

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 55, No. 8

NOVEMBER, 1975

15p Monthly

An Increment of Creativity*

By BRYAN W. MONAHAN

(Continued)

Since the future is at stake—unless it is lost already—it is of the utmost importance that this issue† should be fully comprehended. Now as a creative being, man enjoys “work”—he enjoys making things. “Making things” ranges through individual pursuits and the arts, to participating in projects requiring the co-operation of few or many. But there is a destructive difference between forced co-operation under an imposed policy of “work or starve,” and free participation for the love of the work and the sense of achievement.

Certainly there is an amount of necessary but relatively distasteful work which has to be done if communities are to survive as communities. There was a great deal of this at the beginning of the industrial era, and it was accomplished often under hideous conditions. But the point is that most of it *has been* accomplished. The amount of distasteful work is diminishing all the time with the progress of the industrial arts. The past is not the past for nothing. We possess the accumulation of the already-created. We are tenants-for-life in an inheritance bequeathed to us from the work of our forefathers, but stolen from us by those who would rule over us. On the other hand, much work requires greater and greater skill, and even imagination; it is a *privilege* open to those who have trained themselves for it—indeed it is so regarded in the form of remuneration. But children might be educated differently than in competition for such work; there is no reason why they should be drudges because they cannot qualify for the work that qualifies as a privilege.

All the animals except man expend their creativity within themselves—if they build, they do so in the manner of their kind. As animals, they are born perfect for their way of life. And even so, they have leisure. Few animals work as hard as man, unless it be the ants. But in contrast to the animals, man “becomes”; as no animal does, he differentiates, and he does so by the acquisition of *cugenes*.‡ Certainly there are certain inborn aptitudes which bias the selection of *cugenes*. Nevertheless, to varying degrees individuals may have ideals, and grow into what they want to become. Wanting to become something is to have a sense of vocation, and a sense of vocation, not a need for an income, is the proper attitude towards “work.”

As the son of my father, I am a member of a family which reaches back into the immemorial past. The greater the sense of family feeling, the more important my family home, into which I am born. My earliest *cugenes* are those provided by my family tradition. Just as my mother's milk represents pre-processed food fit for my undeveloped power

of digestion, so society's stock of *cugenes* is processed by my family for my undeveloped mental digestion. “Mum and Dad” are probably my first words.

As I grow older, if I have any special aptitudes my parents are likely to be the ones to observe the first signs of them, and to make provision for them accordingly. And knowing that I am full of faith in what I am told, they will be careful to tell me the truth so far as they understand it. Aware always of what I may become rather than of what I should become, they will keep, so long as they are able, the way open in all directions.

What sense is there for me in “getting on” in the world? What product of our “higher education” today could come near to or equal Leonardo da Vinci? What is the good to me of twenty-five years of “education” specialised to get me a position in a firm which designs bank-buildings and office blocks? And yet that is the fate, or something like it, of all but a handful of the products of higher education. This is not true education at all. Education is “leading out,” not stuffing in, not forcing the wondrous labile mind into a specialised mould to make parts of a machine called the “planned society.”

Any developed industrial country these days could provide a very high standard of true living for all its members with hardly any further “development,” and with only such international trade as is required to make good mutual deficiencies in basic materials. Trade should be advantageous, not competitive. And yet merely to live more and more women *have* to be employed, at the same time as automation and electronic data processing are rapidly creating “job redundancy.” Then re-training programmes have to be undertaken to “fit” displaced persons for other employment, and we are reassured that automation and computers create more jobs than they eliminate. Is that what they are for?

*This title has been added for this reprinting of Chapter XII of Dr. Monahan's *Mystery, Magic, Music and Metaphysics*.

†*Vide* previous paragraph, in *T.S.C.*, October, 1975.

