



Assinaria Revisited

At one point in his unforgettable novel *Asses in Clover* the redoubtable Irish novelist Eimar O'Duffy describes the spectacle of "enlightened" persons pursuing non-alternatives. That unlikely trio — the unemployed demigod Cuandaine, the spirited but none-too-cerebral Mac ui Rudai, and the incisive logician Mr. Robinson — visit the University of Boob in the mythical kingdom of Assinaria. There they are treated to a Swiftian demonstration of "higher learning" applied to economic problems.

At this temple of wisdom, one group of students "was engaged in ascertaining what degree of unemployment was an essential feature of economic health for the community"; another group "was discussing how far the incomes of the community should be reduced in order to increase its prosperity"; a distinguished economist "demonstrated very artfully that if they were given more money they would have less money".

All of which is faintly reminiscent of the discourse of politicians in matters economic — more painfully reminiscent, of course, in this election year.

Take, for example, the case of Canada, and the hydra-headed (so it seems) problem of inflation. The Liberal government (lately deposed), manifested a dismal failure to negotiate the tightrope stretched between "unemployment" and "inflation". To avoid the gaping gulf of the former, they have practised falling into the yawning chasm of the latter — thereby providing a working demonstration of how people can be given more money, and still have less money. The Conservatives, under startlingly dynamic and innovative leadership, have correctly identified the symptom of the disease — inflation — but can suggest no remedy more promising than "price and wage controls". Not only does this imply greater centralization of power in the "State", but — as the case of Britain has recently illustrated — it does not work. Neither producers nor consumers are able to meet their costs *now*: simple restriction of incomes ("how far the incomes of the community should be reduced in order to increase its prosperity") results in social and economic chaos. The Socialists, of course, attribute the problem of inflation to the "rip-offs" of "corporate bums"; thus, they propose to undermine the even-now desperate financial basis of industry, and to replace the "corporate bums" with bureaucratic ciphers who will not have to be accountable even to a shareholders' meeting.

To quote C. H. Douglas, "The choice offered to the free and enlightened elector is between being hanged, boiled in oil, or being shot". Or, to cite a more contemporary source, the song "Mrs. Robinson" (no relation, apparently, to the Mr. Robinson mentioned above), "every way you look at it you lose". Freedom of choice presupposes the existence of real alternatives, which have yet to emerge from the political establishment. The time has perhaps come for "free and enlightened electors" to demand some genuine alternatives.

SEED is an independent monthly journal of philosophy, politics, economics, and culture, published by OUSIA Publishing, Box 3184, Sherwood Park, Alberta, Canada T8A 2A6. All correspondence regarding SEED should be directed to this address.

Editor: Dennis R. Klinck, Ph.D.
Annual subscription: \$7
Foreign subscription by airmail: \$9

Our Policy

SEED aspires to fulfil a unique role transcending the functions of other magazines and journals.

Our purpose is neither to propagandize in the sense of promoting some fixed point of view or body of thought nor merely to comment on current events.

Our partisanship does not extend beyond two considerations. Firstly, we believe that reality does exist: it is not a matter of opinion and will assert its authority over all opinions that contradict it. All sanctions reside in reality; opinion has none. Secondly, we believe in the desirability of extending human freedom. Genuine freedom is contingent upon our comprehension of reality, since to the extent that men disregard reality, they court personal and social disaster.

In other words, far from conforming to the modern view that value judgments are to be avoided, SEED will intentionally consist of a succession of value judgments, which will constitute the principal criterion of its success. Man cannot approach truth without rigorous formation of value judgments and perfecting of definitions. Discovery and refinement of the correct principles for human action and association will be the focus of our attention within the field of reality. If we carry our investigation of the nature of reality far enough, we shall illuminate the way to the formulation of sound policy.

