

Seed

The Dogmas of Oppression

Belatedly reading for the first time G.K. Chesterton's *Orthodoxy* (1908), I am struck by his identification of a number of still-popular beliefs, which purport to have 'scientific' validity, as "the natural allies of oppression": "dogmas of monism, of pantheism, or of Arianism, or of necessity" (124). Against these, which he regards as basically "illiberal", Chesterton places "the essentials of the old orthodoxy".

Predictably, he discusses the first last. The incompatibility of necessity with freedom is obvious, and we have remarked it often: determinism leaves no room for the exercise of choice, of the will, which is the essence of freedom. Not only does it disallow 'miracle', but it obviates policy as a factor in history. Chesterton's analogy here is memorable: life (and history) are like either Differential Calculus (fixed and unchangeable) or *Romeo and Juliet*, the product of imagination and moral and/or esthetic choice. "Christendom", he says, "has excelled in the narrative romance exactly because it has insisted on the theological free-will" (135). Therefore, that "liberal theologians" should endorse, say, scientific materialism, "which leaves nothing free in the universe", is a curious contradiction.

The dogmas of pantheism, monism, and Arianism Chesterton sees as aspects of the same thing; each involves the question of differentiation and relationship. Pantheisms and monisms, which generally identify "God" with the unity of all things--rather than as a personal Creator, the author regards as denying the very important "walls of individuality between man and man"--not to say between man and nature, or between man and God. "If souls are separate love is possible", says Chesterton. "If souls are united love is obviously impossible. A man may be said loosely to love himself, but he can hardly fall in love with himself, or, if he does, it must be a monotonous courtship. . . . Love desires personality; therefore love desires division". The paradox is an important one: love (as Augustine has observed) requires an other to love; total unity is mere absorption into a "whole cosmos [that] is only one enormously selfish person".

The importance of the distinction of persons as a condition of the concord of love is, Chesterton argues, explicit in the idea of the Trinity, a conception which checks the oppressive tendencies of rational monotheism: "there is nothing in the least liberal or akin to reform in the substitution of pure monotheism for the Trinity. The complex God of the Athanasian Creed may be an enigma for the intellect; but He is far less likely to gather the mystery and cruelty of a Sultan than the lonely God of Omar or Mahommed. The god who is a mere/awful unity is not only a king but an Eastern king" (133-4). Whereas crude monotheism leads to intolerance and tyranny, the Christian conception is one of "liberty and variety existing even in the inmost chamber of the world".

What is challenging about these observations is precisely that they invert the popular notion that "orthodoxy" is restrictive and oppressive and that what passes for "science" or "reason" is liberating. Chesterton does not demonstrate primarily that Christian orthodoxy is true (although he asserts it), but that, if some widespread heresies are true, then discussion of 'freedom' (if it is even possible) is futile.

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.



One More Corporatist Cabal

On March 18-9, the Prime Minister, Finance Minister Macdonald, and Labour Minister Munro met with certain prominent persons from the business and union communities at a hotel in downtown Ottawa. The meeting was secret, mention of it first appearing in the press after a lapse of several days, when a list of the participants was published.¹

Reporters wrote that the meeting was between government and "business and labour"—a description to which large numbers of businessmen and employees would undoubtedly take exception, if the organizers of the news cared to seek their views. Although the Ministers could (in a legal, if not a realistic sense) claim to represent the government, because the government is a monopoly, granting a similar status as "officials" or "spokesmen" of "business and labour" to the other participants seems gratuitous. The occupational categories of business and labour are not monolithic blocks, each having a policy or a will—despite the evident desire of powerful interests to accustom the Canadian people to think in these terms. The major newspapers and television and radio networks, however, are irresponsibly abetting this conditioning program, bestowing imaginary offices and titles on a select group of persons whose objectionable motives are proven by their failure to dissociate themselves from the interpretation that they somehow represent millions of individuals.

