

Seed

"We"

Among "British Columbia's Proposals on Income Security in Canada" (sponsored by former B.C. premier Dave Barrett) to the Federal-Provincial Conference of First Ministers (May 23-25, 1973) was one entitled "An Employment Strategy for guaranteed Jobs". Having stated as a proposition that "full employment should be regarded as the responsibility and a prime objective of both the Federal and Provincial levels of Government", the compilers of this document suggest "that governments implement a community employment programme" whose "purpose would be to provide new job opportunities based on the notion of socially profitable employment in the public sector"--in short, "a programme of guaranteed employment".

This is the sort of thing that we have heard before (and since) the publication of these proposals. What is interesting here is the naive contradiction evident in the rationales presented.

First, the document seeks to define "socially profitable employment" by contrasting it with "economically profitable employment". This itself is an admission that such a "community employment programme" would likely be inefficient and wasteful; it could not support itself, and therefore would have to be financed through the familiar devices of debt and taxation--the uncontrolled access of government to the community's credit.

The document goes on to say: "What is new (about this guaranteed employment programme) is the recognition that in an age of affluence and leisure we are free to choose what sort of activities we deem to be socially profitable and designate as employment worthy of pay". Noteworthy here are the words "leisure", "free", "choose", and "we".

In the first place, it seems a curious sort of logic that in an age of "leisure", "full employment" should remain "a prime objective" of governments. The only response to the promise of leisure is "the development of new and different approaches to job creation". This is supposed to be innovative.

Then, of course, there are the references to freedom and choice--whose, and to do what? Freedom to "work", that is, to be employed. Now, it is axiomatic that an employee (to the extent that he is employed) is not free: he is selling his freedom for money; he is subservient to policies determined by somebody else. This is the reality of employment--or wage slavery. A man punching a time clock and subject to penalty if he does not is scarcely free; nor can he choose what he should do *while at work*. Comprehensivizing employment merely extends this sphere of coercion.

If the employee cannot choose, who can? Presumably, the employer--that is, the state. What activities will the state "deem to be socially profitable"? Are they the same as those which we, as individuals (whose credit the state is allocating) would choose--if we had the choice? Mussolini thought that draining the marshes was a "socially profitable activity"--he used the public credit for that. He also regarded the invasion of Abyssinia as "socially profitable" ("the task of colonizing Abyssinia will provide Italians with employment for fifty years to come")--and he mobilized the public credit for that.

As the government becomes the only employer, the individual (far from having the freedom to choose between work and leisure) loses the power to choose even what work he will do--and, on what terms.

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.



Deceit as an Ethic

No doubt many persons who have contributed to OXFAM have been disturbed by the recent revelations by Hugh Keenleyside, former chairman of the organization.

The most shocking matter is not the noteworthy fact that 62 per cent of the budget is being swallowed by administration, but the calculated deception of the public by the management of this "charity". Under cover of the appellation "world relief organization", OXFAM has been channeling its funds to political groups, such as northern natives involved in land claims disputes and so-called "liberation" forces in backward countries. Yet the advertising image presented to the public has continued to center on saving saucer-eyed, undernourished children.

The inconsistency is no accident. A report recently prepared for OXFAM management bluntly recommended deceit as a policy: "we should consider ways of maximizing our income from the upper-income group, even if this means restricting information about our goals."

This affair reminded me of a seminar on "foreign aid" that I happened to attend at Carleton University about three years ago. Members of Parliament, academics, and students from African and other foreign countries participated. Nobody batted an eye as techniques for intimidating Canadians — lying to them, and generating false guilt complexes in them — were clinically discussed. Deceit was accepted as the normal *modus operandi* for extracting more money from a doubting and already over-taxed public. Every means was justified by the end. Ironically, some of these same conspirators could hold forth for hours on the corruption of the society they were plotting to despoil in this way.

Spiritual pride leads a man to assume that he alone has a handle on the truth. Thinking this, he strives to attain some goal. Impatience with and contempt for the judgment of others induce him to use deceptive methods. But those who hold that ends justify means do not understand that means also condition ends. No hermetic seal separates them; and corruption from administrative lies eventually contaminates policy. The money for the food to nourish the little child becomes the money for the land mine planted by terrorists which maims him.

R.E.K.

Marxism and Christianity

This continuation of an article begun last month explores some of the political implications of the doctrinal incompatibility of Marxism and Christianity.

There are, no doubt, many other philosophical differences between Marxism and Christianity: however, those that I have cursorily discussed are, I think, radical and undeniable. A philosophy that is basically materialistic, atheistic, amoral, "dualistic", does not conform very obviously with one that is essentially theistic, moral, and trinitarian, one that emphasizes spiritual values and the principle of reconciliation. Having outlined these philosophical differences, I now should like to suggest that there must, of logical necessity, be corresponding political differences between the two "systems".