We have no delusions about the facility of the course on which we are embarking. It is possibly the most difficult course open to us. However, its value should be proportional to the efforts it requires. If the distractions to intelligence and will which characterize contemporary society are, as we believe them to be, fundamentally unsatisfying, we are confident that some seekers of truth will involve themselves in the experiment that SEED represents. Such persons are the only ones capable of responding to such an experiment.

We approach our undertaking in the spirit of making an offering that will call forth latent creative capacities. If the ideas that SEED disseminates have validity and settle in good soil, they will grow. Moreover, their growth will be progressive and cumulative. SEED will serve as a medium permitting the cross-fertilization of adventurous intellects, thereby diminishing the effects of the entropic phenomenon that paralyzes development by compelling men to struggle to find truths that they have lost sight of and had to rediscover repeatedly during the past.

If our project is conducted correctly, it will at the least generate a new conceptual vigour among a segment of the community -- and perhaps even result in the formation of new men.



'Britain'

A correspondent has written to observe that the article entitled "Coffee", which appeared in the May issue of SEED is "a little cruel" to Great Britain's "silent protesters, who... have not spoken yet". The article, deploring the effects of certain policies upon economic and social relations in that country, was intended neither to cast aspersions on the character of individual Britons, nor to denigrate British institutions.

Though not prepared to go as far as Tommy Bails, the suppositious author of the suppositious treatise, *God at the Wicket*, in asserting that "There is something essentially English about God", we do recognize the signal contributions of British culture to civilization. Not the least of these are English Common Law (particularly in its original development, as this is described by Richard O'Sullivan) and parliamentary government. This is to leave out of account, for the moment, Chaucer, say, and Shakespeare.

Moreover, we suspect that the policies discussed in the offending article do not arise spontaneously from the British cultural tradition, but are in fact alien to it. Recognition of a sphere of authority superior to temporal power, implicit in the theory of the Common Law (and basic to individual freedom), is for example scarcely manifest in "the divine right of Parliament" or its extension, what Lord Hewart has described as the "administrative lawlessness" of contemporary government. And decentralization of political power in the direction of the individual, implicit (though imperfectly realized) in Magna Carta, is the precise opposite of the centralist assumptions underlying Common Market policies.

The suggestion has been made that, to understand the break in this tradition, we must "retrace our steps, in the face of many false guides, to the fork in the road somewhere about the time of the so-called Reformation". Certainly this was a period of profound religious and political upheaval, not the least consequence of which was the arrogation by the temporal power (Henry VIII) to itself of the sphere of authority (the Church). These are matters, of course, which cannot be examined at this time, but which warrant the most careful scrutiny.

Moreover, they do raise certain questions:

- (1) Assuming the value and integrity of the British cultural tradition, why was it susceptible to perversion by antithetical policies?
- (2) Do sufficient vestiges of that tradition persist to constitute sanctions which might reverse the direction in which current undesirable policies are leading? If so, where are they?
- (3) Under what circumstances will the "silent protesters" become vocal, or the passive protesters active?

Editor

Plus ça change

We tend today to regard inflation as a modern phenomenon, one characteristic of advanced economies and susceptible of no remedy other than frantic adaptation by the harried individual to its ravages. While inflation in its modern form and intensity is perhaps "unique", the condition has occurred during previous periods of history. It is interesting, in this regard, to notice the psychological consequences of inflation — the tendency to regard the phenomenon as inevitable in the very nature of things, and to despair of doing anything about it. The following article examines the demoralizing effects of inflation, and looks at some of the "revolutionary" implications of this demoralization.

One of the most remarkable economic phenomena of the Tudor-Stuart period of English history was an alarming rate of inflation. One study of the "consumer price index" for the era, taking the decade 1491-1500 as the standard 100, places the figure for 1551-60 at 315, and that for 1631-40 at 687. Nineteenth-century historians were sufficiently impressed by this process to regard it as a "price revolution". However, as R. B. Outhwaite has pointed out, these historians had not experienced our own price inflation of the past fifty years (not to mention that of the last two or three years), and, "from a mid-twentieth century position the inflationary experience of the Tudors was extremely mild"¹.

