

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Volume 74 No 4

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

July-August 1995

European parties of the Right are waking up to the dangers of ceding national sovereignty

A price too high

BRTAIN'S future in Europe has taken pole position in the political race. As the government beavers away behind the scenes on its negotiating gambits for the Inter-Governmental Conference in 1996, debate builds up in the public domain amid passion and confusion.

Press and TV pundits explore the issues and test the public pulse in makeshift polls. Hardly any aspect, economic or political, escapes attention. Farmers and fishermen, bankers and businessmen, environmentalists and others, all get their brief coverage, often leading to contradictory conclusions. Public utterances of leading figures get close scrutiny to catch nuances of policy within.

Economic arguments have become enmeshed with the political, since the question is nothing less than the future governance of Europe.

Interdependent nation states cooperating for mutual advantage? Or a federated "United States of Europe" with all the organs of central government? The stakes could hardly be higher, and consequently opinions range across the entire spectrum, dividing the main political parties and the populace.

Viewing this turmoil, Social Crediters can easily determine their stance in principle. They understand the *real-politik* dominating the situation, in particular the policy of centralised political and economic power overriding the individual. They will be disposed to demand of their representatives, not only no more concessions of sovereignty to the European Union, but also the positive repatriation to Westminster of some powers already conceded.

They are very far from being alone in this. Representatives from no fewer than 28 centre-right parties in 20 European countries, comprising the European Research Group, have enunciated such

demands in detail. Their pamphlet, *A Europe of Nations*¹, briefly reviewed in our last issue, spells out in precise terms the wide-ranging amendments they advocate to both the Rome and the Maastricht treaties. The general effect of these would be to restore to national governments responsibilities previously ceded, actually or provisionally, to European institutions.

Specifically on monetary and economic union, they say "The experience of recent years should lead us to reject the Maastricht plan for monetary union. Economic convergence as spelt out in the treaties would cause unemployment and dislocation . . . The Articles which provide for monetary union should be removed from the treaties. A single currency would come about only through natural evolution and with the full consent of all participating nations."

This is a highly significant demand. EMU and the single currency is far from being, as commonly presented, just a matter of saving the cost of currency exchanges. It is in fact the key to establishing for ever the dominance of unaccountable central bankers over democratically elected national governments.

The establishment of a European Central Bank to implement EMU has already been provisionally agreed in the Maastricht Treaty of 1991 and it already exists in "shadow" form as the European Monetary Institute. Though it was first intended that the Bank should become operative by 1997 in time to introduce the single currency by 1999, this timetable has since been deferred and Britain retains an "opt-out". Nevertheless, the treaty provides for the ECB to be entirely independent of other European Union institutions and the national governments of member states.

Article 107 states precisely, "when exercising the powers and carrying out

the tasks and duties conferred on them by the treaty . . . neither the ECB nor a national central bank nor any member of their decision-making bodies shall seek or take instructions . . . from any government of a member state".

Thus, at a stroke, all power of national governments over the money they and their citizens need—the very essence of sovereignty—would be lost. Instead, the ECB would be legally entrenched with supreme power, unelected, unaccountable and unassailable. A functional dictatorship of central bankers. Big Brother indeed!

As Rodney Leach put it in the article reprinted in our May issue. ". . . it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the convergence criteria [preliminary conditions for EMU] are a bait laid by convinced federalists. The mouse takes it, and the single currency trap snaps shut, for ever, behind it".

It was such total, but carefully unpub-
continued page 4, column 3

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, founded in 1933 by Clifford Hugh Douglas. Articles from other sources are included for information and illustration of current thinking, reflecting aspects of our cause. The Social Credit Secretariat is non-party and non-class, neither connected with nor supporting any political party.

SUBSCRIPTIONS

Annual rates: UK inland £10.00; overseas surface mail £12.00; overseas air mail £15.00; Australia \$14.00; New Zealand \$15.00; New Zealand airmail \$16.00.

