

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 12.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

BY BRYAN W. MONAHAN

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

(Continued)

IV. THE DIMENSIONS OF MIND

To grasp the significance of the possible evolutionary development, it is necessary to differentiate between what may, for convenience, be called the two-dimensional and the three-dimensional activity of mind. The former is exemplified in knowledge, as contrasted with the latter in understanding.

It so happens that there is a word in use which depends on the distinction between knowledge and understanding: *insight*. The use of this word probably derives from the fact that a particular sort of experience is associated with understanding—an experience of mental direction in a plane different to that of the acquisition of knowledge. Thus we have “insight” and “depth” of understanding, as differentiated from “width” of knowledge—usages embodied in our language, of which the referends are not conceived by all who use the terms.

In the sense used here, “dimensions” of mental activity has the meaning not of a special concept, but the generalised mathematical meaning. Knowledge is a two-dimensional pattern, and that pattern, apprehended by the mind from a point in a third dimension, is comprehended as a pattern; this comprehension is understanding. Thus understanding is related to the notion of perspective.

It is characteristic of insight that it is virtually instantaneous (although, of course, purposeful mental effort may precede it). This is perfectly explicable. Knowledge is antecedent to understanding; understanding is a “view” of knowledge from a particular psychic standpoint. That “view” when obtained, and if to be communicated, requires formulation. But the formulation is essentially a separate matter, and may itself require ratiocination. The formulation is a temporal sequence, which distinguishes it in kind from the understanding in which it had its origin. It must be taken in its sequence; but the understanding of the formulation, once obtained, has the same instantaneous quality, and endures as a whole, in the same way as the original insight. Moreover, the understanding may be re-formulated in another sequence. It is clear that the endurance of an understanding, or of a concept, is dimensionally different from its sequential exposition.

It is essential to realise that language is merely a mechanism, and in itself, in this context, possesses no significance. The realisation, perhaps, is not easy, depending on some-what subtle

introspection. It may possibly be gained in this way, at least by those with cognate experience: anyone who has examined say a piece of machinery with the intention of discovering how it works, will realise that the mental process involved is one of non-verbal cognition, with non-verbal concepts derived from cognate experience. This process, however, is general, but since it is accompanied by verbal processes (relevant or irrelevant), it passes for the most part unrecognised. Yet this non-verbal activity is the actual mental process; verbalism is an epiphenomenon.

Except in the sense discussed next, I do not consider that language is a mechanism of thought at all. It is primarily a mechanism of communication between individuals. Secondly, it is mathematics—a means of calculation which thought can use. Ratiocination is, in fact, calculation. And just as space-time has proved to be non-Euclidean, so some proportion of Reality is non-syllogistic. Probably one of the major and most dangerous delusions of our time is the idea that Reality conforms to syntax. Language is only “true” in the same way as Euclidean geometry is true; it is, properly used, self-consistent—its truth is immanent; but only if its terms, relations and operations bear a one/one relation to a fragment of Reality is the truth of a proposition transcendent. Even this truth can rarely, if ever, be exhaustive, because Reality can be conceived only in fragments. With this qualification, however, language is capable of being used, exactly as mathematics is used, for the investigation of Reality, though with much less precision. But the qualification is frequently—in fact usually—unrecognised, so the brilliant logicians, such as Bertrand Russell, are led to realistically non-sensical conclusions.

The real importance of language lies in its use for communication, and for the embodiment of discovery. The task of the communicator is essentially a craftsman’s task—the embodiment of concept. Language, in this, is both instrument and material, and communication is limited by its limitations. The procedure, however, is a craft. The communicator of knowledge or of understanding is faced with the task of utilising his material to produce something which bears the same relation to Reality as say an engineering design bears to the completed project. A careful writer will choose one word rather than another; and this process gives us a key to understanding what he is doing; the process of rejection and selection of particular words and constructions implies the existence of a non-verbal concept to which they are referred for suitably. Such a process requires, but all too seldom

(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 fee: One year 45/-, Six months 22/6.