Inflation and Demoralization

Shocked as they were by this unwonted condition—for, Outhwaite observes, it followed upon a century of "relative price stability"—sixteenth-century Englishmen postulated various explanations for it. Some argued that it was the result of the enclosure of the commons; others, that it was due to the progressive debasement of coinage, increasing speculation, the machinations of middlemen, or monopolies. William Lane sought the cause in falling exchange rates; Sir Thomas Smith attributed it to the influx of gold and silver from the New World; Alderman Box blamed increasing demand resulting from a growing population. No doubt there is an element of truth in many of these proposed explanations. One thing is certain, however, as Outhwaite notes: "men turned upon each other in their efforts to account for something that was not always clearly understood".

One cannot help remarking the similarity of all this to the contemporary situation. On the one hand, we have multifarious mild-mannered economists speculating upon probable (or possible) causes of inflation, coming

to no consensus and to no agreement about means of ameliorating the condition. On the other hand, we witness the build-up of social tensions: consumers cursing cattle ranchers because of the high price of meat, retail food stores trying to meet their costs in prices, food producers being forced out of business by the cost-price squeeze. Labour disputes and strikes proliferate diurnally, as "workers" attempt (vainly) to keep abreast of the cost of living—all the while agitating, in effect, for higher costs, and aggravated inflation. And we have before us in the examples of Bolshevik Russia and the Weimar Republic (not to mention various and sundry South American republics) illustrations of the "revolutionary" implications of unbridled inflation, as Norman Hill has observed: "Inflation has always been a revolutionary policy, leading ultimately to more and more totalitarianism. It was inflation in Germany in the twenties which destroyed the middle class, demoralized the whole community and paved the way for Hitler".² The operative words here are "policy", "demoralization", and "totalitarianism".

There is, then, grave cause for concern. Unfortunately, however, this "concern" has a tendency to take the form of despair, of the attitude, "There are inexorable economic laws in operation, which even the best economists and Ministers of Finance cannot understand. What can I do?" The attitude is not only dangerous (in that it leaves us both psychologically and practically vulnerable to the strategy of those who support inflation as a *policy*), but it is very likely erroneous. It represents, in fact, a paralysis of will, or an abdication of responsibility which, once more, is not without a parallel in our historical example.

"Gods Heavie Judgements"

Among those who commented on the causes and meaning of Tudor and Stuart inflation was Godfrey Goodman, who

was chaplain to Queen Anne, wife of James I. Goodman composed a large treatise entitled *The Fall of Man, or the Corruption of Nature* (London, 1616), in which he attempted to demonstrate by reference to the universal decay of nature and degeneration of man that the "end of the world" was at hand. One of the most prominent symptoms of this decay is inflation: "consider the prices of things, how excessive they are in these our latter days, and how they are raised above measure beyond all expectation" (369).

Goodman goes on to examine a few of the suggested causes of the inflation, and, with the help of some "historical legerdemain", to "refute" them. It is not the increase in population, he says, for there are now fewer people than in previous epochs (a fact not substantiated by subsequent historical investigation). Nor is it the increase in "money of account"; the coins-to-people ratio is smaller than formerly. Nor, indeed, is it the influx of foreign gold and silver, for, "Now at this time I feare there is more silver and gold wastfully spent and transported then is yeerely brought into this land..." (374).

No, he claims, the real cause of inflation is economic scarcity, a shortage of real wealth: "To conclude, these excessive prices of things do well argue a great scarcitie, that the whole world is turned bankrupt..." (377). His position is significant for two reasons. In the first place, it is reminiscent of a contemporary explanation of inflation that has recently received great publicity, namely, "scarcity". Thus, we are in the grips of an ongoing and worsening "energy crisis"; we are experiencing a bankruptcy of non-renewable resources; we are suffering a food shortage (and, lately, we have been informed that the Soviet Union has been able to plant only a fraction of its wheat crop, which means that the "world-wide shortage" will get even worse). In the second place, and this is what primarily concerns us at the moment, Goodman's argument is remarkable for what he infers from it.