To subscribe, please send a clear note of your name and full postal address, with a money order or cheque made payable to KRP Publications Ltd., to:

KRP Publications Ltd, PO Box 13855, Edinburgh EH15 1YD, Scotland, UK.

[In Australasia, subscription and business enquiries should be addressed to 3 Beresford Drive, Samford, Queensland 4520.]
UK telephone enquiries to: 0131 657 4740.

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

The growing number of pressure groups in society are all failing to address the centralisation

Democracy at

THE GLOBAL crisis is a compound of numerous factors which are themselves in a state of stress and danger. Inevitably people tend to see the crisis simply in terms of one or other of these elements and to act accordingly. Nothing is easier, it would seem, than to set up a national or even an international organisation to counter the pressures on one or other of these factors. Over the last two or three decades the number and strength of such bodies has grown prodigiously; who today has not heard of Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, Ethical Investment, Worldwatch, the World Wildlife Fund, CND, World Population Concern, to say nothing of the numerous charities gestated by the same kind of concern such as Oxfam and War on Want?

Many but by no means all of these bodies have done invaluable work, yet it is no belittlement of their efforts to point out that over the same period the general crisis has significantly worsened. This raises a question over the general direction of their efforts, if only because there is one truism related to them which can only be ignored at the expense of further futility: no solution to the global crisis can hope to register positive effect if the solution does not match in profundity the depth of the crisis itself.

One needs to ask, then, where is this analysis in depth? It is safe to say that outside a very short reading list no such analysis is being made and in consequence none of its lessons are being applied. When it comes to practical policy there is either a drive to influence the established political process directly, or to arouse public awareness on one issue or another to influence that process directly.

Power out of control

Such an approach ignores a quite fundamental element of the general crisis itself; it ignores that at heart it is a crisis of power, power both in political and economic terms which has assumed gargantuan forms and which is simply running amok and out of control. Hence to base policy on an appeal to these power structures to mend their ways amounts to little more than trying to talk a tiger into a trance.

It is because the tiger of power-out-of-control is there that we are in a global crisis at all, so that the first question that needs to be addressed is, how do we deal with it? We have argued repeatedly elsewhere that in

terms of size there is a pronounced limit to the extent to which power can be subjected to effective democratic control. All the major wars of the twentieth century have their origins in a failure to recognise this factor and the same cause has prompted the appalling catastrophe of what passes for economic development.

With genuine democracy no world war would have begun to get off the ground (did not British and German soldiers spontaneously engage in a game of football in no man's land on Christmas Day 1914?), there would be none of the wickedness of mass motoring and motorways, no nuclear power, no serious adulteration of food now common across the entire gamut of factory-type farming and food processing, industrial activity would be kept within the limits of what any local community within which it was situated would decree was decent and, to cut a long list short, the population peril would never have arisen.

And if all these and many other matters are impinging to worsening effect on the human situation, despite all the efforts of these numerous ameliorative organisations, it is a matter which could only prompt surprise if we failed to note that at the same time political and economic forms of power have continued to increase both in size and centralised form. Power is not becoming more accessible and more subject to people's determinative range of decision-making, it is becoming more and more remote and ever further beyond their control.

At one remove this process is observable in the disappearance of local shops, pubs, post offices, hospitals, schools, police stations and the offices of local government itself; in every case, never mind the multiple social problems thus engendered, the move is towards bigger and more remote units which are beyond effective local citizen control.

Europe's unelected powerhouse

Nowhere is this process being more blatantly pursued than in the moves, which continue to gather momentum, to unite 'Europe'. These moves come in no way from the ordinary people of Europe, albeit the extent to which many now appear to support it. The expenditure of vast sums, rivalling the education budgets of some countries, can hardly be deployed on propaganda without achieving some degree of acquiescence from those subjected to it.

Mass gullibility must be taken as a standard feature of any mass society.