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

The week ending August 8th, 1970, saw two gigantic strides towards the culmination of the conspiracy to establish an impregnable World Government; a renewed German-Russian non-'aggression' pact, and the adoption of the 'Nixon' plan for a 90-day cease-fire in the Middle East. The former signalises the informal but effective conquest of Europe and demise of NATO; the latter presages 'Russian control of the Suez Canal and strategic dominance of the Indian Ocean. Desmond Wettern, Naval Correspondent for the *Sunday Telegraph*, reports (August 2, 1970) that Russia is stockpiling arms "every month" in Socotra and Aden, and has laid down heavy mooring buoys for large ships off the Seychelles. It could hardly be said that these effects are the result of the Wilson Administration's East of Suez policy; but it can be said that that policy was in accord with Russian objectives in the area. And it can also be said that Mr. Heath's Administration has no more hope than a feather in hell of retrieving the situation unless America is to guarantee nuclear protection for the several years which would be required to secure the maintenance of a fleet in the Indian Ocean, which, as Sir John Glubb points out, is essential for the survival of Britain "as a whole", i.e., as a national entity.

From a strategic point of view, the Cold War is over, a victory for "the art of using diplomacy and armed strength as a single integrated system". The remaining question is whether rebellion is still possible. It cannot be armed rebellion unless the Insiders in Washington are overthrown; the integrated global opposition to the arming of the Republic of South Africa is evidence enough of that. The only practicable rebellion in sight is the implementation of financial unorthodoxy, combined with exposure to the forces behind such instrumentalities of World Government as the International Monetary Fund; for, as *The Times* (August 1, 1970) remarks editorially, "In fact in the period from 1966 to the present day, British economic policy has been strongly influenced and almost at times controlled by the International Monetary Fund and by official foreign creditors. We may have been sovereign, but we were not our own masters." What is Mr. Heath going to do about that?

Of course, *The Times* is freely admitting only so much of the plot as is already widely obvious; in fact, British economic policy

has been largely controlled ever since the end, or perhaps the middle, of the First World War, and the only real service the Heath Administration can render the British at this juncture is to document and expose the fact. In *The Brief For The Prosecution*, C. H. Douglas outlined the indictment; our survival depends on pressing it home, and regaining mastery of our economic policy; the way to do that is progressively to restore the purchasing power of currency and eliminate confiscatory taxation.

According to figures given in Compton's Encyclopaedia, leisure has increased by fifteen hours, from 57 to 72, in the fifty-six years from 1900 to 1956—an average of about 17 minutes per year. In the same time, productivity has probably increased by a factor of over 100. All that has happened, of course, is that labour "saving" machinery and advanced technology have merely allowed workers to do more work and squandered resources, particularly of fuel, which are ultimately irreplaceable, and calculated to last only another two or three thousand years. And yet the idiot economists are still screaming for more "employment", being themselves in the employ of those to whom the industrial system is basically a system of government.

Sovereignty

The following letter to the Editor was "considered carefully", but the Editor was "unable" to print it.

To The Editor,
The Times,
Printing House Square,
London, E.C.4.

Sir,

The writer of the leading article today — "Choice for Europe" — in describing Britain's new "chief negotiator" remarks, "he is not a first class orator." The article appears to suggest that a trick of oratory can convert the British public to belief in the Common Market.

It may well be that *The Times*, in this connection, will find itself as much the victim of wishful thinking as it was proved to be in the matter of Mr. Enoch Powell and the General Election (leading article, "How Fall'n, How Changed", June 15, 1970).

The apparent collusion between the leaders of the parties on "entry into Europe" cannot disguise the fact that, in the country as a whole, there is deep suspicion. Basically, this is because there is a growing realization that the sovereignty of this nation is at stake.

Hesketh Pearson, in writing of the views of Sydney Smith (*The Smith of Smiths*, 1934) says of his subject something which remains relevant to this day, "He believed in freedom; it was probably the only thing he did entirely believe in; but he knew (what we are only now beginning to find out) that no political party could be trusted with a people's liberties."

Yours faithfully,

Basil L. Steele.

London.

The Huddleston Hubris

The Bishop of Stepney, Dr. Huddleston, has taken it upon himself to pronounce unfavourably on various aspects of British life and policy. In a B.B.C. television interview, he said of the Church that, "as an established Church in London, it is frightfully irrelevant". He further complained that the Church was "not functioning as a revolutionary body". I do not know whether this means, in view of the bishop's political affiliations, that the Church should endorse socialism (*The Church Times*, June 26, 1970). And I wonder what the bishop would do about a movement in Russia which the revolutionaries find disturbing: "The growing threat of Christian revival has recently caused the Soviet Government to send an 'atheist missionary ship' to cruise the inland water of the Vologda province" (*The Times*, September 16, 1969).