‡*Cugene*: This is a neologism expressing a concept developed in the book from which this Chapter is excerpted, and is derived from the word “gene”—the unit of physical heredity—and the word “culture,” in the sense of *cultural inheritance*. Quite evidently, a national culture is made up of elements; as a whole, it is identifiable or recognisable; but the individual human being acquires only a selection of its elements. Thus a *cugene* is to be conceived as analogous to a gene in affecting behaviour, but as transmitted to individuals by “external” heredity. The physical basis of a *cugene* is the engram.

Huge numbers of jobs, of course, are completely non-productive, consisting only of making marks on pieces of paper and filing them; or keeping tabs on the filers and markers. Huge crowds are involved in maintaining a completely unnecessary system of taxation. Enormous numbers of the best brains are involved in legal problems arising from the string-of-sausage like administrative decrees which pass as Law, but are really works-orders in essence. If all this represents man's destiny, then Jesus did not know what He was talking about, and His warnings and death were in vain. He foretold the destruction of Jerusalem; but Jerusalem is world-wide now—a whole civilisation. Is it any wonder that Jesus wept? And He knew that though one rose from the dead, they would not be persuaded.

All this has nothing to do with the so-called profit-motive, save insofar as this has been *perverted* in the interests of centralised power. Practically everyone hopes and expects to make a profit by being paid more for his work than he *has* to expend on his living. The difference represents *leisure*—time to be “lazy”—unless his leisure is organised into “useful” activity. But leisure is time free to become what one aspires to be or do, and is nobody else's business. Nor has it to do with the so-called “evils” of capitalism, whose sin in the eyes of the centralisers is that it distributes dividends to those who have not “worked” for them instead of yielding them to the Government which can use them to employ “workers” to dig holes in the Sahara. But capitalism produces goods in abundance, which is what it exists for. It is the overall policy under which industry operates which causes the trouble. That policy is to use industry as a system of government, a system of keeping people locked up in offices or factories or “on site” for six or eight of the best hours of the day, to keep them out of what the authorities fear might be “mischief,” to keep them governable. I want boots or cars from a factory, not a place on a committee to tell the management how to make boots or to protest against the loss of a job through the introduction of automation. But what fun is there in government if the government hasn't *power*, if people's wants are so simply provided for that there is little for governments to do?

Why the mounting crime-rates and other disorders? They are the outcome of the disparity between what people aspire to become—spiritually, but on a *secure* material foundation—and the system which robs them of their birthright. Modern taxation and inflation are outright and calculated confiscation of what people have earned. It is wicked and conscious lying to teach that taxation ‘controls’ inflation. What is inflation, that it can be ‘fought?’ Prices could be made to fall just as easily as they are made—yes, *made*—to rise. If they fell steadily people would become richer even on their present incomes. Government finance can be provided by means other than taxation. The powers that be know precisely how this can be done, but to do it would be to undermine their power. Inflation is a technique, or instrument, to maintain the centralisation of power.

There is not enough *genuine* work to go around; so that what is needed should go to those best fitted for it by vocation; and positions should be held only long enough for others to grow up to take their place. Higher education in the large should be for those who wish to contribute to the arts of man-kind, or to their own spiritual development.

This is not a panacea or empty and impracticable idealism, but hard practical necessity, as the Churches should be

the first to recognise. For the way we are going, disaster lies ahead. We face the absolute end of Christian civilisation, which already lies dying. Yet there is still a reservoir of religious sentiment in the hearts and minds of innumerable decent people. One more generation, perhaps less, and it will be gone. Our enemies—for Christian civilisation has enemies—know this.

Let people look into their hearts and souls and behold *within* the kingdom of God. Let every man and woman know and realise to the full that in his very essence he possesses divine creativity. Let them know that God is yet creating the world, that there are glories still to come. “Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom.” *You*, not your rulers, who have requisitioned *your* powers to create *their* world.

The mechanical universe of the dawn of the twentieth century has vanished. The world is not like that. We have seen its nature revealed in music, in life, and in evolution. In its beginning, purely immaterial; in its existence, the materialisation of meaning, the most insubstantial and spiritual entity known to us. And we too can create and give meaning, and incarnate it in the world already created. If our creativity is of God, it is entrusted to us. “Render unto God the things that are God's” is an injunction which is anathema to politicians.