On the contrary the move has come wholly from the top, and more specifically from a small group of powerful multinational companies. That Hitler's drive to unite Europe failed in 1945 is a fact of history but by the 1950s there were already many organisations established in Brussels and other capitals to achieve the same aim and which fully shared the Nazi leader's contempt for democratic norms. Already at that time they were funding youth organisations and other social organisations in return for free advertising space in their publications, as well as funding other forms of propaganda. Such support as these early moves achieved in the political field came from those who were scared of the bogey of communism and included significant elements of the Roman Catholic Church.

By 1993 a formal organisation was established called The European Round Table of Industrialists (the ERT) numbering approximately 40 men (no women), all of whom are chairs or chief executives of large multinational companies. It is not too much to say that it is this body which is the 'European' power house. Its members have ready access to the European Commissioners and their policy proposals of far reaching import are frequently made Commission policy in a matter of weeks.

What we are observing here is an extension of the global crisis in the form of a massive confidence trick on a quite unprecedented continental scale by industrial and commercial forces which are themselves a repudiation of the democratic process. They are bent on creating a single government and their effrontery is matched only by their prodigious resources.

In 1994 the Swedish people voted in a referendum to determine their country's membership of the ERT-sponsored organisation. The campaign took a by now standard ERT referendum form. Vast sums of ERT money as well as Swedish government money poured into the scaremongering propaganda, sums which in no way could be matched by the private citizens' organisations desperately seeking to uphold their country's sovereignty.

Two days before the referendum 90 per cent of the full-page advertising in the Swedish press was booked by the ERT 'yes' campaign. The result was a 52 per cent majority in favour. These hair's breadth majorities are the best the ERT moneybags

hay

are able to drum up and are duly taken to be the voice of the people, despite the fact that even a table tennis club would ordinarily insist on a two-thirds majority of members who might wish to change its rules.

Should the referendum fail to reach a majority in favour of membership of 'Europe', as in the case of Denmark, the ERT sponsorship has another card up its sleeve: hold another referendum! So with more money poured out on more scaremongering they succeed in obtaining a hair's breadth majority in favour. In this way, in an age which persists in the illusion that the age of democracy has arrived, the power of money, with gargantuan insolence, is being used to play ducks and drakes with the sovereign destinies of the people of Europe.

There are of course those innocent souls, some of them even occupying university chairs, who, having never taken account of the number of major wars in which a continental United States has waged in this century, or digested the reasons why a continental India has, since independence, had a military confrontation with every one of its neighbours, or perceived the significance of the invasion by united continental China of Tibet, to say nothing of its absurd claim to be the government of Taiwan (200 miles from its shore), persist in believing a continental United Europe will be a bastion of peace!

It is possible of course that pigs may be taught to fly and that tigers can be tamed with a toothpick, but those many organisations seeking to grapple with one aspect or another of the global crisis really should start to get their act together. We need, urgently, a quality standard fortnightly journal to campaign for people's power at parish or neighbourhood level. We need a constant series of seminars, summer schools, study sessions and the like to explore problems of achieving such a goal as a quite minimal response to the gathering threat of power-out-of-control which now overhangs our entire civilisation, and which threatens it with nemesis.

The giant wars and economic upheavals of this century have not been caused by a lack of aromatherapy, transcendental meditation, or Tai Chi, they are a result of a crude imbalance of power, the correction of which is a prerequisite for a peaceful and stable world.



This article is an editorial reprinted with permission from The Fourth World Review.

No taxation

IT SHOULD be clear from our writings how we, as Social Crediters, view the issue of imports, tariffs and taxation in general.

1. We should only have to import items which we cannot produce ourselves because of lack of resources, whether they be physical or technological.

2. If, and I stress the if, we lived in a world where trading was carried out on a correct basis by *all* nations it would be possible and probably beneficial and desirable to import and export on a basis of comparative advantage. Unfortunately this tenet of orthodox economics which is promoted so strongly by economists, politicians and bureaucrats does not work in the financial system under which we operate.

