

SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 71 No. 2

MARCH – APRIL, 1992

KEEPING COMPANY

* The old man stood with the protesters, saying: "Being 90-year-old, I would prefer the peace of my garden and my books to public demonstrations in the street, but I feel that I must do all I can, slight as it may be, to draw the attention of my fellow-citizens to certain facts about this case."

For our purpose, the particulars are not important, but the principle is. The old man said he was there because:

"First, this and related Nazi war crime trials are not driven by justice but by hatred and revenge.

"Second, the events at issue took place half a century ago. The nature of evidence available is dubious.

"Third, the accused committed no crime during their years here.

"Fourth, the accused committed no crimes against our nationals anywhere.

"Fifth, the cost of the trials to our taxpayer has already run into millions of dollars.

"Sixth, this country had no reason whatever for getting mixed up with this costly folly, but every reason for keeping out of it. Government has enough problems without taking on this gratuitous burden – constitutional problems, the faltering economy, unemployment, the crime rate, corruption and incompetence at the highest levels.

"Worse, the spirit of hatred and revenge unleashed by the trials can poison and destabilise nations as well as persons."

The speaker, outside a magistrate's court, was Sir Walter Crocker, Lieutenant Governor of South Australia for nine years and before that, Ambassador of Australia for nearly twenty. He said the Federal Government had given in to the pressures of a lobby representing very few Australians and no Australian interests (a lobby showing its muscle in Canada, France and the United Kingdom at the moment). It is, he said, "buttressed with great wealth, with exceptional self-centred persistence, and with ruthless cleverness."

Sir Walter did not name this lobby. He did not sully his speech. Were this Canada or France, it could not be named lest the plain speakers be hauled before the courts. In the UK, the lobby's identity would go largely unmentioned since Special Branch would be required to take an interest in anyone so concerned as to reveal it.

But the issue will not go away. It will stay so long as there is legislation favouring received wisdom about history; favouring the loudest voice; favouring the myth that race equals religion, equals "rights".

In Glasgow, Scotland, recently, there was a case in point. A

lady, Jewish by religion, sought entrance to an exclusive, secular tennis club. With the backing of the *race* relations industry, she went to court. The club, unable to meet the financial involvement, settled out of court. She was IN.

Race relation officials crowed that this was a great victory for the forces against discrimination. By law, it would appear, no association can restrict membership. Whether this be so or not, it is obvious that if the claimant has enough funds to make a court appearance, the defence runs the risk of paying massive bills, whatever the justice of the defence case. Thus, money and only money achieves results. The high moral tone can be taken only by those who can afford to.

In a plural society, there will always be confusion of race and religion. In the UK, it is seen in the current pressure by some Islamic leaders to have the same clout of "shadow government" as enjoyed by the Jewish Board of Deputies. It is merely a matter of time before the UK Government, elected by the ethnic majority and the ethnic minorities together, finds itself "pig in the middle". Little wonder that so many British MPs are keen to transfer their responsibilities to distant European Community diktat.

It is hard to resist the feeling that the Glasgow lady had more interest in a principle than the facility to invite "anyone for tennis". Can she really enjoy her game in such circumstances? Can others?

The point is: where a principle is established by force, it is rarely accepted *de facto*. At the personal level, it is never left at nastiness. It soon turns into viciousness and virulence all round. At moral level equality is always unachievable... it flees as soon as the under-dog wins. The new under-dog starts barking. The Bible is full of that truth and no one on earth can point to a successful egalitarian society where everybody is happy with their lot, and everybody's lot is a happy one.

Yet in every generation, people dedicate their mortal frame to fight for what they consider to be "equal human rights". They take the name of Christ or of Jehovah as their justification and they are admired for their commitment. Yet such earnest endeavour and martyrdom may well be in vain... still caught up in ongoing conflict. Behind all this lies misapprehension as to what essentially the human condition is about.

C. H. Douglas put it this way in *The Big Idea*:

"It is of the essence of Social Credit ideas that there is an organic connection between peoples, races, and individuals, and the soils of particular portions of the earth's surface which are individualistic."

I. McG.

"The Maastricht Treaty marks a new beginning for the Community. It establishes a European Union based on three separate sections or 'pillars' with the first building on the existing Treaty and the other two based on an inter-governmental approach".

E.P. News, 9-13 December, 1991

In one way or another, the Treaty provides a comprehensive framework within which member States intend to cooperate on all the major issues of the times, including economic and monetary union, foreign policy, social policy, the environment, citizenship and immigration, and many others. Binding decisions on some matters may be made by majority vote; on others, unanimity is required.