To me certainly, the idea of the whole universe starting at a specific time as a great bang is the last resort of a science which, because its methods require the exclusion of the metaphysical, has tried to believe that there is nothing metaphysical. But we cannot weigh or measure meaning, or gauge its depths. Time itself is a creation. If I create an idea, a meaning, but do nothing, it is timeless. When I act on the idea, I endow it with time. This book as an idea has existed as an idea for many years—not as it is now, for it has acquired and accumulated substance, and every sentence has in its own way determined what is to come.

And in this way, the beginning of the universe is timeless, before time, an eternal idea. When its incarnation began simply does not matter. When did Beethoven's last quartet begin? Do his note-books tell us?

Who can believe that the civilisation of the Middle Ages and the High Renaissance—more wonderful perhaps than that of Periclean Athens or of the T'ang Dynasty—was the creation of Government policy speeches? How much “planned production” was there then? But now we see the decay and destruction of our cities and country-sides. Small farming is “uneconomic,” although mounds of vegetables rot and the farmers protest at the destruction of their *family* farms; a huge wheat surplus is a catastrophe, because it brings a “fall” in world prices. Can we not see that skyscrapers are prisons? But people are driven off the land and into cities which have become deathtraps. Pollution and smog threaten the very lives of the people—but where are they to go. They must live close to their “work,” and small-scale production is “uneconomic.”

I defined religion as comprehension of reality. The false economics—and political theory—which is the official teaching of our universities is a part of that reality. It is Sin on the grand scale. “By their fruits shall ye know them.” By and large what people believe in regard to political economy as gospel is a carefully designed system to increase and perpetuate centralised government control over the lives of the

people. Being well-fed and supplied with gadgets does not turn a slave into a free man. Independence of income does, unless a slave-state supervenes. But people are *taught* that independence of income is evil. Precisely what is required is the universalisation of independent incomes—not large incomes, but at least adequate to support life, and particularly family life, where the home should be sacrosanct.

The proper relation of a citizen to his country is that of a shareholder, not an employee. Employment is a function, and we see in the animal kingdom what happens when a function is elevated to pre-eminence. It is *not* the function of the government to “manage” the economy to maintain full employment in the face of the perfection of the industrial arts, whose objective is to dispense with “labour.” It is *not* sane economics to exploit the riches of the earth at the maximum rate to improve “export figures.” Fossil fuel, and even fissionable material, is, so far as is known, most definitely limited, and until it is known for certain that adequate alternatives to fossil fuels and fissionable materials are available when required, what we have should be conserved. And no doubt they will be if a police-state eventuates, as it seems it will.

Another huge misconception is the notion, sedulously propagated, that “labour” produces all wealth. Wealth—in the sense of goods available, not amount of “money” (another myth)—is now overwhelmingly the product of harnessed power and advanced technology. This is our *inheritance*, just as, with our contributions to it, it will be our descendants'; it is not government property, to be used as the government sees fit.

Access by individuals to the wealth which is actually or, perhaps more importantly, *potentially* available is, these days, primarily a matter of possessing money. A family, and particularly a family in the sense of the continuity of the generations (the family of tradition), living on productive land and accumulating possessions, increases its wealth without needing money. But as family becomes community, and work becomes functionalised—the “sub-division of labour” leading to specialisation and, indeed, loss of an individual's ability to be self-supporting—exchange of product becomes a necessity. In its origin this exchange is barter, the exchange of one product for another. But it must soon become apparent that products are not all equal—they differ in the time taken for their production, and the degree of knowledge and skill involved. Here arises the notion of *value*, and hence of relative value, which brings in the problem of measurement. Measurement in turn requires a unit of measurement. But it is impossible to conceive of an absolute unit of measurement, except by attributing it to the unit of measurement itself. And thus the immaterial idea of value materialises into the *token* of value.

