

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

## FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 50. No. 13

SATURDAY, 19 SEPTEMBER, 1970

1s. 3d. Fortnightly

### THE AIMS OF EDUCATION

BY BRYAN W. MONAHAN

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

(Continued)

#### V. EDUCATION

We have seen that evolution in the man-line has been towards lack of adaptation of the individual to his environment towards the replacement of organisation of the non-vegetative functions by a condition of lability. This event is subserved by the genetic mechanism, which as a mechanism, is irrelevant to the present enquiry. Organisation of the non-vegetative functions, highly developed in some animals, is virtually absent in the human infant. The infant possesses little more than a potential for development. This potential is manifested in several vague directions — type of behaviour which we recognise as the instincts; but within and beyond the frame-work of these the development of the individual is free to proceed to extraordinary differentiation.

At birth the infant meets problems posed by its environment. Its capacity to deal with these is, practically speaking, nil; it is completely dependent on outside assistance. Knowledge of the answers to the problems is not inborn, as it is to varying degrees in other animals. In so far as standard solutions are pragmatically satisfactory, and correspondingly invariable, they are passed from parent to off-spring not through the genetic mechanism, but by virtue of lability. Thus so far from inheriting certain acquired abilities, we have lost some possessed by other animals. This change of mechanism clearly allows "variation" to become effective infinitely more rapidly than genetic variation, whether the latter is (as is by no means proved) or is not "spontaneous" and haphazard.

Once the full significance of lability is grasped, it can be seen how immensely significant the cultural environment must be. Certain answers to problems are so standardised as to be equivalent to inborn, or genetic, answers; nevertheless they are passed from one generation to the next entirely through the cultural inheritance, and unquestioned and unrecognised for what they are. What has to be realised is that the individual is a product of these answers (which might almost be described as "cultural genes"). I shall, however, refer to all these "factors" as cultural elements, in practically the same sense as he is a product of his genes. He is, in fact, the resultant of both.

It is quite impossible to know how the individual would develop if he were fully isolated at birth from the cultural tradition, for the simple reason that he would not survive. Any individual, therefore, available for observation must embody some cultural elements. His environment as he first

sees and hears it is a product and portion of the cultural tradition. Any element of this tradition is highly complex, as shown by Tudor Jones (*Fig Tree*, September, 1936). Now although, and especially in a given Society, the initial cultural elements may be very standardised, the infant is at birth extremely labile, so that almost imperceptible differences will be much more significant to the infant than they would appear to be to the adult observer. This is as if cultural elements were showing "mutations". These elements enter into the structure of the developing personality, and consequently play their part in governing the interaction of the personality with its environment. This interaction itself becomes part of the environment, so that the initial effect is magnified. For example, if an infant is made angry, and reacts violently against its environment, it suffers the reaction of the environment, and undergoes some particular experience. The effect of this experience, however, may vary with its relation to previous development. If this line of thought be pursued, it becomes evident that environment is extraordinarily subtle and variable, even when to the observer it appears to be fully standardised. The "same home" provides an infinity of different environments for its children. This concept can be analysed and developed at great length.

It is evident that through this mechanism the child acquires many and varied differences; these in turn affect all subsequent acquisitions of cultural differences, though clearly to varying degrees. They affect the *direction* of subsequent development, and this direction may appear as an aptitude. An "aptitude" of this derivation is clearly not genetically transmissible.

This part of the discussion may be summarised and symbolised in the statement that mental development consists of the development of mental "organisation", and that such development is predominantly and increasingly cultural, and not genetic; its physical basis is lability, which has emerged from the genetic mechanism. This conception enables us to define the essential objective of education. We may say that the problem of education is the problem of ensuring the provision of the cultural material to enable the purpose embodied in the individual to build mental structure by serial decisions of acceptance and rejection.

The subjective aspect of a cultural element is, in the broad sense, a belief. This belief may, of course, be true or false. Beliefs differentiate men as effectively on the mental plane as genetic differences on the physical differentiate animals

(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 *Daily Express*, 17 Aug. 1970:

“Washington, Sunday—

“The Nixon Administration is proposing sharp cuts in America’s 300,000-man military force in Western Europe.

“Informed sources believe that at the Brussels Nato Ministers’ meeting in December America will suggest that the cold war thaw could give the chance for mutual force reductions by Nato and Warsaw Pact nations.”