What he infers is that the apocalypse—the end of the world—is at hand, and that men can do nothing except secure a private and abstract repentance:

Yet sure I am, that the time cannot be long absent, for all the signes of his comming doe already appeare: when the hangings and furniture are taken downe, it is a token that the King and the Court are remooving; nature now beginning to decay, seemes to hasten Christes comming (383).

In short, the dissolution of the world—indexed by inflation, for one thing—is imminent and inevitable. Rather than seeking the proximate causes of economic phenomena, and trying to rectify them practically, rather than identifying the *policies* underlying these phenomena and investigating possible economic alternatives, Goodman argues that these phenomena are outside the political or technical expertise of men to deal with. If they are indeed elements of natural necessity, he probably has a case; if, on the other hand, they result from faulty distribution, for example, he does not. However, rejecting the latter possibility, Goodman maintains that they are in fact the determinations of a Final Cause, whose decrees can only be awaited in submissive inaction.

It is remote from my intention to deny the reality or effect of "Final Causes". However, the attempt to attribute to "Gods heavie judgements" the consequences of human political connivance or administrative incompetence is alibi-hunting of a deplorable kind, for it proposes to justify the abdication of human responsibility for economic disorder by reference to a "religious" concept. If it is the Power that moves the universe that has ordained inflation, then to question inflation is a form of blasphemy. If this is religion, it is degrading religion—both to man and to God. It is at once more reasonable and more reverent to regard the source of the problem as man's failure to discover and conform to a "law of rightness" (both practical and "religious"—assuming, of course, that there is order in the nature of things), and to regard genuine or "sacramental" repentance as the attempt to reorganize our economic arrangements in accordance with that "law".

The Policy of Prophecy

Let us be very clear on this issue: Goodman's mode of arguing represents the drawing of "metaphysical" inferences from not only physical, but economic, data. Economics, by definition, is concerned with "household management", the operative word being "management". Management implies the exercise of human reason and will, for which (at least in the practical sphere), man has responsibility. If there is, then, an irredeemable economic "penurie", as Goodman suggests, then we are forced to one of two conclusions. Either man's

(continued p. 6)

Gathering from Thistles

An article by Arnold Toynbee published in the London *Observer* last month makes disconcerting reading. Mr. Toynbee delineated global economic prospects as follows: "Few of the politicians in the industrialized countries have yet dared to tell the truth to their constituents." "In the so-called developed regions—Europe, North America, the Soviet Union, Japan—'growth' is going to cease. What is more, it is going to be reversed. Continual economic growth is going to be replaced by continual economic recession."

These countries will "find themselves in a permanent state of siege, in which the material conditions of life will be at least as austere as they were during the two world wars. The wartime austerity was temporary; the future austerity will be perennial, and it will become progressively more severe." To prevent anarchy from ensuing, "a new way of life—a severely regimented way—will have to be imposed by a ruthless authoritarian government."

The otherwise gloomy article terminates, strangely, on an optimistic note: our material deprivation "may blessing in disguise" because "a society that is declining materially may be ascending spiritually."

Reading Mr. Toynbee's prognostication, we are reminded of a statement he made in Copenhagen 43 years ago to the Conference of Institutions for the Scientific Study of International Relations, which was published in the November 1931 issue of *International Affairs*. We quote from this speech at length not only because it relates to the *Observer* article, but also because it furnishes an unusual insight into the Machiavellian element present in so-called higher politics.

Either our modern economic internationalism has to be sacrificed, or else we must learn to live our political and our cultural life on the modern world-wide scale, which we have achieved in our economic life already....

The other alternative, of course, is that we should bring our political and cultural life into harmony with our economic life; that we should preserve our economic internationalism by internationalizing our social life through and through, in all its layers....