In the long course of history, all sorts of objects have served as such tokens—animals, stones, shells, slaves, feathers, metals, and even human skulls. Three prime conceptions arise in this development—convenience, function, and *intrinsic* value. The development was influenced by social usages (such as marriage conventions) and religious concepts, so that money came to have both a utilitarian and a mystic content—properties it retains to this day. The utilitarian aspect is that of a medium for the exchange of goods and services, and this leads to the definition of money as “anything, no matter of what it is composed, which no one

will refuse in exchange for his goods and services.” This lack of refusal arises from the *belief* that the money can in turn be exchanged for other goods and services of equal “value.” The mystic content lies in the concept of a monetary *standard*, the gold standard being the most familiar.

With the expansion of population, and even more with the increasing growth of both quantity and complexity of production and commerce—exchange of products—a parallel expansion of the “means” of exchange is necessary—“an increase in the world's money supply,” as the economists say. But a standard of monetary value depends on the *intrinsic* value, which in turn is related to scarcity value. Thus of gold and silver, the former is more valuable, because there is less of it, just as there is less silver than copper. But even here, there is no *absolute* ratio of value. Such a ratio must be “given,” by convention or by fiat. Even less is there an absolute ratio between the “value” of the circulating means of exchange, and the designated value of the “standard” of money. If there were, inflation would be impossible. It is this fact that misleads many people into believing that if exchange rates of “currency” against gold were maintained, inflation would not occur. (In fact, inflation should be called “depreciation in the purchasing-power of the unit of money,” and this is due to the aggregation of costs in the course of production, resulting in higher prices. Increased wages, amongst other costs, go into the aggregate, and thus raise prices. More “money” is then required to maintain distribution of products. “Inflation” thus is a consequence, not a cause of there being more “money” in circulation in a *competitive market*.) At present the ratio of the value of “the means of exchange” to the value of gold is entirely by fiat, as in “devaluation” or “revaluation” of a currency.

But as noted earlier, particularly since the industrial revolution, the growth of “production” follows an exponential law, whereas the accumulation of gold is a more nearly linear function. The expansion of the need for the “medium of exchange” is related to the expansion of “production” and *its cost*, or price (minimum price at which goods can be sold without incurring a book-keeping, or accountancy, loss), and hence outstrips the accumulation of metallic currencies, which have long since become inadequate for the needs of society, and have been almost totally superseded by printed paper units of “money.” The intrinsic value of a dollar note is infinitesimal in comparison with a gold dollar, and is not exchangeable for one; and even gold dollars, like sovereigns, have been absorbed in bullion, which circulates only internationally. Even a good deal of that circulation is imaginary, being represented by what amounts to an exchange of letters between banks. The gold remains in, say Fort Knox, but the ownership of some of it, or claims on it, are transferred from y to x .

This, however, is far from the end of the story. In modern parlance, “money” is regarded as comprising “reserves” of currency, for the most part held in banks, but also represented by capital assets, such as bank properties and Government and other “securities” (the latter representing the Government's power to levy taxes); and the “circulating medium” of exchange—that is, the medium through which goods and services are exchanged, or debts or other obligations (such as fines or taxes) discharged. Yet even this “circulating medium” consists of “currency”—i.e., notes and coins—and “demand deposits,” which circulate, or are exchanged, by means of cheques. But here a curious and vital

question emerges: How do demand deposits come into existence?

At first sight it appears that banks are store-houses of money. The money consists of the "reserves" of the bank, and money stored in the bank by members of the community—put there for safe keeping. Such money is regarded as "idle"—i.e., it is not circulating, and therefore not *functioning* as money. But some people have need of money in excess of their incomes—say to build a house, or to establish or extend a business. The bank therefore on certain terms and conditions "lends" them the idle money.

That is the appearance, but not the reality. The bank does not, in fact, lend "money" at all; it affords a facility. It says, in effect, to an approved customer "If you issue a cheque for a sum of money in excess of the sum you have deposited with us, we will treat that cheque (up to a stated limit) as money, and will credit it to the account of whoever presents it to us, be it one of our own customers, or another bank. We will record this transaction as a debt owing by you to us, to be repaid within a certain time. We will also charge you a percentage of the sum involved, calculated at a certain rate *per annum*, but chargeable daily on the amount outstanding. If you do not repay, we will foreclose on your real assets."

