

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 70 No. 6

NOVEMBER – DECEMBER, 1991

AFTER MARXISM, WHAT?

The Soviet Union was officially declared dead on Thursday 5 September 1991. The supreme legislature, the Congress of Peoples Deputies, voted to dissolve the communist system of centralised government built up over seventy years, and to devolve powers to the assemblies of the fifteen republics, most of whom have declared for independence from Moscow. This claim is already conceded to the three Baltic states. Drafting and acceptance of a new Union Treaty will follow interim rule by a Council of State and two-chamber parliament of deputies elected by the remaining republics.

Thus, at the cost of millions of lives in internal strife, not counting the war dead, the great experiment in Marxism begun by the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 has collapsed in ignominy, having utterly failed to meet the needs and desires of the peoples in whose names, (though in name only,) it held such power. Its economic failures to produce and distribute sufficient of even basic necessities had long been evident. But the collapse of the coup dramatically demonstrated the almost universal political revulsion against communist government as millions choked the streets in protest and the republics' parliaments demanded greater autonomy or outright independence.

Learned academics may reach different verdicts as to the causes of this historic collapse; but for Social Crediters, two cardinal principles of governance suffice. A truly satisfactory economy in a modern society would and could ensure that consumers collectively can dictate what is produced because they are in command of sufficient purchasing power to enable them to do so. Such "effective demand" generates "the market economy" and possession of sufficient of it provides the sanctions which consumers exercise over choice, quality and quantity to satisfy their needs. To the limited extent that the market economy works now, it works very efficiently. But it lacks any morality. "Money will buy anything" as the cynics say. The strong can exploit the weak at all levels of Society. And it works hardly at all for the millions on or below the poverty line who are vulnerable to exploitation.

Matching their needs with the unused resources represented by so-called "unemployment" and underused plant and machinery is the supreme economic and political challenge of our times. Its solution is a basic income as of right to represent the individual's personal share in our inheritance of "know-how" which is the major factor in modern productive efficiency. Moreover, the security of an independent basic income frees the individual from economic exploitation.

Likewise on the political level, satisfaction of electors' needs requires that they, collectively, through the exercise of their own initiatives, dictate the political agenda and specify the results desired, whatever their representative's party label. Their sanction to ensure compliance is withdrawal of support and dismissal in the event of unsatisfactory service.

On both these crucial counts, Marxism as applied in the Soviet Union and elsewhere has amply proved its inefficiency, and has now been decisively rejected by most of its peoples, in theory if not yet wholly in practice.

But what next?

As the republics of the Eastern bloc come increasingly under Western influence in reshaping their economies and political structures, how far does the capitalist West itself fall short of these basic criteria? Do their market economies really supply the needs of their populations? Do their parliaments really meet the aspirations of their electors?

The economic question can only properly be judged against the background of the greatest expansion in productive efficiency in history. Whether it be in agriculture, or in industry, or in medicine or in transportation, the cumulative achievements of this 20th century are so stupendous as to hold the promise of a guaranteed sufficiency for all, in freedom. But as science and technology have multiplied capacity, so have they reduced the demand for human labour. Hence "unemployment" breeds poverty while industry provides abundance and has to fight for export markets for the "surpluses" unsaleable at home.

Politicians, economists and churchmen alike, all ensnared in their own predilections, appear impotent when confronted with the continuing paradoxes of poverty amidst plenty; of hunger while food surpluses mount; of bankruptcies as markets shrink from lack of consumer purchasing power; of inadequate housing and homelessness in town and country as unemployed builders draw the dole. The mere mention of "inner cities" conjures up images of deprivation and neglect, of sullen hopelessness and smouldering resentment.

In short, the "wealthy" nations are themselves unable to distribute the abundance they are capable of, with fairness to all and injury to none. And unable to satisfy the modest aspirations of many of their people for a tolerable life in decent surroundings at a reasonable standard of living.

And why not?

Because: they are all alike imprisoned in the same fraudulent monetary system which permits the creation of money only as

(cont: back page)

In a collection of essays entitled *And No One Cheered*, analysing the 1982 Canadian Constitution Act, Keith Banting and Richard Simeon concluded:

"Our constitutional life... reveals much about the nature of Canadian democracy. Champions of representative democracy can rest assured that those historic conditions have been preserved with only minor challenge. Those who yearn for greater public participation in political life, on the other hand, will agree that both the process by which we changed our constitution and the substance of the changes themselves fall far short of their aspirations for a democratic Canada".

In world terms at least, it might be argued that what became known as The Meech Lake Accord has now drifted into the pages of regional history, a mere blip on the radar scan of North American life. However, its detail rewards scrutiny in view of Maastricht in December when the intention is that the Dutch should host the signing in principle of European political and monetary union.