3. Free Trade or Free Enterprise? This is a confusion that has been overlooked by most. The first is a pretence because it does not exist because of political, financial and ideological reasons and yet is promoted to the hilt. The second is a philosophical question.

4. We do not accept the legitimacy of taxation as a source of government revenue, although it could be used as a fiscal measure in controlling certain areas of the economy from time to time as a *temporary* measure. It would certainly be better than using monetary policy, ie raising interest rates which extend over the total economy.

5. Dr Gregory Clark some time back commented on the question of Australian imports. He had many years experience in Japan and after arriving back in Australia wrote an article in the Quadrant magazine in which he made a very valid point. He said that we should learn from the experience of what the Japanese did after the war—ban imports. This together with the massive injections of finance from the United States put Japan where it is today.

6. The GATT and WTO regulations are not for the purpose of promoting a level playing field, reducing or increasing world trade but for ultimate political purposes. In opposing the "machinations of the internationalists" we are opposing the trend to centralisation and control. The "Common Market" was promoted as a trading

concept, as is NAFTA and APEC.

The reality is that they were and are mechanisms for increasing centralised control. Genuine world trade under a social credit policy would be simply barter or an exchange of surpluses which in reality like any surplus has no commercial value and can be freely exchanged for something else that may be desired. I have 1000 marbles and no Blood Alleys so I will swap 20 of my marbles for one of your 50 Blood Alleys (and we do not need any money).

Our views on this may help to clear up any misunderstandings but the real question is, what do the elected representatives think? Assuming that they agree on the policy of reducing tariffs under the pretext of a free trade policy:

a) Lowering tariffs lowers government revenue

b) If revenue is lowered how will the gap be filled? This is based on an assumption that if revenue is filled either the government will reduce expenditure or increase revenue in some other area.

c) Will the deficit be made up by increasing other taxes—income, company, sales taxes, or an all-embracing GST?

The question is for them to answer, not us.

Victor J Bridger



Point Taken is an occasional column dealing with specific questions arising from general Social Credit perspectives. The text comes from actual responses to individual enquiries, recently received.

RECOMMENDED READING

C H Douglas	The Development of World Dominion Economic Democracy The Monopoly of Credit The Policy of a Philosophy Social Credit
Eric de Maré	A Matter of Life or Debt
Bryan W Monahan	An Introduction to Social Credit Why I am a Social Creditor
Thomas Robertson	Human Ecology (<i>out of print</i>)
Social Credit Secretariat	Elements of Social Credit

Abundant life in Social Credit

SOcial Crediters throughout the world will be sad to hear of the death of Audrey Fforde, whose loving heart embraced us all. The daughter of Lt Com Rex Richardson (an early director of the Social Credit Secretariat), she had a lifetime in Social Credit. She filled a very special niche within the movement, exercising a gift of knowing intuitively Social Credit's nature and policy. This she pursued in her own most graceful way.

She began in her teens, before World War II, helping Mrs Beatrice Palmer to run the tea rooms at the Social Credit Centre in the Strand in London. There, everyone enjoyed her high spirits and friendliness in a solemn world. When L D Byrne took up the Alberta government's request to become their economics adviser and moved his family to Edmonton, Audrey went with them to look after the children. Once they were settled, she returned home when war began—to be virtually absorbed into the Hewlett Edwards family. By then, Audrey's father was stationed abroad and her mother went with him, leaving Audrey to keep house for her younger brother, still at school. She spent much of her time with me when I was editing the newly-launched *The Social Crediter* from Liverpool.

But not unnaturally, Liverpool in war never fulfilled her idyllic dream of a wandering life, a (horse) caravan and "the wind on the heath, brother." A marriage to Børge Jensen was eventually annulled, though friendship remained. They promoted local objectives, and many local Social Credit groups benefited from their help. Local objectives—practical democracy on a small scale—played an important part in showing people how they themselves could get the results they wanted from small government. And if small government, why not ultimately Parliament? The campaign was cut short by the war, just when it was producing significant long-term results.