The bishop's activities extend beyond Stepney and London, for we find him so addressing 3,000 people in the Abbey Gardens, Bury St. Edmunds, that the local M.P. walked out and "accused the bishop of using a religious service for political ends" (*The Times*, July 13, 1970). The Mayor of Bury St. Edmunds felt that "the M.P. did the right thing". The bishop's remarks concerned arms for South Africa, and the Provost of the Cathedral complained that he never knew "why people should walk out if somebody says something they disagree with" (*The Church Times*, July 17, 1970). Presumably Mr. Griffiths walked out to express his disapproval of the bishop confusing British security with the internal affairs of South Africa.

But neither religion nor British security is receiving very kind treatment at the moment. The Bishop of Coventry complained in the Church Assembly (*Church Times*, July 17, 1970) that the two or three men he alleged to be in control of the form and content of B.B.C. religious programmes had reached an "all-time low" in *Beyond Belief* while in *Songs of Praise*, they provided "as little Christian content as possible in the linking material" and omitted the prayer and blessing at the end. Further, Mr. Goyder said in the House of Laity of the Church Assembly (*Church Times*, July 10, 1970) that the prayer book revisers had replaced absolutes about the standard of God's righteousness "with wishy-washy sentiments, thus accelerating the progress of the permissive society", adding that "all around us authority is challenged". And still more precise, Mr. W. A. Barker, Headmaster of Leys School, Cambridge, writes (*The Times*, July 17, 1970) that "Montefiore, Robinson, Soper, Leach and Huddleston are all men of integrity, but in recent years their public statements, interpreted by the mass media, have bewildered many of us. The hungry sheep look up and are not fed".

As for Britain, we note two items in *The Times*, June 27, 1970, the first describing the commemoration of the 25th anniversary of the signing of the United Nations Charter in Westminster Hall, at which the Queen said, "It is in the United Nations and its work that we can feel ourselves to be citizens of the world. In this ancient hall we look forward to further steps to world government." In the correspondence columns, Mr. R. M. Bell, Q.C., writes about the Treaty of Rome, which contains "248 articles, four annexes, 13 protocols and eight declarations". He says that the consequence of signing the treaty is too vast to hang on a slender margin of votes in the House of Commons, and properly enough concludes, "There should be no question of

accession without the explicit, direct and overwhelming consent of the general body of the people of this country."

Doubtless a man of integrity, sincerity, etc., could get his sums wrong, but when a country or religion is at stake, great importance attaches to finding the right answer — narrow is the way that leads to life, broad the way that leads to destruction.

— H.S.

R.I.P.

W. A. Willox, on 29th July, 1970.

Trevor S. Stewart, in Cape Town, on 11th August, 1970.

Survival of Britain

From Sir John Glubb.

(Published in the *Observer*, August 2, 1970)

SIR,—May I venture to comment on your last Sunday's article by Colin Legum, 'Sir Alec's goodies and baddies', and on your editorial on July 19, 'Lost World of Sir Alec'? I am no party politician and am concerned only with the survival of Britain as a whole.

Your editorial suggested that the reactivation of the Simons-town base was unnecessary and that the Russian Navy would not interfere with our merchant ships except in war. I feel personally that the distinction between peace and war is out of date, as witness Russia's recent assumption of a dominating position in the Middle East by the use of armed forces but without firing a shot. The art of using diplomacy and armed strength together as a single integrated system is one requiring great skill and a high standard of technical proficiency.

To take an example, suppose the Royal Navy is withdrawn from the Indian Ocean and the Russian fleet takes over, and one day begins to stop, obstruct and search British merchant ships. What could we do? The 'aggression' is not sufficient to justify a nuclear war, but if it continues we starve. With no forces in the area, we can only bow to Russia's terms. Only a British fleet in those waters can protect the commerce on which Britain lives.

I submit that we should start on this basis: 'It is essential for our survival to maintain a fleet in the Indian Ocean.' Once this axiom is established, we can move on to discuss the best method to achieve it. We now seem to be arguing furiously over the details before establishing our basic principle.

Meanwhile we are daily losing ground. Mauritius, the ideal naval base for the Indian Ocean, and for 200 years a British colony, has just concluded an agreement with the Soviets. As soon as the Suez Canal is open, the Russians will probably be able to use Aden. This situation is a matter of life and death for Britain and should not become a tool of party politics.

J. B. Glubb.

Mayfield.

The Aims of Education

(continued from page 1)

receives, the converse treatment by the recipient of the communication—a continuous effort at understanding, not the communication, but the Reality symbolised by it, in exactly the same way as an engineer studies a design. I do not think my experience is exceptional, but it is that the majority of people who receive a non-trivial communication simply do not reach Reality through it. They recognise the words and follow the syntax, but do not see the project in the design. The realistic meaning remains unperceived. One can be familiar with a word and with the use of a word, without having first-hand knowledge of its referend.