Ostensibly, the meeting in March concerned the lifting of wage and price controls. However, since the agreement reported reached found no expression in the budget presented 12 days later, we may wonder whether this subject constituted the essence or the pretext of the discussions. All that is certain is that the public was not supposed to know what its purported "representatives" were up to and that the explanation finally offered lacks verisimilitude. That those involved in the meeting merely wasted two days in idle talk is improbable: they are not people who habitually waste their time.*

(continued p. 6)

*After we received this article, the federal government announced that it would be providing \$10 million to the Canadian Labour Congress for "educational purposes". The chairman of the CLC, Joseph Morris, was one of the participants in the secret meeting of March 18-9. The triumvirate of big labour, big business, and government seems already to be moving in the direction of a merger. — Editor

Religation

by Geoffrey Dobbs

An expansion of a discussion paper read to the Science and Religion Forum on April 9, 1976, at their meeting at Cumberland Lodge, Windsor Great Park, on the theme: Man's Responsibility for Nature.

(Continued from last month)

Every way one looks at it, it seems clear that our Society is now dominated and controlled by people with minds and beliefs which are widely estranged from reality. They live, or imagine they do, in a pseudo-world of symbols—of figures, especially monetary and voting numbers, and words, especially political and other promotional power-verbiage. They believe that, Man being the Supreme Being, and they being the Supreme Men, 'nature' including human and other biological natures, must adapt itself to this imaginary 'world' which they have created and imposed upon the 'undermen', rather than that the human mind must humbly bend itself to grasp and accommodate itself to the nature of things, which is the posture of mind which, hitherto, has been responsible for the great achievements of science. But this posture was originally inspired by the belief that this 'nature' is the work of a Creator, whose will is the ultimate reality to which we must adapt ourselves, or die. With the weakening of this belief and its abandonment by many, especially scientists, we are in a lag phase in which the belief in the reality of what the natural scientist studies is also weakening, and getting overlaid by what looks like the far more dominant 'reality' of the pseudo-world of words and numbers which superficially seems to control his life, but which the Created Nature is now telling us, with its manifold voices, is dangerously at variance with the real world.

It has been said that the Ecological Movement has not yet found a 'soul'—that is, a consistent philosophy or religion. It is largely a movement of protest and of somewhat puritanic doom-prophecy, reacting against the squandermania of our civilisation without any clear vision of the alternative. Such protest movements are notoriously vulnerable to being taken over and used as tools by the very people against whose actions and ideas they are protesting, since those people, at any rate, have a practical philosophy which they are carrying out. It is now all too clear that this is what has been happening since 'environmentalism'

became a 'bandwaggon'. Now we have a Department of the Environment, and every major Conference on the subject is dominated by the representatives of Government and of Big Business. A protest against the dreary squandering of vast resources of energy and materials and human effort on phoney imitations and substitutes for the real things of life can easily be twisted round with the aid of current financial policy to become an attack on the quality of life: on the life more abundant and all that belongs to it, on growth and reproduction and expansion and initiative and on the consumption of what people really need and want, which is the only legitimate reason for the expenditure of energy in production. In so far as some of the environmentalists have allowed themselves to become associated with this perversion, they have changed sides. They are contending against life itself. The cure can lie only in looking closely at their true objectives, and deeply at their philosophy of life and its relation with reality.

In recent years there has been a strong tendency to turn to the East for this philosophy, in the belief that its spirituality and contempt for material things will provide the needed antidote to the gross and witless materialism of the West; but this is no antidote, merely the other side of the same false coin. In broad terms, if the one religates to a life of overfed comfort and convenience, based upon a plethora of shoddy and wasteful throw-away gadgetry which we pay for by mortgaging the future, the other expresses itself in that terrible apathy and indifference to the most ghastly extremes of human poverty, misery, sickness and starvation which come as a shock to every traveller from the West on his first visit to the East. Man is not a witlessly evolved matter-lump with an enlarged and clever brain, which has given him an epiphenomenon called 'mind' that enables him to dominate the Universe; but neither is he a spirit, temporarily inhabiting and imprisoned in a coarse material body, from which he strives and yearns to purify himself and to escape into the ultimate nirvana. We Christians have been taught that

he is a tri-une being: body, mind, spirit, three in one, made in the image of a Tri-Une God, and in this belief there lies that balance, that stability, that peace which quite clearly passes our understanding, now that the churches are largely abandoning it or reducing it to a mere formula.