The term “thaw” means to pass from a state of icy immobility to a state of movement. The “cold war” has meant immobility on the part of NATO, but not on the part of the Warsaw Pact countries. The “invasion” of Czechoslovakia was, in fact, a logistical move of the greatest significance, quite comparable to the occupation of the Sudetenland by Germany as a prelude to World War II. Russian forces, and stock-piles, and communications, are in Czechoslovakia; but the Russians say, merely to enforce the Brezhnev Doctrine; which means that these troops could not participate in any “mutual” withdrawal of forces. Furthermore, the Russian troops in the Middle East are there to protect the Arabs from ‘invasion’ by Israel, so they too could hardly be expected to withdraw.

Commenting, more or less, on this situation, the leading article in the *Daily Telegraph* (17 August, 1970) says: “President Nixon, despite America’s vastly superior wealth, must use every trick of the political trade to show Russia that she will not be allowed to win the arms race and then dictate terms . . . If Western European forces *continue* (our emphasis) to run down unilaterally, goodbye to all hopes of anything like a level bargain with the Russians”. But the *Telegraph* also says: “Russia is able to outnumber NATO by more than two to one, to build a world-wide navy and to threaten to out-build America on missiles.” This means, if correct, that Russia *has won* the arms race, unless it be supposed that this superiority has come about by chance. But to anyone who can see that “Russia” and “America” are but two arms of a single Conspiracy to achieve a monolithic World Government, the notion of chance is but delusion with, on the part of honest commentators, a high degree of wishful thinking.

With an eye on Russia only, the *Telegraph* describes the situation as “the recipe for world domination”! What else?

In short, if the Moscow-Bonn Axis proposes to “dictate terms” to Europe, it is already in a position to do so, and the “tricks of the political trade” are simply tricks to blind the Common Man to the actual reality of the moves that have been and are being made. To imagine that Russia, having achieved superiority, would allow the attainment of “balanced forces” is like imagining that a Socialist millionaire would divide all his wealth equally among the poor.

Grim and deadly though the situation is, there remains, for the time being, a possible way out. The last thing the Conspirators want, or could even afford, is a large-scale war. The credible *threat* of war, yes; but war that would destroy the assets on which their power depends, decidedly no. But that cherished power is exercised through financial manipulation, and a challenge to that power of manipulation would pose to them that very threat of war which would end not only their power, but even their physical existence. Any attempt to overcome Russia’s European superiority would be denounced as ‘aggression’, and dealt with accordingly, but rectification of the economic system, which would be fatal to the aspirations of the Internationalists, would have to be countered by *actual* aggression, which this time could be deterred by a determination to use nuclear weapons if necessary. This implies the risk of sudden annihilation, as against the certainty of a not very gradual national obliteration. The idea that if Communism conquered the world, all the peoples of the world would thereby achieve the American standard of living, is too silly to discuss.

## QUESTIONS OF CONSCIENCE

Mr. Michael Carden asked the most penetrating question of the month in a brief letter to *The Times* (25 July, 1970): “I wonder”, he says, “what nationality the Bishop of Stepney would find compatible with his conscience?”. The Bishop’s letter to *The Times* (23 July, 1970) has provoked the question, for Dr. Huddleston had said that it was only too easy to appear self-righteous when dealing with issues of international morality, adding that “the critical issue for myself is how much longer I can accept the privileges of British citizenship when I no longer believe in the integrity of British intentions towards the peoples of Africa”.

A few days later an editorial in the *Daily Telegraph* (29 July, 1970) headed “From the Russian Depths” pointed out that any abuse of power in a free country is “fair game for publicity”, but that three Russian dissidents had recorded a television programme secretly in Moscow which did something to “put the balance right”. The programme described hounding by secret police, torture, slave labour camps, and the horror of certification as insane of the régime’s opponents who are then shut up in lunatic asylums “where mind-destroying drugs are used on them.”

Doubtless the Bishop of Stepney would agree that such practices are “an affront to the Christian doctrine of man” which is his description of apartheid in South Africa. Yet his attacks on the white peoples in general and on South Africa in particular have tended to advance the interests of the

brutal Soviet régime by sowing discord among the Western nations and actually weakening their defences.

In fact we find a note in *RSA World* (Fourth issue, 1970) which complains that "around 1960, two political priests and avowed enemies of South Africa — Father Trevor Huddleston and the Rev. Michael Scott — began their agitation. They were joined by the communists and at the 1962 congress of the (Olympic) Movement, Russia pressed for South Africa's exclusion". The same issue reports that in June "the last of South Africa's seven Bantu nations — the Zulus — having opted for apartheid, were given their Territorial Authority and set on the road to independence". And Dr. Cyril Northcote Parkinson, after noting that "there seems to be nothing more intolerant than liberal opinion" and that it considers that whatever South Africa does is wrong, concludes that in South Africa "the problem is infinitely more complex than the liberal demonstrators realise".