Unless language is seen in its proper relation, it is probably not possible to progress, at any rate not rapidly, beyond verbalism, as things are. This is a difficulty that must have arisen with increased perfection of language, which has grown from its origin as an instrument of communication to be a thing in itself, an end rather than a means. As such, it has intervened as a curtain between Reality and understanding. Yet much ancient wisdom bears evidence of an understanding vastly beyond the capacity of its language to express it, as well as a comprehension of the inadequacy of language. (As a mental exercise, I recommend the elucidation of the expression "paradox: ambiguity".)

What we find at any level of evolutionary development (in the man-line) is a mechanism evolved which may be mistaken, broadly at that level, for that "something" of which purpose is an aspect. Progress involves the reduction of that mechanism to its subordinate position—its relegation to automaticity—; the mechanism must be passed through consciousness, but beyond it. The mechanism must first be recognised as a mechanism, then understood in its setting. The technique of the instrumental virtuoso is unconscious; he is concerned only with the interpretation of his music; but it is evident to an observer that the learner has technique in itself as an end in itself as a preliminary stage.

The next point to grasp is the difference between understanding and memory. Memory, for our present limited purpose, is simply a form of knowledge. It is knowledge which can be recalled, and as such may include knowledge of an understanding. Understanding, however, is a mental development in another dimension. It is equivalent on the mental plane to a new bodily development on the material plane. Every new understanding is a new attribute of mind; the mind is altered thereby just as the body would be by the acquisition of a new function. Thus the pattern of all future knowledge will be comprehended differently as a result of each understanding gained.

But we can go further than this. Understanding itself can be understood, made a habit, and subordinated as a mechanism. In this way we can approach the direct perception of Reality as a matter of course. This, I believe, marks a fresh stage in evolutionary development. Understanding itself is an emancipation of purpose from some limitations, and of this emancipation we need to be conscious, in order to pass beyond it. It appears probable that emancipation of purpose may be an acceleration when consciously pursued in the light of automatic understanding. The direction of evolution certainly indicates the emergence of super-men; but the emergence will not be on the material

plane where materialists at present anticipate it. The materialist never looks for anything but the hypertrophy of present capacities; he is, accordingly, a mental Crustacean.

It follows from the nature of understanding that it cannot be taught, any more than vision can be taught. Those who wish to achieve conscious control of understanding must first, by contemplation and introspection, differentiate from the total flux of experience the element that is understanding. Isolated, it must be brought into consciousness. It is a recognisable, but indescribable experience. Once gained, the recognition of the experience can be applied to the understanding of other experience, and to the penetration of the mechanism of language to the Reality underlying it.

It may be added here, because of a wide-spread misconception of the subject, that delving into the unconscious brings, not progress, but retrogression. It may, possibly, be helpful occasionally in the same way as a surgical operation may be necessary occasionally on a diseased physique. It seems more probable, however, that mental disorder will respond best to a correct orientation of purpose; but this is a discussion outside the scope of these articles.

(To be continued)

The Pugwash Conference

Selected leaders from thirty-five nations on both sides of the Iron Curtain will meet in Chicago and Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, from September eighth to fifteenth, for the twentieth session of the subversive Pugwash Conference. Announcement of the programme was made by Pugwash President Eugene Rabinowich and Will R. Polk, President of the Adlai Stevenson Institute. (The latter is the sponsoring organization for the meetings in America.)

U.S. participants will be selected by the American Academy Of Arts And Sciences and the National Academy Of Science; Soviet representatives by the Soviet Academy Of Science. They will discuss: International Security; Disarmament And Arms Limitation; International Cooperation In Science And Technology; and, Technological Aspects Of Development.

—M.P.W. in *The Review of The News*, July 8, 1970.

The Rising Toll in South-East Asia

Saigon, June 25 — Officials of the U.S. Command report that 80 Americans were killed in Vietnam and Cambodia last week and 643 were wounded. These figures bring total U.S. combat casualties since 1961 to 42,754 killed, 281,701 wounded, and more than 1,500 listed as missing or captured. Another 8,000 Americans have died as a result of so-called non-hostile causes such as accidents and illness. South Vietnamese losses for the week are put at 366 men killed and 1,017 wounded, bringing their death toll for the war to 112,358. An estimated 652,296 Communists have been killed during the same period. (Since the war talks began in Paris more than 25 months ago, 20,140 Americans have died in combat.)

—*The Review of The News*, July 8, 1970.

Circular Press Limited, Colwyn Bay.