What, first, are some of the political implications of the disagreement between Christianity and Marxism on the question of the existence of God? Note that the essence of this matter has to do with the issue of the reality of something outside the purely temporal and material.

Creation

Perhaps the first, and most obvious, aspect of this question is the nature of creation itself. Christian doctrine insists upon the fact of creation *ex nihilo*, from nothing: the being of the world and everything in it is a free, uncoerced, untailed act by the creator. Thus, what we have is, as John Calvin has observed, the inheritance of children, not the stipend of servants: life (in the broadest sense of the word) is a divine gift. The Christian, then, believes in the primacy of grace: presumably, he will seek a political economy which embodies the principle of inheritance and recognizes natural abundance as a gift of God. The Marxist, on the other hand, tends to deny the concept of "grace"—natural as well as supernatural. Thus, it is characteristic of Marxists to excoriate the notion of inheritance and to glorify labour: "Equal liability of all to labour" is one of the "ten points" in *The Communist Manifesto*; Marx's economic analysis is based upon the "labour theory of values". What is the source of wealth? The Marxist emphasizes labour; the Chris-

tian insists that God's spontaneous act of creation is the source of wealth, and that such concomitant factors as the cultural heritage must be considered. For the Marxist, life (or livelihood) is something that must be earned; to the Christian, life is freely given.

Related to this notion that man 'owes' his existence to something beyond his own material efforts (in the Christian view) is the idea that he owes his allegiance to something transcendent. As the first implies not only the need for gratitude, but also a great blessing, so the second implies not only a responsibility, but also an inestimable advantage. Christ's dictum "Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's" once and for all time epitomized a distinction of priorities in the disposition of allegiances. Men have a primary allegiance to God; this means that 'Caesar', the state, the collectivity, can have only limited or restricted claims on a man. The allegiance to God is thus also a guarantee of personal sovereignty: the state can never claim to have total allegiance from a person, for individuals have a relationship with God that precedes any claims the state may have. That is, human rights are not privileges dispensed at the whim of temporal powers: they exist prior to any temporal power. Any political organization claiming to be "Christian" must recognize the primacy of these rights. The state exists to serve the individual.

In atheism, of course, there is no God with whom persons can have a primary relationship. There is no metaphysical support for the limitation of the claims of temporal power (that is, force masquerading as power). Thus, as W.H. Auden observes, one of the problems with atheism is that the absolute comes to be identified with the political: all power, the argument then goes, issues from the state; "Big Brother" usurps the place of God. The practical manifestations of Marxist theory all exhibit this tendency: the lord and giver of life is the omniscient state.

Personality

Moreover, the concept that God is characterized by personality must also have profound political implications. Personality—expressed in consciousness and intention—is, as we have seen, an attribute not only of God in the Christian view, but also of man. "What does it profit a man," Christ asks, "if he gains the whole world—if he loses his own soul?" The soul of the individual person, regarded as unique, is more worth than the world. What characterizes a soul is consciousness and will—the powers of discrimination and choice. A Christian dispensation, then, must maximize the sphere of choice, must encourage (or permit) the development of individual excellence (and not merely functional excellence, but moral or spiritual excellence): political or economic arrangements that limit the sphere of choice are therefore fundamentally anti-Christian.

Once again, a philosophy like Marxism, that repudiates the concept of personality, that regards "salvation" as a collective and material matter, must support an entirely different kind of political organization—one in which *only* functional differentiation is possible. Personality—again, defined by consciousness and intention—will be standardized, uniform. Persons, as economic 'units', will be useful only as long as they acquiesce in centrally-determined policies. The unique personality, so central to Christian philosophy, is merely an excrescence in Marxist society.

Sanctions Against Evil

Having a related political influence is the question of the nature of evil. The Marxist, however much he excoriates the "corruptions" of capitalist society, does not, as we have seen, really believe in radical evil. "Evil" persists only so long as certain persons hold a certain kind of "power"; when they are eradicated, "evil" is eradicated. Thus, it is a bad thing when an hereditary aristocracy or "capitalists" exercise unrestrained political control; however, when exactly the same kind of control (and even more comprehensive in degree) is held by commissars and central committeeocrats, it is all right. This kind of control will, of course, ultimately "wither away", leaving only the communist Utopia, in which pride, covetousness, lust, gluttony, sloth, anger, and invidiousness will no longer be part of human nature. Obviously, a world in

which there is no evil requires no safeguards against evil: Marxism, denying the radical nature of evil and promising to erase manifestations of socially-determined evil, convinces persons to relinquish their sanctions against evil (leaving them politically impotent), but never fulfills its promise to deliver a perfect world.