Quicunque Vult

There seems to be a disastrous tendency among contemporary theologians and leading Christians to retreat from the immense revelation of the nature of the Godhead implicit in the concept of the Holy Trinity, which it is fashionable to refer to as 'Hellenistic', into a re-judaized religion which is constantly referred to nowadays as 'Judaeo-Christianity'. Ironically enough, this is commonly represented as 'modern' and 'progressive' rather than, as it clearly is, wholly retrogressive. That 'Confession of our Christian Faith, commonly called the Creed of Saint Athanasius' and formerly said in the Anglican churches on thirteen Feast Days during the Christian Year, is now said only on Trinity Sunday, and then may be 'explained away' in a sermon as an ingenious verbal formula thrashed out in the Councils of the Early Church for the confounding of heresies and the defense of the *Unity* of the Godhead, with no mention of the *Diversity*. Sometimes the word 'persona' is translated as 'an actor's mask' rather than as 'character' or 'personality', so that the faithful are given a picture of the tribal god of the Jews, blown up until he becomes the Monolithic Dictator of the Universe, play-acting with humanity by appearing in different 'guises'. The Creed goes to elaborate lengths to place precisely equal stress on the Unity and the diverse Trinity of God: "And the Catholick Faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity: Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance". So this Creed has to be 'phased out' before our religion can be brought 'up-to-date' and in line with the modern obsession with centralised Power, which is the characteristic of Unity not balanced by diversity.

If we think in practical terms, rather than verbalisms, about the Created Order, we see that unity-in-diversity and diversity-in-unity are of its very nature. A simple, unitary God, who does not comprise Diversity within his Being, cannot be a Creator; for the act of creation is the act of diversifying. Moreover, if the *Personae* of the Godhead are but masks, then the man

Jesus is a mask; and whatever that may mean, it cannot mean that he is the Incarnate Deity. One or other of the ancient heresies must be revived: either he was a mere simulacrum of a man, temporarily used by the Divine Spirit at a certain time in history, or he was a true man, and 'nothing but' a man—a Jewish prophet of such exceptional merit that he may be said to have had a special relationship with God, which by some verbal legerdemain might even be stretched to include some participation in the Godhead. In either case, the co-eternity of the Son becomes an incredible nonsense, and the Love which 'gave' dwindles in its very nature to a mere exhibition of supernatural Power. The Holy Spirit also—proceeding from the Father and the Son—must be lost also to the faith of those who share this thinking.

Why then are we so often given to understand that the *Quicunque vult* is nowadays mainly of historical and academic importance, scarcely applicable to the World of To-Day; that the heresies of the past which it was devised to meet have little bearing on the thinking of to-day; and that the tremendous doctrine concerning the eternal nature of God which emerged was a matter of temporary applicability to the circumstances of the time which we must now regard as expendable? Why are we scarcely ever shown that the World is now increasingly dominated by very much the same types of wrong thinking, wearing, indeed, contemporary 'masks', and especially the dualism of dialectical materialism which is the modern form of Manichaeism? And why, with all this talk about adapting our theology to the current situation and the new knowledge which science has brought us, has not this new knowledge been used to enrich our understanding of this historic revelation rather than to impoverish it or even to destroy it?

These questions are not merely rhetorical. They are asked in the hope of a reply from those who ought to know the answers, but there seems little hope of receiving one from those who are operating the current factory for 'situational theologies', manufactured to fit a world dominated by the atheology of human power.

What is so difficult for a practical scientist to grasp is the sort of verbal thinking which seems to dominate this whole field, varying abruptly with the current fashion or 'trend' which in turn is probably based upon the temporary dominance of a particular author or 'school' in the printed dialogue selected by

the editors and publishing houses. I shall probably be asked—at least by implication—whether I am up-to-date in current theological verbalistics, with the further implication that if I am not I am merely making a fool of myself in expressing my inexpert and unimportant opinions; which may well be true, but is of no significance as compared with the idea implicit in this criticism that the nature of God and of Man is a matter of opinion rather than of reality.