The all-important point here is that in affording the facility, the bank does not reduce the sum of "deposits" it holds; but when it "honours" the cheque, an increase in the sum of deposits is recorded, either in that or another bank. On the other hand, when the 'debt' is repaid, the sum of deposits is reduced to what it was before, *except by the amount of interest paid*, which thereby becomes a permanent addition, one way or another, to the supply of "real" money. This procedure has given rise to the now well-known expression: "Every loan made by a bank creates a deposit, and every repayment of a loan made to a bank destroys a deposit." This is a convenient but not quite accurate statement. The customer who writes the cheque against the 'facility' creates the 'money'; this cheque "circulates" and functions as money, or cash, enabling the exchange of goods and services. As such, it has an ephemeral existence. Once it is deposited with a bank, it ceases to function as a circulating medium. It is not re-issued, as a currency note is. Although it is stored as a record of a transaction, its nature as *money* has gone. It is "money" only so long as it is outside the bank. It may pass through two or three hands, effecting exchange of goods and services, but its 'life,' unlike the life of a metallic coin or a printed currency note, is a matter of days. But as well as effecting an exchange of goods or services, or possibly several exchanges, it sets in operation a system of accountancy. So long as the rate at which bank "loans" are made exceeds the rate at which they are repaid (as it must, if interest is to be paid on top of the debt, otherwise the system would choke to a halt) the sum of "demand deposits" increases, and the effect is that of an expansion of the "money-supply," and *vice versa*. In general, and over and above interest, the loan rate does exceed the repayment rate, so that the amount of "money" in existence does increase beyond the increase provided by mining gold, silver, and copper. The rate of increase is, however, subject to "policy," which is determined between Governments and Central Banks. However, the interest charged on "loans" is not subject to cancellation; it becomes "real" money, and is added to the "capital" of the bank. If the bank spends this

"capital," or pays it out as dividends, the community comes into possession of additional "real" money, just as it does when gold or silver is mined and "put into circulation," or currency notes are printed and circulated.

By now, the ratio of 'ephemeral' money to 'real' money is enormous. Because of its long lineage and ancestry—the Greek word *pekus*, meaning ox, enshrined in the word "pecuniary," bears witness to the ancient concept of money—money retains the mythical quality of reality. But the operation of the "financial system" is overwhelmingly the operation of a system of accountancy. Man cannot alter the *fact* of gravity (though he can re-formulate the 'Law' of Gravity), but the 'laws' governing the operation of the system of accountancy are man-made laws, or regulations deriving from those laws. That is what makes it possible to have a "financial policy." And, indeed, financial policy is the over-riding policy, for it is looked on as "governing" industry and regulating a wide range of community or individual activities. Thus a government may decide on "a period of rapid . . . or steady . . . or restrained 'expansion'"—mediated by "easy credit" or "low interest rates" on the one hand, or restricted credit and high interest rates on the other.

In the real sense, wealth is the ability to provide and deliver goods and services. The general 'law' governing its increase is the exponential law—its rate of growth is proportional to its state of growth. The actual limit to this law is the availability of resources. Resources include raw materials, power, and technological ability. The natural increase, and the direction it takes, is restrained, or governed, by "policy," much as a gardener prunes trees and shrubs. Or it might be said that the relation of a government to "the economy" is the relation of the rider to the horse. That is to say, the essence of government, as presently conceived, is restraint and direction. And the chief mechanism of this restraint is central control over the supply of money.