The Meech Lake situation is very similar in background and operation to the event at Maastricht – to the point that both would appear to be masterminded not only within one kind of ideology but within one kind of plan.

On April 30, 1987, the Canadian federal government (elected 1984) and all ten provincial governments reached a new constitutional agreement at Meech Lake, Quebec. The aim was to lock in Quebec to the nation, irrevocably. The Accord was signed on June 3, 1987 in Ottawa. This took place without any public clamour for reform; at least of this nature – only aboriginal concerns had raised any current public ferment. The fairly even tenor of existence gave governments at both federal and provincial level the impression that they could make decisions 'in camera' and present their findings to the nation as *a fait accompli*.

In fact, an elitist brokerage marked the Canadian leadership – just as obtains in Europe. Secrecy is of the essence. The format was described by Peter Leslie in *Canada: The State of the Federation, 1986* (Queen's University, Ontario, 1987):

"... a preliminary set of informal discussions must take place behind closed doors, and the outcome of these discussions should determine whether prospects for agreement are good enough to move the talks into a public phase..."

Federal Premier Brian Mulroney had called the Meech Lake meetings to get Quebec back into quiescent partnership with the rest of Canada and he was anxious not to have the provincial premiers take the chance of pressing claims of their own. He did not want to be blackmailed into conceding factional demands for the sake of overall unity. He sought to resist any attempt at wholesale re-writing of the constitution. Chaos and de-centralisation would ensue, he felt.

At the 27th Annual Premiers' Conference in Edmonton, Alberta, August 10–12, 1986, Mulroney had won his case. A Press Release stated Quebec was top of the ongoing agenda and only after that was happily resolved would there be further constitutional discussions on such as Senate reform, fisheries, property rights etc. This was, of course, a relatively public airing of what was being planned but it was presented as something technical, not for the populace to bother about. After all, that was what politicians were for. They were given power for just such purpose.

However, by March 1987, Quebec Premier Robert Bourassa had begun to rock the boat. He intimated his boycott of a First

EC's MEECH I

Ministers' Conference on native self-government. This was his signal that Quebec was not getting the deal it had expected from the Edmonton deliberations.

Mulroney decided to head off the trouble and called a First Ministers' Conference for Meech Lake on April 30, with Quebec and the constitution as sole item on the agenda. Again, only the eleven governments were involved. People and media did not realise the importance of what was happening and largely ignored it. This was the idea. Every move was officially devised and controlled to meet the only requirement: instant success.

Aboriginal leaders were denied participation in what integrally mattered to them and their claims. Mulroney refused to place the private correspondence he had with the provincial premiers before the House of Commons.

The eleven government leaders arrived at Meech Lake shortly before noon on April 30, 1987 and emerged at 9.45pm with an agreement in principle. This was put into constitutional language and was finalised after an all-day and into-the-night bargaining session on June 3, 1987 in Ottawa. It was an impressive bit of jugglery but only a week later it was attracting the first criticism from "outside" for the secretive means by which it had been effected. Former Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, certainly not everyone's favourite when in power, was in the van and his intervention served to highlight the importance of objections and hence the importance of what had been done in the name and interests of the "nation".

The provincial governments seemed surprised at charges of undemocratic behaviour. After all, for 20 years the issues had been debated at large. These final meetings were only drawing the threads together. Indeed, Trudeau himself had pledged renewed federalism in 1980. And in Quebec at least, no one was in any doubt as to what was demanded and what was needed.

Meech Lake was duly endorsed in the Canadian House of Commons, with all three party leaders in agreement. Approval in October 1987 was by 242 votes to 16. Senate amendments were over-ridden by the Lower House in June 1988.

Eight provincial governments endorsed the Accord. The assumption that governments were reflecting the approval of their voters can be clearly seen in the provincial results. The Accord was supported as follows: Quebec, June 1987, by 95 votes to 18; Saskatchewan, September 1987, 43 – 3; Alberta, December 1987, 40 – 0 (43 MLAs absent); Prince Edward Island, May 1988, only one vote (Liberal) against; Nova Scotia, May 1988, 35 – 7; Ontario, June 1988, 112 – 8; British Columbia, June 1988, 42 – 5; Newfoundland, July, 1988, 28 – 10.

But in October 1989 Manitoba and New Brunswick refused, and later Newfoundland rescinded its endorsement. Manitoba wanted significant change, as did New Brunswick which introduced a "companion resolution" on March 21, 1990. Newfoundland changed its mind on April 6, 1990 under the Liberal government of new Premier Clyde Wells.

Te

TAKE ACCORD

In response, a First Ministers' meeting was called in Ottawa, June 3-9, 1990, to resolve the differences. The dissidents were prevailed upon to submit the Accord, *as it stood*, to immediate legislative and/or public debate for a result within a fortnight.