Science, at least since the Renaissance, has been based upon the belief that facts are not determined by thoughts and symbols, but are subject to the tests of the real Universe. It is *not* a matter of opinion as to whether water is correctly represented by the symbols H₂O or HO₂ because this deals with realities which can fairly quickly and easily be tested. Because the supreme questions of the ultimate nature of the Universe and of Man's place in it are not subject, by their very nature, to such simple tests, must this imply that they are less real than the chemical nature of water? If indeed the water molecule were HO₂ the practical consequences would be catastrophic. But is it a matter of no practical consequence whether God exists, and if so, whether He is a simple Unity, or a Trinity-in-Unity; or whether Man is essentially an Hebraic duality of body and soul, or a tri-une being of body, mind and spirit?

This would appear to be a question which invites the answer 'No—of course not!' But the whole trend of the current writing and discussion on the subject seems to carry the implication that such matters are matters of opinion, of expert scholarship, of linguistic interpretation or historical analysis, of anything but their practical consequences. We are led to believe that radically different and opposed beliefs about the nature of Man and the Universe can lead to similar results; and not only that the road to Hell can be paved with good intentions but the road to Heaven with wrong ones. Is it surprising that when the vision is so confused and detached from reality the people are on the way to perishing? How can Man be responsible for Nature if he has no idea of what Nature is or how to treat her? The English countryside at its best is the product of centuries of belief that Nature is the Creation of the love of God in whose Trinitarian Nature the principle of balance, of equilibrium, of unity-in-diversity, is made holy. In the deserts of North Africa (created by the

Roman *latifundia*), the dust bowl of the Middle West, the slums (vertical and horizontal) of our great cities, the dreary blocks of workers' flats in Moscow and the vast collective farms of the Russian Revolution may be seen the product of the belief that Nature is a chaos engendered by an impersonal play of forces, upon which Man alone can impose order, and the Masters of mankind their supreme will, whether by the operation of financial or of political power. So much of the argument and discussion about Man's responsibility for Nature is futile, because it covers a fundamental difference of belief about Man, about Nature, and even about responsibility. Particularly since our nation has been made into a multiracial, multicultural, multireligious conglomeration of humanity, with no common ground to work from except a common subjection to money and employment and to the State and its controls and its universal, compulsory education, it has become vitally necessary for Christians especially, to make clear the basis of belief from which they operate, since this can no longer be taken for granted, and to seek to apply it, in full, here and there, so that it may be known by its fruits, its results may be seen and its example may be followed by others.

Erratum: We wish to draw attention to an omission in the previous installment of this article on p. 4, col. 1, line 18 of the May, 1977, issue. The complete sentence should read: "But add marrows, potatoes, sloes, beetles and pebbles, and we can add them up to z 'objects'—a summation which has no reality whatever, but is merely an imaginary collection or 'set' which I have made in my mind and transferred to words on paper; though I could, if it were not far too much trouble, impose my imaginary 'set' upon the real world by physically assembling the things in one fatuous heap, an action with real consequences in waste of time and energy, probably annoyance to other people, and waste of some of the perishables."

No. It is not Christianity which need fear the giant universe. It is those systems which place the whole meaning of existence in biological or social evolution on our own planet. It is the creative evolutionist, the Bergsonian or Shavian, or the Communist, who should tremble when he looks up at the night sky. For he really is committed to a sinking ship. He really is attempting to ignore the discovered nature of things, as though by concentrating on the possibly upward trend in a single planet he could make himself forget the inevitable downward trend in the universe as a whole, the trend to low temperatures and irrevocable disorganization. For entropy is the real cosmic wave, and evolution only a momentary tellurian ripple within it.