Audrey spent the rest of the war in Scotland near Major and Mrs C H Douglas. About this time, she took a strong and practical interest in Nature Cure and proper diet, mostly vegetarian, which she maintained to the end of her life. She believed in organic farming and gardening with only natural fertilisers.

When I married Geoffrey Dobbs,

botanist, ecologist and Social Crediter, Audrey was the matron of honour. She was with us on Hampstead Heath on VE night when the air over London was alive with joyous relief. We joined with the others dancing and singing around a colossal bonfire in a dazzle of emotion that sprang higher than the house-high flames.

A little later, Audrey took part in some serious organic farming, growing vines in France and making wine. Philip Oyler's small property was a show-place of the genre. Run on strictly traditional lines, it had no modern labour-saving equipment.

Audrey's children by her second marriage (which had ended in divorce) were a great joy to her. She took their education very seriously though her unorthodox ideas and the idiosyncratic notions of Philip Oyler proved less than easy as the time came for their later training for careers. She returned to Scotland and settled near Major and Mrs Douglas in a cottage by a waterfall. It was at the bottom of a steep hill in a treey meadow on the shore of Loch Tay, beside a burn. Inaccessible by car, it filled to the brim her love of idyllic, romantic surroundings. From it she drew the radiant energy she showered on all around in both spirit and action. From this exhilarating centre of Social Credit culture she spread the weave of faith and belief and friendliness that made for personal achievement.

Audrey had grown up among people whose minds had been sparked by the ideas and actions, enthusiasm and purpose arising from Major Douglas's insights. The onrush of faith that Social Credit was the way on for our present civilisation, the Third Alternative—not Socialism nor Fascism—was (and is) a tremendous, even somewhat dizzying prospect.

Fifty and 60 years later, when those to whom in her youth she had passed on the social credit of gaiety and friendship were leaving this life, she was still there, still giving the needed help in crisis. One after another they have gone, all drawing on her own social credit: Major Douglas; her own father; Mrs Douglas; Bob and Nellie Millburn; Børge Jensen; Marjorie Douglas; and at the last, her partner, Bob, with whom she had found peace and tranquillity at the end of her life.

A price too high

continued from page 1

licised, negation of parliamentary government typified by EMU that has moved Lord Tonypany, in the columns of *The Times*, to appeal to the nation to make its voice heard. In a move unprecedented by any former Speakers of the House of Commons, who by long tradition abstain from political activity, he pleads, "It is because I am convinced that the question of national sovereignty towers above all that I feel free to submit this address to the electors of Britain. Our Westminster Parliament is in dire danger of being supplanted by a European assembly controlled by a hotchpotch of European politicians and bureaucrats who have no love for this country. Our national destiny will be subject to foreign control . . ."

"No political party in Britain has a mandate from the electorate to surrender our national sovereignty to foreign hands. The current slide towards a single European currency threatens both our economic and political independence, and thus our sovereignty . . ."

The growing awareness that monetary union must lead inexorably to political union and the loss of self-government is very much to be welcomed. There are also encouraging signs that public opinion, not only in the UK but elsewhere in Europe, is hardening against the threat of ever more centralised and more remote government. Deep-seated national sentiments are in favour of retaining national identities and self-government.

It is significant that John Major, who negotiated the opt-out from EMU at Maastricht, is steadily distancing himself from the concept of monetary union. In his latest House of Commons pronouncement on 8 June, he said that "circumstances may not ever be right for a single currency", and reiterated that if and when it came to the point of decision, that would still lie with the House.

In the meantime, as the great debate will continue, Social Crediters will wish to lend their maximum support to organisations campaigning for the retention of national self-government and against further concentration of unaccountable political and economic power.

¹"A Europe of Nations"; *Conclusions of the European Research Group*. From Daniel Hannan, 3 Dean's Yard, Westminster, London SW1A 0AA, £5 pp.