We shall doubtless hear plenty more from the "liberal" clerics about South Africa, very little about Russia, and they will sponsor no demonstrations against Russian athletes or entertainers. Yet we find (*Church of England Newspaper/Record*, 7 August, 1970) Betty Best reporting an interview with a South African clergyman who dissents from John Laurence's view that apartheid is "a mass killer of black South African children". The Rev. John Matthews was drawn to the southern hemisphere by Bishop Huddleston's "Naught for your Comfort", but he "criticises England's moral judgment of the land he has come to love and admire". For the English have little knowledge of the true facts and their strictures will push the South African into his "laager" or barricade mentality.

John Matthews admits that distress may arise but asks, "What would be the alternative? Absolute chaos". The Church, he says, is bound to uphold the country's law and order, also to demonstrate the Christian rule of love, and does reach out to help with orphanages and feeding schemes. But advice from countries who are not managing their own affairs adequately will be resented, sanctions hit the non-European first, and outside attacks will harden the laager withdrawal into a determined policy "which intends to avoid at all costs any repetition of the tragedies enacted in the Congo, Biafra and Kenya. Who are we to blame them?".

— H.S.

## COMPUTERISED DOSSIERS

Vast computerised and microfilmed files, containing information on "persons of interest", many of whom have no criminal records, are now being compiled by agencies of the federal government. Senator Sam J. Ervin (D.-North Carolina) believes that this procedure is leading the country toward a "police state". The Senator, Chairman of the Senate Sub-Committee on Constitutional Rights, adds that the government files are pushing the country toward "a mass surveillance system unprecedented in American history". In the interconnection of government files of such data, the Senator concludes, "there rests a potential for control and intimidation that is alien to our form of government and foreign to a society of free men".

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

## The Myth of the Trades Union

*The following article is repeated from our issue for 8 March, 1958:*

By reason of its chameleon-like disguises, MONOPOLY often escapes notice under the label of some particular embodiment of it. When Social Crediters drew attention to the dominance of Finance in the years of the Armistice, they were merely (and the better-informed of them realised the fact) dealing with something which, *at that time*, occupied an almost unique position astride the world of production and distribution — a position derived from its peculiar claim to synthesise *value*, or wealth. Major Douglas has frequently deplored the undue emphasis on the later chapters of *Economic Democracy*. The pathetic inability of many otherwise intelligent people to penetrate below the appearance to the MONOPOLY, which was the thing-in-itself, has been demonstrated by the almost universal clamour, until it was too late, for the "nationalisation", *i.e.* complete centralisation and MONOPOLY, under an uncontrolled and uncontrollable anonymity, of Banking and Currency.

But the phenomenon is far from standing alone. For generations and almost without protest the Myth of the Trades Union, *i.e.* the MONOPOLY of Public Service, has gone forth.

The Myth takes the form that Trades Unionism is inherently good; a marvellous gift to suffering humanity; that British Trades Unionism in particular is the primary cause of the "emancipation" of "the worker", and that to attack Trades Unionism is just a Tory demonstration of obsolete reaction. Trades Unionism is MONOPOLY and inherently bad and anti-social.

The first point to notice is that Trades Unionism, like every other monopolistic economic practice, is directed against the consumer, consumption being the only aspect of the human individual which is recognisably universal. With that Satanic ingenuity which suggests its origin, Trades Union propaganda never admitted this; its adversary was always the "rapacious" employer, the man who had the brains, the enterprise and the courage to come out of the rut, to try something new, and, to take the responsibility for it. But, in his turn, the employer was instructed, probably from the same source, that the attack of the Labour MONOPOLY could be passed on to the Individual, the consumer, by monopolistic price rings, Trade Associations, Trusts and similar devices. Clearly, the logical next step was the Mond-Turner Conference to unify Labour and Management into a Production MONOPOLY which would eventually deal only with the Individual through a Distribution MONOPOLY, of which the Co-Operative Societies would be the shop-front but would either give place to, or be wholly controlled by, the not-very-shadowy PLANNERS, the MONOPOLY OF POWER, P.E.P.

### THE MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

#### A Personal Interpretation

by SIR JOHN GLUBB

Sir John Glubb (Glubb Pasha) reveals his expert knowledge of the Middle East and deals with Russia's role there.

4/6 posted

K.R.P. Publications Ltd.

245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11

**The Aims of Education***(continued from page 1)*

into species. Certain beliefs divide men into immiscible groups. There is, I believe, a true speciation of human beings which has developed away from the genetic mechanism. Its aim is differentiation; there is no significance in the emergence of its mechanism (lability) if differentiation does not occur.