What emerges clearly from the welter of comment about Maastricht, despite all attempts to play down its significance, is the added impetus it has given towards a federal Europe. The underlying reason for this was well put, even before the summit meeting, by Anatole Kalensky in *The Times* of December 1991. After demolishing the myth of EC economic efficiency, he continued:-

"Why, then are the EC's founder nations so keen on closer union and why is there a queue for new membership stretching from the Arctic Ocean to the Red Sea? Perhaps it is because continentals now value the EC not as an economic, but as a political, entity. For the Germans, Belgians and French, the EC's greatest achievement has not been to add or subtract a quarter of a percentage point to economic growth rates. It has been, first and foremost, to eliminate the threat of war that had decimated their ancestors in every generation for two thousand years... In Germany, France, and even Italy, Belgium and Austria, the idea of being a small part of a European empire does not connote subservience, but greatness. For the continentals, therefore, the 'federal destiny' that will inevitably emerge from monetary union is the positive goal of the whole enterprise". (Our emphasis, Ed. T.S.C.)

Monetary union is thus again clearly identified as the key mechanism by which supreme power cloaked in federal garb is intended to be enthroned. The European Parliament is earmarked a small role in this process by "assenting" to the appointment of the President of the proposed European Central Bank (or "Euro-Fed") and "participating" in economic policy decisions. But it is inevitable that this can amount to no more than token oversight of the Bank. Not only is the European Parliament so unwieldy and divided as to be incapable of exerting any real authority over its operations, but the existing international banking institutions from which the new Bank will be derived are already so firmly entrenched as to be able to cock a snook at any pretentious "democratic" supervision.

Their political supremacy was dramatically demonstrated for all to see barely a week after Maastricht by the decision about interest rates taken separately by the Bundesbank in Germany and by the Federal Reserve Board in the USA. The former raised rates by $\frac{1}{2}\%$, the latter lowered theirs by 1%. In each case, these were decisions taken by the banks themselves, quite independent of their respective governments. *The Times* of December 28 had this to say about the Bundesbank's action:-

"This tightening of the German monetary squeeze was no ordinary central bank action. The message was meant for politicians throughout Europe, and above all for Germany's Chancellor, Helmut Kohl.

MAASTRICHT

"In the off-the-record words of one Bundesbank council member, the message was brutally simple: the Treaty on Economic and Monetary Union signed at Maastricht earlier this month was a 'criminal act'; the Bundesbank would do its best to resist it. Some German central bankers would evidently prefer to plunge the whole of Europe, Germany included, into deeper recession rather than see the mark replaced with an ecu, and the Bundesbank find its own identity submerged in a rival Central Bank in 1997.

"On the outcome turns the democratic status and well-being of millions of people and businesses throughout Europe. That they should be made canon-fodder in a power-struggle between an autocratic Bundesbank and an elected German government is outrageous". (Our emphasis, Ed. T.S.C.)

Let us first note, before the condemnation of it, the unsurprised admission by *The Times* that central bankers are capable of dictating economic policy independent of and in opposition to the elected government. This is precisely the situation common to all elected governments who "rent" their currency from the private moneylending sector. Wittingly or not, *The Times* pinpoints the crucial issue confronting all democratically elected governments in the EC, especially now the British. **That issue is whether or not the European Monetary System (EMS) is to be their master or their servant.**

We can now re-state the core issues.

If the monetary system visualised for Europe was an honest and efficient system which reflected objectively that the economies of member states are physically capable of ensuring economic sufficiency in freedom for all their peoples, as they undoubtedly are, then there might be much to be said for a single currency which would eliminate present complexities surrounding dealings in foreign currencies.

Unhappily, the sober truth is that the system is grossly dishonest, inefficient and fraudulent. Specifically, it creates and issues money only as debt owed to private moneylenders who create it out of nothing in the first place; it condemns millions to unnecessary poverty in the midst of abundance because it generates prices much faster than it generates incomes; it thereby distorts national economies into engines of trade wars as nations fight for export markets instead of peacefully exchanging their respective surpluses; and it condemns individuals, businesses and governments alike to the tyranny of irredeemable debt.

Once installed as the supreme monetary power in Europe, the functionaries of this system will have unchallengeable authority over all elected governments, and the situation of "the handful of unelected and unaccountable men round a table in Frankfurt" castigated by *The Times* for their arrogance in the case of the Bundesbank's rate rise, will be perpetuated in the governing council of the Euro-Fed.