The insistence that the Accord had to be seen as a package and non-negotiable, and that it had to be immediately embraced in a take-it-or-leave-it option proved its undoing. The Manitoba and Newfoundland legislatures greeted the deadline by adjourning without giving approval to the constitutional amendment. And so Meech Lake, requiring total consent of all governments to all aspects, failed. Railroading had gone too far. Yet it became unstuck more on technicality than on popular rejection.

In the period April to June 1987, only Quebec conducted public hearings. After the Ottawa meeting of June 3, 1987, only four provinces held public hearings: Ontario, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick and Manitoba. All of the subsequent reports were highly critical of the Meech Lake process.

The Report of the Ontario Select Committee on Constitutional Reform published in June 1988 said:

"We declare in the most emphatic terms that it is very difficult for provincial legislators and the people they represent to perform their proper function of helping the nation achieve an agreeable resolution of constitutional debate when confronted by a virtual fait accompli of First Ministers..."

"It is surely crucial for the health of contemporary Canadian parliamentary democracy that the people and their elected representatives be an integral part of the process of constitutional change..."

"If constitutional reform is to be carried out democratically, legislatures must have a voice in the development, as well as the ratification, of constitutional amendments".

The Report of the Manitoba Task Force on the 1987 Constitutional Accord published in October 1989 concluded:

"The process of constitutional reform is as strong a statement on the nature of a country as the constitution itself. Both reveal the fundamental characteristics of the state and its people. Canada is a representative democracy. As a nation we pride ourselves on our ability to blend strong leadership with public input. The Task Force strongly believes that the process of constitutional change must reflect these hallmarks of our

nation. Only then will the constitutional process be able to satisfy public concerns".

The Report of the New Brunswick Select Committee on the 1987 Constitutional Accord, also published in October 1989, regretted "the lack of any debate or public scrutiny of the Accord before the final draft was agreed upon". The First Ministers' 'side agreement' not to brook any change to the Accord, the Report said, was "an extension of the application of executive federalism to constitutional development". There should have been "a proposed resolution" for public debate and scrutiny not "a draft of an agreement", the Report said.

Mulroney finally acknowledged defeat of his machinations when he accepted the verdict of the final communiqué of the June 3-9, 1990 meeting:

"The Prime Minister and all Premiers agree jointly to review... the entire process of amending the Constitution including... the question of mandatory public hearings prior to adopting any measure related to a constitutional amendment".

Thus, in the end, it was noted that 20 years of public debate was not the same as public participation in a final decision-making process.

As with Meech Lake, so with the European Community. There has been a plethora of information, disinformation, and misinformation to feed many an argument over many years. Unanimity is especially hard to find in the UK. And so the British Government has decided it will decide. Its Prime Minister, set alongside presidents and their equivalent in the EC, has been afforded presidential powers to press Britain's case without recourse to the British Parliament. A decision will have to be made under the insistence of EC "Partners"; and it will have to be forced upon domestic squabblers, doubters and the apathetic. The democratic ideal is going to be bogged down unless dictatorship takes over! What is deemed to be progress must be made, and quickly. If people cannot make up their minds, then their minds must be made up for them.

As with Meech Lake, so with the UK. There is a growing body of opposition at grass-roots to the high-handed attitudes of Government - an opposition led by a few thinkers and activists.

In May 1987, Canada had a protest movement formed of women's groups, native people's organisations and the Committee of 43, so-called because it comprised that number of lawyers and academics. By the end of June, they were a substantial coalition and had become formidable enough to shake the certainty of Premiers Howard Pawley of Manitoba and David Peterson of Ontario. Pawley came out with the statement:

"This is a very deplorable situation if we have a constitutional draft being circulated and then we are being advised by anyone that we create problems if we ask questions".

Peterson said:

"I don't want any sense that this is being force-fed or shoe-horned into a pre-ordained time-frame."

Today, as we approach the same crisis in the European Community, the UK has a similar protest movement: the British Housewives League, "black" minority groups, the Campaign for an Independent Britain, the British Anti Common Market League, the Scottish Anti Common Market Council. Numbers and make-up are relatively similar - and Social Credit informs the thinking of some prominent members therein.

(cont: over)

* Please send me **The Social Crediter** for a year

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....

Enclosed: £

AFTER MARXISM (Continued)

debt, which ensures a chronic deficiency of consumer purchasing power, and enslaves governments, industry and individuals alike in ultimately unpayable debt.

And so it will be for the "emerging democracies" of the East as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and other agencies of the same monopolistic money power shackle the new authorities with financial regimes founded on indebtedness, and thereby sow the seeds for the same harvest of economic and political failures already ravaging Western societies.