If we are frank with ourselves we shall admit that we are engaged on a deliberate and sustained and concentrated effort to impose limitations upon the sovereignty and the independence of the fifty or sixty local sovereign independent States....

The surest sign, to my mind, that this fetish of local national sovereignty is our intended victim is the emphasis with which all our statesmen and our publicists protest with one accord, and over and over again, at every step forward which we take, that, whatever changes we may make in the international situation, the sacred principle of local sovereignty will be maintained inviolable. It is just because we are really attacking the principle of local sovereignty that we keep up protesting our loyalty to it so loudly. The harder we press our attack upon the idol, the more pains we take to keep its priests and devotees in a fool's paradise—lapped in a false sense of security which will inhibit them from taking up arms in their idol's defense....

I will not prophesy. I will merely repeat that we are at present working, discreetly but with all our might, to wrest this mysterious political force called sovereignty out of the clutches of the local national states of our world. And all the time we are denying with our lips what we are doing with our hands....

One suspects that there have been few more frank definitions of the distinction between appearance and fact in the domain of international politics.

It would be illuminating to know the identities of the mysterious "we" to whom Toynbee makes repeated reference. Certainly, there is abundant empirical evidence that the initiatives to the plot he described have been busy in subsequent years. We have been brought to the pass that we hardly react at all to being told that inflation must be endured because it is an international problem, that (despite our abundant domestic energy resources) we must experience a crisis caused by hostilities thousands of miles away, that our legislation must be patterned on the Orwellian inanities of United Nations codes, etc.

Seen in light of his 1931 speech in Copenhagen, Mr. Toynbee's recent predictions of imminent, world-wide austerity and dictatorship may be an admission that internationalism has not proven to be the magic formula for initiating the Millennium, after all. On the other hand, we should not rule out the possibility that he has merely provided a capsule view of the further steps in the conspiratorial program he outlined years ago. The final stages may necessitate resorting to rather more direct force than has been required thus far.

R.E.K.

("Change", continued from p. 4)

will or reason is so perverse that he cannot approach economic rectitude, or, created nature is so defective that it cannot sustain human life (in other words, no rectitude exists). The first of these conclusions is implicitly contradicted by Goodman's attacks on "policy" (which suggests human determinations) and his Arminian insistence that "the kingdome of grace doth not overthrow our naturall rights" (264). The second is contradicted by his axiomatic insistence upon the goodness of the Creator. In other words, if "inflation" is "God's judgement", then it is so only to the extent that it is the "law of rightness" reacting upon political or rational deviations (which, to use Goodman's metaphor, constitute "sin") from the law. By defining these "judgements" as "prophecy", however, Goodman enforces the conviction that nothing can be done about the proximate causes of, for example, inflation.

In fact, he encounters the classic logical difficulty of the determinist: postulating that universal decay is inevitable, he at the same time attacks "policy" and "sin", implying that human determinations have something to do with at least the economic aspect of this degeneracy. (Similarly, the Marxist, who regards historical process as inevitable, still attaches moral blame to the "capitalist", and foments revolution—presumably at the urging of wholly irrational forces.) However, the psychological effect of his thesis is to make his reader despair of dealing with proximate or immediate causes and focus his attention upon a theological abstraction, a disincarnate deity. In other words, man's attention is diverted from the sphere of incarnate faith ("How can we realize the Law in our associations?") to the sphere of transcendent metaphor. The consequence of this abstractionism is to render him an easy prey to the depredations of those whose policy is perversion of relationships *in the world*.

This issue gathers poignancy from the observation that the same process is operative today: confronted by supposed "scarcity" and its concomitant, inflation, we are enticed to avert our eyes from the policies behind these phenomena (it will be recalled that, as recently as 1970, Canadian farmers were paid \$100 million not to grow wheat) to large—overwhelming—metaphysical *alibis*. We have already noticed the "inexorable laws

(continued p. 8)

'They'

We are all familiar with such expressions as, "What will they think of next?" and "They say (such and such)" in which the "they" refers to some abstract collectivity. The English language would be greatly improved by the systematic eradication of this indiscriminate usage of the term "they".