It is obvious that anything in the nature of standardised education is in flat contradiction to the direction of evolution. The infant possesses at birth a potential for development which is gradually exhausted, and a potential for differentiation which is gradually exhausted, and a potential for differentiation which is gradually modified as the result of the differentiation already progressively achieved. Certain biases to the direction of differentiation are given willy-nilly from the moment of birth by the immediate comprehensive environment, and the cultural material of the environment is always a factor throughout life. But purpose emerges in the child, and accepts or rejects the cultural elements available so far as it can discriminate them.

The only overriding policy of education which is consistent with the observable trend of evolution is first to aim at the conscious emancipation of purpose, the second to aim at the emergence of conscious understanding. The technique of this policy is to aim at the reduction of any aim through consciousness to automaticity, so that each aim becomes a mechanism to be transcended in its turn by purpose. Thus the alphabet is learnt for the sake of words; words for the symbolisation of concept; concept for understanding.

The converse policy is that of canalising the individual's development potential in accordance with a pre-arranged pattern — in accordance with some other individual's purpose — or even with some disembodied purpose, a collective purpose such as has already been achieved to a high degree of perfection particularly in the insect world, and there by the genetic mechanism. I repeat, lability has no significance except as a mechanism to permit a high degree of differentiation. The world of living things consists almost entirely of examples of purpose confined by the mechanisms it has devised. Man is the exception. The collectivist idea really is a barrier to progress in just the same sense as the ventral development of a nervous cord proved to be at the epoch when the decision was made. Human progress does not lie in the physical sphere, although no doubt development may there be looked for. Our progress lies in the third dimension of mind in the continuous supercession of achieved mechanisms; possibly, conceivably, in other dimensions still. The fundamental law of the physical world is the law of entropy; the first achievement of purpose was to reverse it. That was the earliest organic problem. The mechanism devised was sub-ordinated, and made to subserve function. But then function was subordinated to integration, and integration in turn to investigation, investigation to knowledge, and knowledge to understanding. Any one of these stages could be pursued as an end in itself, could undergo enormous elaboration; but elaboration or expansion is not progress. Extrapolation suggests that the next step for us is automatic understanding, the step to which is the recognition of the significance of our own evolution, and the conscious discrimination of its present end-point. Thus education must be applied to the emancipation of purpose. This will probably

be achieved by such a cultivation of understanding as will lead to the child's acquiring early the ability to educate itself.

It will probably be realised that this is a problem of dimensions; cultural elements may be one, two, or three dimensional; probably, ultimately, more. But I do not wish to pursue this aspect here.

The starting point of education is the child's curiosity, which is the expression of its potential for development and differentiation on the mental plane. The teacher's part is not to canalise, but to assist, by the provision of cultural material as requested, with developing insight, by the child. It is a striking characteristic of a child, from infancy onwards, who is not interfered with, that it has a pronounced continuity of development, combined with a tremendous capacity for concentration. These characteristics are greatly modified in most adults. We find them disintegrated in most of their aspects. This is the result of interference and distraction, from infancy onwards: it can be verified by simple observation in almost any home.

The basis of educational policy can only lie, I believe, in understanding in that ultimate sense previously discussed, for here we are at the growing point of our true progress, which is affected as never before by our understanding of its direction. A new and genuine emancipation lies ahead, awaiting our recognition of its possibility.

*(Concluded)***AMERICAN OPINION "SCOREBOARD 1970"****9/6 posted****K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London, E.11.****Centralisation**

It is quite beyond dispute that, whether we prefer to use the vocabulary of the Church, and to call the present struggle the War between Christ and Anti-Christ, or to pander to that curious vogue of depersonalisation which pretends that policies can exist without politicians, and so talk of "the trend to centralisation", "The Common Good" or other abstractionist phrases, the Thing in Itself is there for anyone to see. And, as seems always to be the case, "perversion" is the key word to an understanding of it. Unless we are to adopt the Manichaeian Heresy, and believe that matter, material, is in itself essentially evil, then it is tool-power politics, and not tool-power, which is threatening us with destruction. To say that this matter is of primary importance is banal. We have to make up our minds, and act upon our decisions, as to whether the world can produce tool-users whose politics are fitted to justify the possession of their tools: or whether our only hope is to break up the tools. It is along the lines of the first idea that the arguments of centralisation lie: and, like a gigantic question mark, we see in this direction the well-known words of Lord Acton: "All power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

*— The Social Crediter, 17 May, 1958***ERRATUM**

In our last issue, line 9 of paragraph 1, column 2, page 2, should read "calculated to last only about another five hundred years" (not two or three thousand).