D. N.

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

Subscription rates (one year): U.K. inland £10.00; overseas surface mail £12.00; overseas airmail £15.00; Australia \$10.00; New Zealand \$11.00; New Zealand airmail \$12.00.

Offices – Business: K.R.P. Publications Ltd., 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD. Tel. 0787 76374.
 – Editorial: 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.
 – In Australasia (Subscriptions, Business and Books): 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

BOOKS and booklets on the subject of Social Credit and allied subjects are available from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, SUDBURY, Suffolk, England, CO10 6TD; and in Australia from The Social Credit School of Studies, 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.

ADDITIONAL COPIES of THE SOCIAL CREDITER and back numbers are available from the above address.

U.K. enquiries for editorial and publicity phone 031 657 4740.

RECOMMENDED READING

Benson, Ivor	This Age of Conflict.
Burkitt, B. & Baimbridge, M.	What 1992 Really Means: Single Market or Double Cross?
Douglas, C. H.	The Brief for the Prosecution. The Development of World Dominion. Economic Democracy. The Monopoly of Credit. The Policy of a Philosophy. Social Credit.
Eringer, R.	The Global Manipulators.
Maré, Eric de	A matter of Life or Debt.
Monahan, Bryan W.	The Moving Storm. The Survival of Britain. Why I am a Social Crediter.
Robertson, Thomas	Human Ecology.
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit.
Tether, C. Gordon	The Great Common Market Fraud.

THE INCREMENTS OF ASSOCIATION

Readers interested in forming a Social Credit group in the London area, or in the Edinburgh area, are invited to write in the first instance to The Editor, The Social Crediter, 21 Hawkhead Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 6LR.

EC'S MEECH LAKE ACCORD (Continued)

The obstacles are also much the same: the conclave that met on Meech Lake did not expose itself to collective questioning and challenge; the media were complacent; the deal struck was supposed to be passed on the nod as self-evidently beneficial.

The underlying philosophy is that Independence is a luxury that cannot be afforded in a market-led world. Centralisation is the best form of defence. It also makes sense for the people – everyone across a landmass knows where they stand with each other. Political and economic union is the inevitable way of survival and advance.

Such an ideology, of course, over-rides the plain facts of geography and history and culture and characteristics of any measurable area. C. H. Douglas, in April 1950, observed:

"... what you can do in the way of Constitution-making is very little. We have to bring out the Truth – the nature of the Universe. Either what the situation yields is in accordance with the nature of things, or it isn't."

It remains to be seen whether the European Heads of Government meeting in Maastricht in December can accommodate this simple wisdom. If they cobble together a form of words that veils their differences and offers a commitment to unity, be sure their sins will find them out. The lesson of Meech Lake lives on. In Edinburgh in June 1992, the UK is scheduled to host the Final Surrender of Sovereignty by all EC partners. Yet that result is not yet a foregone conclusion. The elitist brokers of our destiny have yet to reckon with our housewives, our academics, our lawyers, our ethnic minorities. In these humble hands is our future.

DRAFT TREATY

Maastricht is involved with what is described as a "consolidated draft treaty" which was a negotiating document until the end of June, further refinements to be added. It was issued to national delegations and was not initially intended for a wider audience.

It incorporates the Rome Treaty and the Coal & Steel and Atomic Energy Treaties, as amended by the Single European Act, with new draft articles on joint decision-making procedure and common foreign and security policy, whose objectives and means are listed under Articles A – P. This calls for a new bureaucracy (Article D): the Permanent Representatives Committee, the Political Committee and the General Secretariat of the Council.

The ratchet mechanism is still being applied; nothing that has been given away is given back. The section on Co-operation on Home Affairs and Judicial Co-operation leaves no doubt that omitting the word 'federal' from the negotiations does not alter the objectives.

There is a space for General and Final Provisions, now set out (only in French) in the form of an Annex. They were agreed by the Foreign Ministers meeting in Dresden and show disregard for British sensibilities by using words, once translated, that escape easy definition:

solidaire – droits – Citoyenneté de L'Union – subsidiarité – principes démocratiques – libertés fondamentales – fédéral.

In the end, it will fall to the Court of Justice to define these terms, and they will be interpreted according to the political expedient of the time.

Article Z or the Foreign Ministers' Paper would replace Article 240 of the Rome Treaty. In translation, it says: "The present Treaty is concluded for an unlimited period."

As to the next move, it should be remembered that the Single European Act was presented to the UK Parliament in an unamendable form, having been negotiated in private in Luxembourg and signed quietly by a Junior Minister in Holland. The necessary legislation was then slipped through Parliament, in a sparsely-populated House, late at night – after the papers had gone to bed; like most folk.