Now just as a belief in a religion is a *cugene*, so a man's or a people's belief about money is a *cugene*. Because control of money is so powerful and so subtle an instrument of government, a certain mystical and mythical quality of belief is promoted and sustained in men's minds, so that they believe that money is in some sense real, whereas it is really almost wholly accountancy. People do not think they are talking nonsense when they speak of a multi-millionaire "having millions." But in fact the multi-millionaire *controls assets*, 'valued' at any given time as worth x million dollars. He would find it hard to obtain *cash* for all those assets. On the other hand, a change in the Law might deprive him of them.

If value does not inhere in money, where is it to be found, and how measured? It is to be found in the *objects* of exchange. People work primarily to obtain personal possessions, beginning with food, clothes and shelter, and ascending through tools to "save labour" to more complex possessions, such as labour-saving appliances and motor-cars and boats to objects of art or instruments of music.

The "measurement" of the value of various objects is to be found in the concept of *ratio*. The importance of ratio is that it is independent of any particular unit, so long as it is the same unit. Thus the ratio of the diameter to the circumference of a circle can be expressed in various ways and can be symbolised and take its place as a number in the ordinal numbers. So: How many bicycles are equivalent to one motor-cycle? How many motor-cycles to one motor-car?

Now what of money? Whatever it was originally, it is now chiefly a *unit of accountancy*. The ratio of cash (notes and coins, but excluding demand deposits) is, compared to the accountancy 'value' of 'capital assets,' insurance 'funds,' and demand deposits, minute. Gold, the only 'money' with a significant inherent value, is only a small fraction of cash. But together cash and demand-deposits effect changes in the accountancy "books"—ledgers, balance-sheets, assets and liabilities, etc.

The exchange 'value' of an object is "accounted" by aggregating the 'costs' incurred in the course of its production, and these costs are *recorded* in terms of monetary units. Not all costs involve cash-disbursements; the aggregating costs are transferred in the various stages of manufacture; practically, only payments made to individuals involve cash disbursements, and not even all of these; salaries may be "paid" by an order on a bank to credit an individual's account; and the order may in fact be against the 'facility' of an overdraft, thus increasing demand-deposits. Other elements of cost involve such things as the cost of raw materials, the use of power (oil and electricity), transportation, rent, and charges *allocated* (not distributed at all but hypothecated against future income derived from sales) against the depreciation and eventual obsolescence of capital items—plant, office equipment, buildings, etc. If a bank overdraft is involved, or "money" borrowed elsewhere than from a bank, interest is also one of the costs of production. Higher interest rates result in higher prices. When industry is financed by funds subscribed by share-holders, dividends paid on the shares are equivalent to interest paid on borrowed money, from an accounting point of view.

With the increasing complexity of the methods of production—the more machines relatively replace men—the greater the proportion of total cost represented by aggregated costs and "allocated charges" as against direct payments made to individuals; and it is payments made to individuals which make up the *cash income* of the community. So in any given period of time, total "costs" of total production exceed the cash income of the community. But of course the individuals of the community are not expected to buy "all" of the production; they buy only what is of use to them as individuals. But as practically the whole of the cash income derived from "all" production (*personal savings* as against *institutional savings* representing the difference) is paid away for items of personal consumption (including relatively durable items such as houses, furnishings, tools and cars, etc., but which "wear out" or become obsolescent) the community gets possession of, or—a more important concept—control over only a part, and a diminishing part, of total production, even if the "standard of living is rising." The point is that the standard of living (including the distribution of leisure) is not rising as fast as it might, in relation to the possibilities. That is to say, the accounting system of itself gives rise to a disproportionate emphasis on capital production. This fact, once hotly denied, is now justified in such terms as "expanding the economy," "providing employment" and others of the current jargon.

What does it mean when a car bought say ten years ago for two thousand dollars today "costs" three thousand dollars? True, in the ten years the car may have been "improved"—but almost certainly not to the extent represented by the relative prices. In any case, the cost of food and clothing, which do not improve very much in "value" for money but which,

with housing, account for a great part of personal expenditure, rises in proportion to the rise in the cost of more durable items. All this is reflected in a loss, or depreciation, in the "value" of money. The *purchasing-power* of the unit of money is lowered. This is called "inflation"; but it is not a "natural phenomenon"; it is a consequence only of the *system* of accountancy.

