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[**] 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 spatial 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 physical 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 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 concept, possesses no significance. The realisation, perhaps, is not easy, depending on somewhat 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. Secondarily, 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 that brilliant logicians, such as Bertrand Russell, are led to realistically nonsensical 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 suitability. Such a process requires, but all too seldom 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 except-
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For the individual, Social Credit represents, so to speak, a
view-point from which to ‘see’ events, and accordingly, a Social Crediter is not one who ‘believes in’ Social Credit, but one who deals with problems from the Social Credit
point of view. It is in this way that Social Credit comprehends so much more than political economy alone, since so much else affects political economy, and needs to be seen
in the perspective afforded by the Social Credit frame of
reference. Thus Douglas dealt with the problems of the
land, of the Constitution, of the Church, to mention only a
few large subjects, in a way which was only possible in the
light of the revelation of Social Credit.

Every day, of course, raises problems, from those of
the personal to those of the international level; and the task
of the true Social Crediter is to deal with each as faithfully
and as competently as is in his power, and with as careful
a discrimination as possible. All too often, indeed, the
problem is which problem to leave alone, as contributing
little or nothing to the ultimate solution we strive after, or
even, and worse, dissipating energy sorely needed on the main
front of the battle. Our opponents can—and do—raise quite
enough problems on the ‘arithmetical’ level to delay our progress
in higher mathematics. To change the metaphor, we have always to be sure that the road-block we propose to
demolish is a block on the road we wish to travel, and not a
decoy to indicate a false trail. The road we must follow is
leading to the monopoly of credit; and our objective,
when we get there, is to decentralise the control of credit.
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In our last issue (April 28) there were two typographical
errors under the title of “Eight Eminent Economists.”

In the introduction to Dr. Monahan’s letters to The
Canberra Times, the date of publication in the second line
should have read March 14.

The question quoted in the first paragraph of the third
letter, page 3 second column, should have read “If imports
greatly exceed exports . . . ?”
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Equality

“The tendency to argue from the particular to the general
is a special case of the sequence from materialism to
collectivism. If the world is reduced to molecules, ultimately we can dispense with a catalogue and a
dictionary, all things are the same thing, and all words
are just sounds—molecules in motion. That is the
ultimate meaning of Equality—having no quality.”

—C.H. Douglas in The Brief for the Prosecution (Preface)

It must surely be an illusion that there is any real
incompatibility or cause for rivalry between the concepts
of Quality and Quantity. And yet if you look sufficiently
deply into human motives, you will find that it is just
this illusion that constitutes the fissure that divides modern
society. How has this come about? Since Quality, being
an attribute or effect of Truth, is like its cause unlimited,
and therefore can provide no valid subject for competition,
which involves the idea of limitation. If that argument is
correct, one has only to establish Quality, or relative per-
fection, as a political objective, to remove from human
consciousness all grounds for contention of any sort; for by
doing so all fear or sense of limitation is disposed of auto-
matically. It is by this same mental process that the pure
scientists and mathematicians have arrived at their brilliant
discoveries the crude and somewhat hasty application of
which has had such a shattering effect on our post-Baconian
universe, releasing the pent-up energies of the physicists from
the terrified grip of Classic deductive orthodoxy, upon the
apparently defenceless human personality of our times.