Christianity, by contrast, in insisting upon the radical nature of evil, implies the need for continuing political sanctions against it. We have quoted elsewhere the assertion by C.S. Lewis of two possible reasons for being a "democrat": one, that men are so good that they all deserve a share in government; two, that men are so prone to wickedness that no man can be trusted to exercise irresponsible power over his fellows. The first view is consistent with theoretical Marxism: it says, in effect, men are essentially good, but some men have been corrupted by institutions; give us power so that we can change the institutions and allow all men to be good. So far as I know, no group of Marxists, having once acquired political power, has relinquished that power voluntarily. Christianity's insistence on the radical nature of evil, however, requires a political dispensation which guarantees the preservation of individual sanctions through law (to protect personal rights) and through the distribution of power as much as possible to individuals so that no person (subject to pride, avarice, envy, malice, lust, gluttony, and/or sloth) will have power over another.

Dualism

Most of the foregoing can also be related to the divergent views of Marxism and Christianity in the matter of unity and diversity. Recall that Marxism is essentially dualistic: it claims that reality consists in contradictions. Moreover, it argues that progress can result only from the dialectical process, from violent confrontation. Thus, its best-known image is that of 'war', for example, the class war. It sees society as fractured, with different groups in inevitable conflict with each other—conflict that can be resolved only through "revolution". Note that "dualism" implies the existence of two *autonomous* principles of being—not one principle which allows different manifestations, but two. Thus, there is one principle that might be called "capital" and another that might be called "la-

(continued p. 7)

Roosevelt and the Corporate Socialists

Antony Sutton's latest book¹ traces the genealogy of the New Deal introduced by President Franklin Delano Roosevelt during the 1930's. Sutton's thesis is that the myth that Roosevelt was a champion of the weak against big business and finance is completely false. In fact, his career was inextricably bound up with and advanced by these very interests, which demonstrated keen appreciation of his talent for converting political influence into monetary profit.

FDR -- "Wall Streeter"

The initial chapters establish FDR's numerous and intimate links with Wall Street heavyweights. Both the Delano and Roosevelt families were well-represented in this society, and he exploited his connections to the full. Sutton reproduces correspondence indicating that this was his principal value to the firms in which he occupied prominent positions. Roosevelt's specialty was gaining advantages for private companies from government agencies—and scruples were peripheral to his undertakings in this field. Examples of his dubious projects were his efforts to profit by the postwar hyperinflation in Germany and the industrial strictures imposed on that country by the Treaty of Versailles.

Between 1921 and 1928, this supposed ally of the common man was a director of eleven corporations whose headquarters were in the so-called "golden circle" of Wall Street. Had he really changed when, four years later, he emerged as a knight in shining armour denouncing the abuses of the rich? Sutton would give a negative reply to this question—and has accumulated much convincing, if unfamiliar, evidence for his case.

Capitalists Push for Totalitarianism

At this point (in order to make his basic argument comprehensible) he is compelled to embark upon a major digression. His concern is to correct a common misconception about the natural lines of division in politics. A stereotyped idea about the "capitalist" associates him with undying loyalty to the principles of personal freedom and individual initiative; but, citing statements by a number of the executives of the largest corporations and banks in the United States, Sutton shows that such men were typically dedicated centralizers of

power who recognized the utility of State interference in furthering this process. They spoke like — and, in fact, sometimes with—socialist agitators, with whom they shared a preoccupation with the means of 'making society work for the few.'

What was the philosophy of the financiers ...? Certainly *anything* but laissez-faire competition, which was the last system they envisaged. Socialism, communism, fascism or their variants were acceptable. The ideal for these financiers was "cooperation," forced if necessary. Individualism was out, and competition was immoral.²

The reason is not hard to find:—

... this element of compulsion ... enables a few—those who hold and gain from legal monopoly—to live in society at the expense of the many. Those who control or benefit from the legislative franchises and regulations and who influence the government bureaucracies at the same time are determining the rules and regulations to protect their present wealth, prey on the wealth of others, and keep out new entrants from their business.³

These Wall Street financiers and industrialists developed and actively promoted schemes for the creation of a totalitarian United States of America. Two of them closely associated with FDR's political career were Bernard Baruch, speculator and economic dictator of the country during World War I, and Gerard Swope, chairman of the General Electric Company. Baruch advocated continuation in peacetime of the type of economic organization erected during the war, while Swope in 1931 produced a plan "for the stabilization of industry" which was, says Sutton, "a transparent device to lay the groundwork for the corporate state by defusing potential labor opposition with a massive welfare carrot."⁴

Repaying Political Favours

Such a program was expressed in Al Smith's campaign against Herbert Hoover for the presidency in 1928. Then, the preponderance of major Wall Street donations went to the former—even though Hoover was no foe of government intervention in the economy. In 1932, both presidential candidates were sounded out for their reactions to the Swope plan. Hoover described what occurred as follows in his memoirs.