Thus "purchasing-power" should properly reflect man's increasing control over his environment, as manifest in the ratio of mechanical "horse-power" energy to human energy, just as a longer lever enables the lifting of a heavier weight. A realistic system of accountancy should reflect, to the individual's benefit, this increasing "purchase" of human effort. Money should *gain*, not lose, "value" (as measured by its purchasing-power).

Inflation is a major cause of social friction. Quite obviously, a steady increase in the purchasing-power of the unit of money would decrease the discontent of the lesser-paid members as against the better-paid. A ten *per cent* increase in the purchasing-power of a given (*i.e.*, unaltered) income would be as meaningful as a ten *per cent* increase in income; but it would not be reflected in a subsequent rise in prices. A fall in the general price-level would be an immense social benefit, accruing *to individuals*. And although "money" has practically no inherent value, while being immensely serviceable and flexible as a means of exchange and unit of accounting, nothing ought to stand in the way of a modification of the system of accountancy. There are many methods by which this might be done; but the principle is simple: Depreciation of capital assets should be "written off" at a rate appropriate to the asset, and not be charged into prices. Obviously, nobody could lose anything *real* if the purchasing power of the medium of exchange increased, just as it is obvious (because it is happening) that everyone (as individuals comprising the community) loses if purchasing-power decreases. With one exception: the power of centralised government, which all over the world is tending to authoritarianism, would diminish.

No doubt most readers of this book will regard this excursion into "economics" as too difficult to grasp. But professional economists, who resemble the priests of esoteric religions, would call it "over-simplification," while they muttered incantations designed to "curb inflation," or "cool-off" the economy, or "strengthen" sterling. No wonder there is mystification.

All these matters are part of contemporary reality, and misconceptions regarding them must be just as dangerous as fooling about with high voltage electricity lines. If man's nature and his relation to God are as Jesus taught them to be—then His prophecy of disaster is just as relevant now as it was then, for, after a period of at least partial Christianity, the world has reverted, only on a far larger scale, to the pre-Christian era. If the Christian European tradition had been carried forward into the industrial era so that man, increasingly liberated from the burden of work, became ever more free to develop spiritually, who knows what achievements might have emerged?

In its essence, the requirements of life are very simple—food, clothing and shelter. Luxuries add very little though labour saving should. South Sea Islanders in their native condition lead joyous lives. Now in these days, in industrialised communities, every man, woman and child is entitled to

the provision of basic requirements. The means to their easy production and distribution were, after all, created by our fore-fathers; they are our inheritance. Every family should have a *secure* home. Then children are entitled to such education as they themselves can make use of, in schools of their parents' choice, for the parents know their children. A "full" school education is not necessary for a musician, an artist or a writer, all of whom can study *so much as they wish* when reasonable *foundations* have been laid. But as things are today, promising musicians "have no time" to practise.

This is to look to the future. Before a sane and safe world can be restored, enormous damage will have to be repaired—and before it can begin, there will surely have to be a revival of religion—a restatement in modern terms of man's place in the universe. *Man is not born to work under central direction, either industrial or governmental, except with his voluntary consent, for the sake of the work—because he wishes to participate in a project which he judges to be worth while.* Then a start might be made on earlier retirement on an adequate income. This would not disturb the existing organisation, but would mean immediate "promotion" for those following on. At the other end the traditional school system might be restored, with emphasis placed on the potential glories of life rather than on compliance to a soul-destroying system. For who can doubt that however much discontent may be exploited, it *arises* from the destruction of souls in the young, who face an essentially futile future? Much of the matter touched on in this book, if truly comprehended through proper teaching, might lay the foundation for a better life. The teaching syllabus should be revised, and purged of the false doctrines of "sociology," "social studies," and "economics."