C.S. Lewis, *God in the Dock*, 44

The Trinity in Creatures

C.N. Cochrane, in *Christianity and Classical Culture* (1940), remarks that John Henry Newman's assertion that the Trinity is "intellectually incomprehensible" did much to "set up a cult of unintelligibility" around the doctrine, and make it obscure and remote. On the contrary, Cochrane notes, Athanasius—a relentless proponent of trinitarianism—saw in the doctrine an *arche*, "a basic principle broad and inclusive enough to bear the weight of the conclusions derived from it and to sustain, rather than stifle, the life of religion and philosophy" (361-3). In other words, the principle, far from being one that must remain a "mystery in and for itself", opens up reality to the mind.

This notion that the deepest of religious mysteries can tell men about comprehensible realities—and *vice versa*—is not unique to Athanasius. Implicit in the multitude of analogies which have been used to illustrate the Trinity, it is evident in direct assertions by many theologians. Thus, Augustine, in *The Trinity*, says: "Insofar, therefore, as anything is, it is good, that is, to the extent it bears some resemblance, though very remote, to the highest good; and if a natural likeness, then certainly right and well-ordered, but if a defective likeness, then certainly shameful and perverse"¹. What is good is like God—although it cannot duplicate God. Moreover, Augustine thinks of good specifically in trinitarian terms: "For it was not that gods might make to the image and likeness of gods, but that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit might make to the image of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, in order that man might subsist as the image of God. But God is the Trinity". The image of God in creatures, then, must be tri-une.

The idea occurs in later periods as well. Alexander Gil, in *A Treatise Concerning the Trinitie of Persons in Unitie of the Deitie* (1601), justifies his use of analogies for the Trinity by saying: "Maruel not, that I make this argument from the creature to the Creator; for in this very point of/the *Power & Godhead*, the *Holy ghost* himselfe teacheth me to reason of the *invisible things of God*, by the things visible, Rom. I.20" (24-5). Richard Fowns, in *Trisagion or the Three Holy Offices of Jesus Christ* (1618), writes: "The glorious and incomprehensible TRINITY in unitie, hath so created all

things in the spacious Theatre of this round world, that although nothing can perfectly comprehend or expresse his cause; yet in euery thing there is a certaine image and resemblance of the great Creator" (1); this principle of elements "differing, but not diuided: sundry, and yet the same" occurs in "euery thing, which Arte, or Nature doth bring forth" (2).

These are large claims, surely, and some will no doubt find them frivolous and outmoded. Note that I do not assert that they are *true*; I do not know. What I do assert is that, if we are to take Christianity seriously, such claims must be examined. The facts are that Romans I.20 does state, unequivocally, that "the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, *even* his eternal power and Godhead", and that a fundamental point of Christian doctrine is the Trinity: "the Catholic faith is this: That we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity". Such is Christianity. The notion that the tri-une character of the Godhead is inherent in the very structure of created reality is either truth or it is nonsense; it cannot be fobbed off as a "mystery"; St. Paul does not admit that "excuse". If it is truth, then it must, as Athanasius believed, be a "starting-point" for radically new understanding; if it is nonsense, then the essence of Christianity is nonsense, and this matter might as well be cleared up, once and for all. But to base the discussion on matters that stand aloof from the main point is merely perverse and obscurantist.

D.R.K.

¹Trans. Stephen McKenna (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1963). See pages 327 and 240.

("Cabal", continued from p. 2)

Such an event naturally arouses one's curiosity; but it acquires even more special interest in the light of statements made in recent years by the Prime Minister. For example, in a taped interview with the editor of *The Financial Times* in March 1972 Mr. Trudeau suggested that "business and government and labour have to get much more together than they are now."² He was more

(continued p. 7)

("Cabal", continued from p. 6)

specific in a controversial declaration made on television at the end of 1975:—

Our problem is how to deal with bigness, not how you do away with it. We can't destroy the big unions and we can't destroy the multinationals. We can control them. But who can control them? The government—and that means the government is going to take a larger role in running institutions.... And this means that you're also going to have big governments.

... there's going to be not less authority in our lives, but perhaps more.³

These are but two of a series of glimpses the Prime Minister has provided of his vision of Canadian society in the future—a society in which policy will be determined by the leaders of government, big unions, and big business and power will flow downward upon the people rather than upward from them.