Douglas never allowed students of his writings to go for
long unreminisced of his own firm conviction that the basis
of all unconstitutional intrigue and revolution was the force
or motive-power of cultural—more narrowly termed class
—jealousy; in the jargon of modern psychology, the inferiority-complex. He saw it as an irreverent and vicious
attack on Quality, as such; the satanic hatred of the naturally
inferior mentality for the naturally superior. This is the
fundamental human conflict; the still-unresolved world issue,
expressed symbolically in the story of the rebellion of Satan,
and his expulsion from heaven,—‘like lightning from the
sky’,—and historically typified in the circumstances of the
earthly career of Jesus of Nazareth. It was the objective
of this career, the function of its circumstantial events, to
prove the present reality of what he called The Kingdom;
showing it to be neither more nor less than an understanding
of the vital importance of Truth in the absolute, objective
sense—the correct facts, whatever they might be, on this
relative plane of consciousness,—as an invariable priority.
And he promised his hearers, as a practical result of this
understanding, faithfully followed out, that “all these
things”—desirable and satisfying effects of every conceivable
kind, but of a secondary nature mathematically speaking,
which in their human impatience they persisted in putting
first,—would follow naturally and comparatively easily,
having assumed their correct relationship and sequence to
Truth and to one another.

Francis Bacon, in the very first paragraph of his Great
Instauration (Reform) reaffirmed exactly the same idea,
to which we now give the name of Induction or the inductive
method. He expressed it in rather different terms, and with
less authority, as became him and the circumstances; specu-
latively, “whether that commerce between the mind of man
and the nature of things, which is more precious than any-
th ing . . . that is on earth, might . . . be restored . . .” 
His plea, however, was the same; for the reinstatement of 
truth—the relatively correct facts—as a priority. In short 
it amounted to this, the substitution as an object of research, 
of the understanding of Nature in place of the attempt to 
exploit her. And it is to the awful potency of this simple 
suggestion, employed as a disciplinary formula, that all the 
literally overwhelming achievements of the modern physicists 
in the last hundred and fifty years or so, must be attributed. 
Unbalanced and over-hasty as was the Industrial Revolution, 
and as a demonstration of the truth of the matter, so partial 
and misleading, never the less, it was through the agency 
of the physicists in their application of the discoveries of the 
abstract scientists, that the so-called “problem” of the 
physical development of civilized society, which for 
thousands of years had remained frozen, was resolved. As 
Douglas so often quoted, “First things first;” not however, 
employing it merely as a useful sounding cliche, but proceed-
ing from that point, and with complete success at the first 
attempt, to prove inductively the practical effectiveness of his 
belief, by disclosing the entirely illusionary nature of the “so-
called problem” of distribution, which had baffled, and will 
continue to baffle, all those who persist in tackling it from 
the wrong, the deductive end. As we know, he did even 
more than that; for along with this useful discovery, and as 
a secondary effect of it, he developed a simple means by 
which the error could be adjusted with a minimum of tech-
nical upset.

It is the conscious cultivation of this mental attitude, 
the Christian climate of The Kingdom or self-governed 
domination of the mind, that is destined to release the pressure 
of the expanding intelligence of the age. Actual experience 
forces one to the conclusion that nothing less fundamental 
could possibly restore the present alarming loss of balance, 
produced by the exclusively physical application of the Bac-
onian formula, in conjunction with the prevailing ignorance 
of the vital necessity for a counter-balancing metaphysical 
application. It is surely unthinkable that a real Renaissance 
or rebirth could possibly come about through any centrally-
controlled and promoted means, such as are, of their very 
nature, deductive and dictatorial. As Douglas puts it, “The 
tendency to argue from the particular to the general is a special 
case of the sequence from materialism to collectivism.” 
It is not improbable that this rebirth, if and when it does come, 
will appear in the form of a simultaneous development in the 
individual consciousness of an influential sophisticated 
minority of a separate Heaven, or haven of individual mental 
immunity; a new power of resistance to exactly that particular, 
occult and collective form of mental conditioning. This is the 
process referred to by Douglas as de-mesmerization; producing 
just the relative paradise that the circumstances demand, to 
replace the obsolescent spatially-located Heaven of the prevalent, 
mediaevally-simplified mentality, which not withstanding the natural, organic, loveliness of its faith, lacks the essential integrity of understanding which 
the present pressure of events demands. Nothing less 
intrinsic than a constitutional change of mind, or reform in 
depth of that kind in the individual, could possibly have 
sufficient authority to rescue the modern, University-trained 
Intelectual, the spineless schizophrenic of the Burgess-Mc-
Clean type, lost in the arid and purposeless wastes of 
dialectical materialism. It would be sheer waste of time 
expecting anything, any movement whatsoever not strongly 
reinforced by metaphysical understanding, to arrest, for 
instance, the present stampede into the ranks of the mass-
produced “scientists” and chemists choking the entrances 
to our universities in order to qualify as the galley-slaves 
of the approaching Work State; itself a general concept de-
duced from the particular experience of a single, and possibly 
singular, race.