Convenient—for slovenly intellects—this linguistic device may be; but it is certainly not innocent. Indeed, by separating actions from their specific executors, it constitutes a potent assault on the principle of personal responsibility. Mere recognition that human agents have caused an effect does not carry us very far: there is a diminished possibility of altering a situation if the people who have brought it about remain unidentified—hidden behind the blind furnished by "they". The frequent association of the indefinite "they" with bizarre or unpleasant results should be remarked.

Obviously, general acceptance of this device is immeasurably advantageous to persons who hope to avoid being held accountable for their actions. For example, we would expect—and do in fact find—that increased use of the indefinite "they" should accompany the growth of bureaucratic structures, since rendering the attribution of blame impossible is one of the principal effects of bureaucracy.

However, if we pliantly adapt our speech to suit an unwholesome social context, we are liable to undermine completely the principle of personal responsibility so deeply imbedded in the language we have inherited. The point will be reached at which no one, except the nameless persons so placed as to be able to enforce their decisions, will have any effective recourse against mistreatment and injustice.

Language, after all, is one of our main instruments for relating to reality and should be accorded a chary respect commensurate with its function. We must never forget that a frightening power to confuse is the counterpoise of its power to elucidate.

Believe me, without farther instance, I could show you, in all time, that every nation's vice, or virtue, was written in its art: the soldiership of early Greece; the sensuality of late Italy; the visionary religion of Tuscany; the splendid human energy of Venice.

John Ruskin, "Traffic"

Election Law

There is nothing like an election campaign to remind one of the silliness of the notion that casting a ballot constitutes the ultimate expression of "democracy in action". Our election processes are largely orchestrated by plotters in back rooms of whose machinations most voters are totally ignorant.

Less remarkable, though, than such hidden corruption is the corruption emblazoned in virtually every party platform; for systematic bribery of the electorate is an invariable component—if not the essence—of every general election campaign.

There is much evidence of disgust at this state of affairs. Moreover, the statutes governing the conduct of elections do aspire (in print, at least) to promote a higher standard. Consider, for example, Section 66(1) of the Canada Elections Act on "corrupt inducement of voters": "Every one who corruptly, by himself or by any other person, during an election, directly or indirectly ... provides or promises to procure ... employment ... to induce any person to vote or refrain from voting ... is guilty of an offense against this Act."

Odd, is it not, in view of this prohibition, that during the present campaign, every party leader will travel across the country contravening this law in every speech by promising "jobs for Canadians" on condition that they vote for his party? The situation recalls the classic principle of *Real-politik* that a lie which is sufficiently audacious and grandiose ceases to be recognized as a lie. The sort of "corrupt inducement" that sends lesser men to prison wins adulation for political leaders, in respect of whom the scale of the corruption seems to render its existence imperceptible.

With such anomalies becoming more and more common, we should hardly wonder at the decline in respect for the law. A law without a sanction cannot be applied, and a law that cannot be applied is ridiculous. Where is the sanction against politicians for the provisions in the Elections Act prohibiting corrupt inducement of voters?

"The wisdom of a learned man cometh by his time of leisure, and he that is less in action, shall receive wisdom."

Ecclesiasticus, 38:v

To Those Who Share Our Concern

The publication of SEED is an enterprise which we feel is of cardinal importance to the revitalization of our culture. This endeavour represents the concern of a few individuals sensible of their responsibility to reverse, where possible, what they perceive to be the deterioration of the ideological and practical bases of this culture, and prepared to make personal sacrifices in the accomplishment of this objective.

However, our success can only be in proportion to our resources, which — particularly in their financial aspect — are quite limited. We are determined to proceed, even within those limitations. But we would like to do more.

Therefore, if you respond to the challenge that SEED has set for itself and would like to contribute to our venture, we invite your donations.

