's superficial and biased criticisms cannot hide this, nor judging by the demands which are being made on the League by an increasing number of farmers, are they likely to do so even temporarily. The price subsidy scheme, which he so lightly dismisses, is in fact the policy upon which the present Federal Government campaigned and was elected in 1949, in order to "put the shillings back into the pound". I don't believe it is fair comment to suggest that the stated policies propounded by the then Mr. Menzies, and Sir Arthur Fadden, the leaders of the coalition, were, as Dr. Schapper puts it, "nonsensical ideas", particularly when the present system, based as it is on the premises of the Fabian Socialist John Maynard Keynes, is producing such disastrous results.

On the other hand, there are very good grounds for asking why those policies were never in fact implemented, and what might have been the result had inflation been halted, and prices reduced by the "shillings back into the pound" policy.

There are even better grounds for insisting that a price subsidy system, without the rigidity of price controls, should be implemented at the present time, twenty years after it was first promised, so that the cost-price squeeze is completely halted, and prices reduced, not only to primary producers, but to all consumers in Australia.

A policy such as this, linked with a heavy reduction in both direct and indirect taxation, *without* the Keynesian technique of restricting demand, would serve to return some incentives to cost-beset farmers instead of eliminating them, as well as increasing the purchasing power of every wage. We might then see a result which has been the haunting dream of every political party, and the great majority of Australians for many years; namely, a situation where the rural population begins to grow, where small country towns, at present decaying, regain their vigour; where Local Government, the most decentralised and the most efficient type of Government we have, develops a new stature; where young Australians have a genuine chance of a farming career, and new rural communities develop; where farming families are able to look forward to real stability and a secure future; where the growing and never-ending list of taxes, licences, controls, forms, returns and levies become an outworn relic of the past, instead of the nightmare of the present; and where the population pressure is taken off our overloaded urban centres, and a genuine balance between city and country is achieved.

Dr. Schapper's proposals substitute statistics for human values. One is tempted to wonder what he would say were it suggested that we have too many economists, and that we should "re-habilitate" some into another occupation, under the slogan "Get Better or Get Out." I feel that he would then be a little more concerned about the rights of the individual, and a little less affronted by the criticisms of a man-made, and therefore a fallible system. He does not believe that the policies which underlie a free-enterprise system—built as it is round the small, independent producer—are feasible. It remains to be seen whether primary producers agree with him.

I find it hard to believe that Dr. Schapper is unaware of the impact that socialist philosophies have had on the moulding of current financial policy. Nor is it easy to believe that he cannot foresee the grim results which lie ahead if the same policy is pursued. Where is it to end? Dr. Mauldon, of the University of Sydney, has suggested that the economic farm of today will be the uneconomic farm of tomorrow. He is undoubtedly correct if the policies of inflation and rising costs are allowed to continue. Where does this leave the primary producer, or any independent producer for that matter, in ten years time?

The present situation is the result of a deliberate policy which is perhaps more clearly described by one of the best-known economists of his day, Mr. John Strachey, a one-time Communist, a Fabian Socialist, and an economic planner in the Attlee Labour Government in the early post-war period in Britain, in his book *Programme for Progress*. Mr. Strachey wrote that inflationary credit policies were "an indispensable

step in the right direction." He continued by saying "the fact that the loss of objectivity which is involved (i.e. inflation) will sooner or later make necessary, on pain of ever-increasing dislocation, a growing degree of social control . . . for the partial character of the policy will itself lead to further measures. The very fact that no stability, no permanently workable solution can be found within the limits of this policy will ensure that once a community has been driven by events to tackle its problems in this way, it cannot halt at the first stage, but must of necessity push on to more thorough-going measures of re-organisation."

The Australian League of Rights suggests that there was never anything inevitable about a policy which drives people from their homes and their farms. But it is only by tackling the root-cause of this mess that any alternative can be achieved. That root-cause is inflation. This can be done, and a start might well be made by demanding some better results, and some alternative policies from those economists who seek refuge from their responsibilities by eliminating farmers.

The Aims of Education

(continued from page 1)

abilities that free will operates. What a man is at any moment he has just become; he is, at each instant, the latest integration of a continuous series of decisions between alternatives.

That the problem essentially is not one of adaptation to environment is clear from the fact that other animals, perhaps without exception (unless man has interfered), are far more perfectly adapted, with a perfection that ties them all the more to their environment. The biological problem was—and still is—to produce a material structure in which the physico-chemical properties of matter, which of course must be accepted as given, increasingly serve purpose, just as the properties of concrete and steel serve the purpose of the engineer, for example. In other words, the explanation of evolution is not adaptation *to* environment, but adaptation *of* environment. The perfectly adapted creature is, in fact, from the point of view of purpose, a failure; it is to the creature with a problem (*pace* Freud and Adler) that we must look for progress.

Purpose is served by the genetic mechanism especially as regards structure; but there is another mechanism parallel to it, and in man of immense importance; it may be called external, or non-genetic, inheritance, in contrast to internal genetic inheritance. Probably it is synonymous with what is called the cultural tradition, in the comprehensive sense of these words. The cultural inheritance exists among animals, though to what extent we do not know—so that we are not dealing with anything specifically human; but in humans its significance is so much greater that it amounts almost to a difference in kind. And that is why lability is such an important achievement—it allows culture to superimpose on the genetic structure greater and greater modifications *within the life-time of the individual*.

(To be continued)

SOUTHERN AFRICA AND THE WORLD CRISIS. Extra copies of The Social Crediter containing this article are available at 1/0 per set (*posted*).

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.