There is nothing esoteric or “mystically religious” in what 
is stated here; though it could in fact stand for a definition of Christianity. For, as we have seen, the mental 
climate of The Kingdom is as far removed from the academic 
exclusive inclusiveness of the ethical expert, as is the Baconian, 
inductive method from that of the Aristotelian Schoolmen, 
who as we now realize, held up—whether for good or ill, who 
shall say—the material progress of man-kind in their jealous 
and terrified grip for thousands of years. One is just dealing 
with the historical facts as demonstration of the potency of 
absolute Truth accepted as a priority; not only as an end 
in itself, but relatifely as well, as the true means to its own end. 
For to elevate abstract, absolute, Truth to Its right 
and natural position, is automatically to establish the relative 
truth, or—coming back to that aspect of the matter with 
which we started—Quality, as our aim, thus sub-consciously 
invoking the relative Kingdom, with all its beneficial conse-
quences associated with the qualitative approach to any 
problem.

Students of Social Credit should not find this line of 
thought difficult to follow, since they have been witnesses 
of the actual break-up in their own minds of the mesmeric 
power of the prevalent false belief in abstract Scarcity; the 
ilusion of a threat to bare survival, on account of which, 
not only nations, but coalitions of nations, are at this moment 
defensively ranged and arming themselves atomically. This 
ilusion as we have seen, in effect represents the groundless 
issue between Quality and Quantity, and is only one aspect, 
though perhaps the most significant one, of Douglas’ immense 
achievement in realism. It was a gift to posterity, doubly 
decided, so to speak, by the complimentary disclosure of 
the real cause of modern, global, warfare; which actually 
turns out to be both technical Plenty itself; academic over-
production. Or rather, the explosive pressure generated by the 
truly satanic urge, or necessity, to suppress the Truth.
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ional, 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 referent.

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 is to grasp 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 materialism's 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 recognizable, 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 concluded)

Education without Culture

"Deprived of their cultural tradition, the newly educated Western men no longer possess in the form and substance of their own minds and spirits, the ideas, the premises, the rationale, the logic, the method, the values, or the deposited wisdom which are the genius of the development of western civilization. The prevailing education is destined, if it continues, to destroy Western civilization, and is in fact destroying it.

"Modern education rejects and excludes from the curriculum of necessary studies the whole religious tradition of the West. It abandons and neglects as no longer necessary the study of the whole classical heritage of the great works of great men.

"Thus there is an enormous vacuum where until a few decades ago there was the substance of education . . . .

"The institutions of the Western world were formed by men who learned to regard themselves as inviolable persons because they were rational and free. They meant by 'rational' that they were capable of comprehending the moral order of the universe and their place in that moral order . . . .

"Yet the historical fact is that the institutions we cherish—and now we must defend against the most determined and efficient attack ever organized against them—are the products of a culture which, as Gibson put it, 'is essentially the culture of Greece, inherited from the Greeks by the Romans, transfused by the Fathers of the Church with the religious teachings of Christianity, and progressively enlarged by countless numbers of artists, writers, scientists and philosophers from the beginning of the Middle Ages up to the first third of the nineteenth century.'

"Modern education, however, is based on a denial that it is necessary or useful or desirable for the schools and colleges to transmit from generation to generation the religious and classical culture of the Western world."

Walter Lippman in Education Without Culture.