If you know anyone who would like to receive SEED, GIFT TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS are available at a rate of \$4.00 half-yearly. QUANTITY ORDERS of any issue can be obtained at the following prices (post-paid):

10 for \$4.00; 25 for \$8.00; 50 for \$12.00.

Seed

Ousia Publishing, Box 3184
Sherwood Park, Alberta, Canada T8A 2A6

Enclosed is my cheque/money order in the amount of \$ for:

Canada & U.S. —

- Annual subscription (\$7.00)
- Semi-annual subscription (\$4.00)

Overseas airmail

- Annual subscription (\$9.00)
- Semi-annual subscription (\$5.00)



Name

Address

..... Postal Code

("Change", continued from p. 6)

of economics": as Bertrand Russell has observed, it is regarded as more "scientific" to call "the Ruler of the Universe" by new names, like "Dialectical Materialism"³. Nevertheless, the psychological (and, ultimately, the political) implications are the same. Moreover, the proliferation of the "prophetic fallacy" in terms of the old, "religious", metaphor is also remarkable today, with motley sects predicting the coming apocalypse. I had occasion recently to attend a "religious" meeting at which the speaker dramatically identified all the world's problems: inflation, international monetary crisis, environmental pollution, wars, imminent establishment of global tyranny. He then said that this was all prophesied in Scripture, that it was therefore inevitable, and that there was nothing to be done except to make verbal affirmation of one's faith in "God". Thus are hordes of the "religious", who (one would have supposed) should be seeking to realize "inward, invisible graces" (the metaphysical prototype of Reality) in "outward, visible signs" (the created universe, including human associations), impelled to embrace as part

of "God's wonderful plan" such policies as that recently outlined by Arnold Toynbee for a totalitarian, scarcity-perpetuating world government.⁴

To return, briefly, to Goodman. Three hundred and fifty years ago, he predicted the imminent demise of the world. The most important aspect of this prediction (based, no doubt, upon the best scriptural authority) is that it was patently *wrong*. We should, I think, consider the possibility that our current "prophets of doom" may be similarly misapprised. We might even reflect upon the (doubtless remote) chance that they are merely the priest-propagandists of a program of demoralization—lulling the credulous laity into despair of coping with the policy that masquerades as prophecy.

D.R.K.

¹ *Inflation in Tudor and Early Stuart England* (Economic History Society, 1969), 9. I am indebted to Outhwaite also for facts included in the following paragraph.

² "The Inflation Menace and the Moral Law" (Melbourne: New Times, Ltd., 1960), 5.

³ "In Praise of Idleness", *Mass Leisure*, ed. Eric Larrabee and Rolf Meyersohn (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1958), 101.

⁴ In an article for *The Observer* (London), reprinted in the *Edmonton Journal* (April 23, 1974). Toynbee, who here argues that a totalitarian regime enforcing strict rationing is the only answer to an inevitable economic disaster, has elsewhere admitted that the elimination of national sovereignties in favour of World Government is his political objective. Strange, is it not, how the "inevitable" so neatly corresponds with his policy?

This really revolutionary revolution is to be achieved, not in the external world, but in the souls and flesh of human beings. Living as he did in a revolutionary period, the Marquis de Sade very naturally made use of this theory of revolutions in order to rationalize his peculiar brand of insanity. Robespierre had achieved the most superficial kind of revolution, the political. Going a little deeper, Babeuf had attempted the economic revolution. Sade regarded himself as the apostle of the truly revolutionary revolution, beyond mere politics and economics—the revolution of individual men, women, and children, whose bodies were henceforward to become the common sexual property of all and whose minds were to be purged of all the natural decencies, all the laboriously acquired inhibitions of traditional civilization.

Aldous Huxley, "Foreword", *Brave New World*

Seed

An independent monthly journal of
philosophy, politics, economics and culture

Published & Printed by



OUSA
PUBLISHING

Box 3184, Sherwood Park,
Alberta, Canada T8A 2A6