This is not a plan or a system; it is a bare indication of what is possible. If Christianity is true—in precisely the sense that an electrically charged wire is "live," or that music is real—then society must live by its truth, or collapse; it *is* collapsing. That the collapse is being aided and exploited by its enemies is something else again. We need to know that it is the *Christian* order that is collapsing, so that we know what it is that we have to save and restore. Stated politically, the objective of Christianity is the emergence of self-conscious, self-governing individuals, exercising free-will in all that pertains to them, and choosing good *because* it is good—because as spirit-conscious individuals they are attracted to good as they are attracted to the beautiful. This most certainly does not mean aggressive individualism; it means dignified individuality, respect for others because of one's own self-respect; do unto others as ye would they do unto you. Co-operation is essential to community life; division of labour pays high dividends in the form of unearned increment. But co-operation should be voluntary, for the sake of the work that it is agreed needs to be done. But when the decision is made, self-discipline as in a team playing a game must be observed. Strikes are an absurdity. The hierarchy of a team of volunteers is something different from the discipline of a "work"-force recruited by the threat of starvation.

The Church stood for centuries for certain immutable principles—not *rational*, but derived from Christ's teaching. Their truth (which has nothing whatever to do with reason) was demonstrated by the glory of Christian Europe, with its promise of greater glories to come. But the Church (not, at first, the Roman Church) wavered in the face of the attack

of rationalist materialism. The result of that wavering is precisely what we see today—a world torn with dissension and strife, and in mortal danger of either slavery or annihilation. And if Christianity is *true*, the Church must condemn with all the authority it can regain the actions of Governments, which are quite definitely and obviously anti-Christian. How dare they connive at the destruction of religion in the schools? "Suffer little children to come unto *Me*"—not unto full employment.

Since probably the majority of people are at heart religious, but terribly confused, a religious revival is entirely possible, given conscious and informed leadership. Evangelists quickly get large followings, but they do not challenge with correctly informed authority the totalitarian precepts which now inform governments everywhere. The Church should once more put the fear of God into politicians. I do not doubt that the totalitarians in so-called free countries have a greater fear of a genuine religious revival than of anything else on earth. But the overtly totalitarian countries have no such fear, for they have the secret police. And a little more anarchy, crime and immorality, and the secret police will be universal. For unless the environment giving rise to anarchy is rectified, in the end anarchy must be suppressed.

It is not too much to say that we face Armageddon—its manifestations are already with us. There *is* a militant, incarnate anti-Christianity abroad in the world. Communism and Socialism are organised systems, one at heart, with perfectly clear objectives, and fully intending, with any necessary degree of deceit, cunning, and ultimate ruthlessness ("the generations pass away"), to attain them. Christ said: "The truth shall make ye free." This does not mean *doctrinal* truth; it means the *living* truth that is *in* the doctrine. Music will make a musician, not the rules governing inversions of chords or modulations of key. Man's worth is his worth in the sight of God, not in the examination hall or the industrial complex: his Christian destiny, his inner and own dignity as an individual, not as a unit of the work-force. Let him bestow his dignity on the work he chooses to do, not suffer degradation in "organisation" for full employment. Take away the power of government over food, clothing and shelter, and you take away the *power* of government, for that is where, in the last resort, it resides. *Then* government is reduced to its proper and minimum functions of maintaining a Constitution of balanced and distributed and minimum powers.

The battle this time shows every sign of a fight to a finish—if Christianity revives and joins battle. We stand even today at the cross-roads of civilisation: a Christian world or an ant-heap world.

Science, for all its misdirection of outlook, has in the end revealed something of the truly miraculous nature of the universe. That the self-elected few should interfere in the marvellous development which has brought man from protoplasmic slime to Leonardo da Vinci, Chaucer, Beethoven, Shakespeare . . . is an intolerable Evil almost beyond contemplation. But a new Renaissance offers a prospect so profound and so unpredictable that we can but pray for it, and devote our lives in courageous humility to its coming.

For we are Children of God. And if the Kingdom of God is within me, where is God?

Mystery, Magic, Mime and Metaphysics is available from K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 245 Cann Hall Road, London E11 3NL, at £2.50 posted.