Among the early Roosevelt fascist measures was the National Industry Recovery Act (NIRA) of June 16, 1933. These ideas were first suggested by

Gerard Swope (of General Electric Company) During the campaign of 1932, Henry I. Harriman, president of [the U.S. Chamber of Commerce], urged that I agree to support these proposals, informing me that Mr. Roosevelt had agreed to do so. I tried to show him that this stuff was pure fascism; that it was merely a remaking of Mussolini's "corporate state" and refused to agree to any of it. He informed me that in view of my attitude, the business world would support Roosevelt with money and influence. That for the most part, proved true.⁵

At the first meeting of Cabinet after FDR took office in 1933, Bernard Baruch and his long-time assistant, General Hugh Johnson, distributed copies to all members of a work by the Italian Fascist theoretician, Gentile. This was a foreshadowing of the sort of legislation for "national recovery" from the Depression that the administration would bring forward. The brain trust set to work formulating economic plans for the federal government consisted of three representatives of Wall Street (Baruch, Johnson, and Alexander Sachs) and academics Rexford Tugwell and Raymond Moley.

Far from being contrary to the interests of the rich and powerful, the National Recovery Administration, the most important component of the New Deal, was "designed, constructed and promoted by Wall Street." The potency of this influence is reflected by Roosevelt's selection of personnel for NRA. General Johnson was installed at the top of the administration, assisted principally by the "three musketeers": Gerard Swope, president of GE, Walter C. Teagle, of Standard Oil of New Jersey, and Louis Kirstein, of William Filene's Sons, a retail merchandising company.

The peak of the Roosevelt National Recovery Administration consisted of the president of the largest electrical corporation, the chairman of the largest oil company, and the representative of the most prominent financial speculator in the United States.⁶

Silent Lips, Busy Hands

The lesson to be learned from Sutton's books is that denying with the lips what one is doing with the hands is an art brought to a high level of perfection in the field of politics. Moreover, the most significant lines of differentiation in politics are not accurately represented in the finance-dominated media. The monopolistic thrust—because it is anti-social—is kept hidden as much as possible by its promoters: efforts are constantly made to blind us to the essence of policy decisions by feints, verbiage, and superficial scrapping by political front men. If we are to make any sense

at all of the past century of history, we must see it from this viewpoint.

This robber baron scheme is also, under different labels, the socialist plan. The difference between a corporate state monopoly and a socialist state monopoly is essentially only the identity of the group controlling the power structure. The essence of socialism is monopoly control by the state using hired planners and academic sponges. On the other hand, Rockefeller, Morgan, and their corporate friends aimed to acquire and control *their* monopoly and to maximize its profits through influence in the state political apparatus; this, while it still needs hired planners and academic sponges, is a discreet and far more subtle process than outright state ownership under socialism. Success for the Rockefeller gambit has depended particularly upon focusing public attention upon largely irrelevant and superficial historical creations, such as the myth of a struggle between capitalists and communists, and careful cultivation of political forces by big business.⁷

The elements in the career of FDR offer type samples of these techniques, from the study of which we can gain much insight into current politico-economic developments.

Unfortunate Distraction

Considering our admiration for Sutton's painstaking researches, we are saddened to notice one feature of his work unworthy of the rest—namely, his new-found fascination with economic "alternatives" espoused by theorists of the "libertarian" school. For example, he suggests that unfettered competition is the ultimate good in economics. Yet it would be reasonable to argue that Rockefeller is simply a competitor who has won—and that influence over governments is just part of the fruits of victory. If the Rockefeller empire were dismantled, have we any assurance that individuals with similar talents and proclivities would not rebuild it?

The defect in this argument is, of course, that genuine competition cannot exist in a society where the "ignition fuel" of economic activity, money, is in the hands of a monopoly which administers it for its own advantage. However, Sutton has no proposals for rectifying this situation—except a reversion to the gold standard! Apparently libertarian pilpulisms have bamboozled him to the point where he cannot see that gold as a monetary base is not only liable to monopoly control but so inadequate in the face of expanding economic requirements that it literally *had* to be fraudulently operated for centuries. If the belief that a farmer in America should not be allowed to grow potatoes until

some Peruvian peon has taken some rock out of the ground and a banker has reburied it in a vault is not an instance of crude superstition, what is?