This is the unmistakable import of Mr. Trudeau's words, although his terminology might be a bit more euphemistic than the foregoing. Under all the lyrical, staged, vacuous, contradictory verbiage that smothers daily life in politics lies a hard stratum of clear, consistent purpose, which keeps emerging on those occasions when candour is most apparent. This concept of state policy being dictated increasingly by an elite drawn from government, business, and union circles must be taken as basic to Mr. Trudeau's long-term political purposes. What such a development boils down to, of course, is centralization of power—a goal the Prime Minister was explicitly advocating years ago as a professor and radical social critic. Born into a wealthy business environment, he became in his youth a promoter of causes of "organized labour" before moving into government. The tripodal power centre he is encouraging faithfully reflects this background.

The scheme itself is not new. It has been the object of experiments for at least a century. Bismarck developed the means of governing through an unofficial triumvirate of this sort while building the unitary state of Germany in the 19th century. His principle of making the interests of "the State" primordial in relation to any other interests was pushed to theoretical extremes about 60 years ago by the head of the German General Electric Company, Walther Rathenau, whose concepts, in turn, found expression in the Fascist and National Socialist movements in Italy and Germany. In the latter country, after Hitler had acceded to power

(continued p. 8)

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

("Cabal", continued from p. 7)

with the backing of bankers and large business concerns, all unions were merged into a German Labour Front, and Goebbels explained how this was a strategy to get "the trade unions in our hands" as a prelude to getting "Germany entirely in our hands."⁴ In Italy, Mussolini set up a structure of comparable implications through the organization of so-called Corporations for persons engaged in business and for employees, the executives of which were appointed by and coordinated with the government.⁵ A similar scheme was promoted in England out of the Mond-Turner Conferences in 1926.

Thus, the policy that Mr. Trudeau is espousing—on the hackneyed old pretext of "inevitability"—is just a new variant of an old theme with a thoroughly discredited pedigree. The effect of the policy has always been to diminish the status of the individual—to swallow him up in great causes, overriding plans, and ponderous organizations. His power to opt out is eliminated: the logic of the system—which postulates that the desires and purposes of millions of men can be embodied in a single (or, in the case of the Trudeau scheme, a three-fold)

will—leads naturally to the suppression of this ultimate defense against tyranny.

So Mr. Trudeau's direction is clear. How far he intends to go in that direction is not, but the praise he has regularly showered on the most brutal dictatorships in the world is hardly reassuring.

What should be understood is that the political evolution he is working towards diverges radically from the philosophical basis of the best in our political tradition. Mr. Trudeau is all for monopoly: the important consideration for him is that it should be in the right hands. However, the Christian tradition holds that monopoly *always* falls into the wrong hands—that, in fact, human hands are by their nature unsuited to the kind of power that monopoly confers. The defect is not in the way people are represented relative to centralized power, but in the way such power is itself constituted.

That the natural heirs of this hard-won wisdom have all but completely lost it is tragic, but comprehensible. Exposed from infancy to an assortment of imaginary Supermen, Spidermen, Bionic Men, etc., who incorruptibly incarnate and dispense justice; taught in school that the formula for ridding the world of its problems is to concentrate adequate sanctions in such reservoirs of human virtue as the United Nations—our population quite normally has difficulty attaining a sane perspective on the dynamics of power in human association.

The only practical corrective would seem to be to identify major power relationships and rigorously insist that, where they cannot conveniently be broken up, effective accountability and the ability to contract out should be incorporated into them. The choice is between this and government by cabals of ambitious and irresponsible men.

R.E.K.

Seed

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

Published & Printed by



PUBLISHING

Box 3184, Sherwood Park
Alberta, Canada T8A 2A6

¹The four men attending for "business" held among them more than 60 corporate directorships and chairmanships; three of the four sit on the boards of directors of chartered banks.

²*The Ottawa Citizen*, March 13, 1972, page 7.

³*Edmonton Journal*, January 2, 1976, page 7.

⁴*Hitler: A Study in Tyranny*, Alan Bullock (New York, 1962), page 273.

⁵*Mussolini: A Study in Power*, Ivone Kirkpatrick (New York, 1968), pages 240-1.