It is unfortunate that a man of Sutton's abilities and concerns should have become infected by such nonsense.

R.E.K.

¹Wall Street and FDR (New York: Arlington House, 1975).
²Ibid., 83. ³Ibid., 74. ⁴Ibid., 127.
⁵Ibid., 116. ⁶Ibid., 135. ⁷Ibid., 72-3.

("Marxism", continued from p. 4)

bour": they cannot live together, but must clash, with the resulting defeat of one— thus, for example, "labour" becomes "capital". Or, to offer another example, the two might be "Tsarism" and "Bolshevism": they clash, and Bolshevism replaces Tsarism with Stalin.

There are two practical implications of this worldview. One is that it fosters division; it encourages social disintegration. Disintegration, of course, is an entropic phenomenon: violence results in the dissipation of energy; conflict is a form of waste. Thus, the Marxist contention that "progress" or "creation" can emerge from contradictions is a questionable one. A second is that the dualism is a mirage: the "opposites" in Marxist dialectic are always essentially the same thing. Thus, the Marxist view is really monistic, not dualistic, and crudely monistic at that. The replacement of the Tsar by Stalin is merely the exchange of one version of the monolithic state for another: politically, there is no difference between, say, Hitlerism and Stalinism and Mao Tse-tungism: all involve the centralization of power, and the regimentation of persons.

Trinitarianism

Christian trinitarianism, again, suggests a radically different type of political organization. The image of "the unity of substance" implies the essentially "conservative" nature of order, of harmony. However, within the unity of substance, there is the image of the diversity of persons— suggesting not absolute autonomy, but differentiation, as a fundamental principle in Christianity. Christianity does not support subjec-

(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

("Marxism", continued from p. 7)

tivism: we are not 'free' to create our own realities; but we are free to realize ourselves through our unique relationships with God. We are not required to fit ourselves into Joe Stalin's, Adolph Hitler's, Mao Tse-tung's, or Peregrine Codwallop's version of "reality".

One more specific way of looking at this might be to apply the trinitarian image to an actual organization, and look at (1) Policy—the objective of the organization, (2) Administration—how that objective is to be accomplished, and (3) Sanctions—the distribution of power to individuals so that they can make their subscription to the policy of the organization effective. That is, individuals, having sanctions, can choose or refuse to support a given program; thus, policy is a matter of individual discrimination and choice (that is, persons in this kind of organization are functioning as conscious and intentional beings). Christianity, as we have seen, must insist upon this aspect of any association. Marxism, not concerned with reason and will (in other than a few select individuals), does not allow the distribution or guarantee of sanctions.

Policy is centrally determined and everyone participates in administration of that policy: persons become functionaries, technicians, or, as Marx would have it, "units"; no one can opt out of a Five-Year Plan.

Of course, no one can opt out of paying income tax either. In the foregoing, my assumption has not been that so-called "Western democracy" is the Christian alternative to Marxist totalitarianism. Christian principles have certainly been influential in the development of some of our political institutions, but, more and more, the notion (and practice) of the supremacy of the state has become the reality of our political lives—as the most fleeting reflection on many of the recent pronouncements of Pierre Trudeau will confirm. At the same time, however, I do not acquiesce in the identification of "capitalism" as the villain of the piece. The simple fact is that all progress, at least all material progress, is the result of 'capitalism'—of the allocation or investment of resources by someone with a view to gaining some advantage. This is as true of collectivist systems as it is of "free enterprise". The crucial point is who controls the capital, who owns the capital, and therefore who has the right to decide how it is to be invested. Christianity, it seems to me, has something to say about this: if personal political autonomy is essential to a Christian dispensation, then the practical concomitant of this is the distribution of economic power to individuals so that they can make their own choices. This autonomy, this power to choose, this control of personal sanctions, is compromised equally in a system where the communal credit is controlled and directed by the state and one in which the communal capital is treated as a debt to the banking system.

This is, admittedly, a superficial treatment of a question upon which volumes could be written. My intention has not been to be exhaustive, but rather to be synoptic. I have attempted to point out a few of the central (and, it seems to me, unavoidable) philosophical differences between Marxism and Christianity, and some of their practical implications. If anyone can shrug these divergencies off as inconsequential, so be it. For my part, I cannot but feel that they indicate, as has been rather unequivocally said, that "there is no room in the universe, much less on earth, for Christianity and commu-socialism".

D.R.K.

Seed

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

Published & Printed by



OUSIA
PUBLISHING

Box 3184, Sherwood Park
Alberta, Canada T8A 2A6