But much more than economic dictatorship is at stake. Who pays the piper calls the tune, and the crucial function of money creation and control is being manipulated to subvert democratic accountability and to impose Absolute Political Power by stealth on the unsuspecting peoples of Europe.

T AND AFTER

For Britain, the constitutional consequences of the Maastricht Treaty are far-reaching and perilous. Not only do they entail the transfer of much ministerial responsibility to the European bureaucracies, but also the emasculation of the reserve powers vested in the Crown as the ultimate guardian of the people's good.

Honeyed words about supposed economic advantages (which are within our grasp anyway had we but the wit and the will to secure them) are being spread to seduce the British people into surrendering their age-old and hard-won independence and binding themselves, seemingly for ever, into a federal noose. It is here that John Major's opt-out clause assumes special significance in giving pause to the rush to federalism and time for second and third thoughts.

Truly there is little enough time for the British people everywhere to grasp all that is really at stake for them and their succeeding generations, and to make their voices heard above the Babel of Europe.

D.N.

QUOTES

"In several statements at the World Forum at Davos, Herr Tietmeyer (deputy president of the Bundesbank) denied that... it's tightening (of monetary policy) had been motivated by displeasure about the outcome of the Maastricht summit. Commenting on the outcome at Maastricht, Herr Tietmeyer said that the Bundesbank still believed that a monetary union could 'only be a success on the basis of a political union'." The Times, 3 February, 1992.

"...Over the last six years the internal operation of the Commission has become a mess. Backbiting among Commissioners has reached levels undreamed of in the days of Francois-Xavier Ortoli (1973-6) and Roy Jenkins (1977-81); political intrigue has flourished like science-fiction weed, stifling reasoned advice from senior officials; internally the Commission has come to resemble Tammany Hall with a French accent. This has to change... There should be real control by the European parliament over the Commission. The member states will not permit it. They regard the Commission and the European Parliament as rivals in a power struggle and do their best to clip their wings.

"This is not in the interests of the peoples of Europe. They are moving inexorably (with Britain as always shuffling ten years behind) to a Union where national governments will be reduced to the role of local authorities.

"The citizens of the Union will have the right to expect at the centre an executive branch of high quality, efficiently administered, and directly and effectively accountable to their elected representatives. In obstructing this the national governments are short-changing the peoples of Europe. It is time they were told so". Sir Roy Denham, former EC Commission official, in a letter to The Times, 29 January, 1992.

QUESTIONS •

Why is the issue of Britain's role in Europe so important?

Because it presents you with a choice which will affect every aspect of your life and future. In a nutshell: do you want Britain to remain an independent self-governing country, or would you rather we became a province of a new European State? Do you want to be ruled by our own national Parliament at Westminster or do you want to be ruled from Brussels?

Wouldn't our ability to govern ourselves be safeguarded within a Federal Europe by the European Parliament?

No. However extensive the powers of a democratically elected European Parliament, it would still be the case that British MEPs would be a minority within it, and therefore unable to prevent the passage of legislation or the introduction of regulations harmful to British interests. Furthermore, a majority of British voters could elect Tory MEPs and find themselves ruled by a European Socialist Government, or vice versa. Is that what you want?

Is it true that Britain's loss of sovereignty within the EC is justified by the benefits of being part of a larger European 'home market'?

No. There is no connection between the size of countries and their living standards... The highest incomes per head in Europe are in Switzerland while the Scandinavian countries have for many years enjoyed better living standards than the European average...

But surely we have gained something?

No. We have actually lost a great deal. Because of the EC's external tariff wall against the rest of the world, Britain's natural trading patterns have been distorted, especially in agriculture. Cheap food imports from the outside world have been replaced by expensively produced European substitutes... The total cost to a family of four of the EC's fraud-bedeveloped Common Agricultural Policy is £18 per week – more than the hated poll tax!

Even if political union is undesirable, should we not agree to economic and monetary union?

No, since economic union inevitably leads to political union. Just as a family loses its independence if its household budget is controlled by outsiders, so a nation loses its freedom of action if decisions about taxation, public expenditure, and monetary policy are transferred to supranational institutions – in this case, European ones. Acceptance of the principle of a single European currency controlled by a single European central bank, a policy adopted by the Labour and Liberal Democrat parties, would commit our country to the destruction of her national independence.

* Extracts from "The Truth about a Federal Europe", copies obtainable from The Freedom Association, 35 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB. Tel: 071-928 9925. £1 for 5 copies (minimum order), £5 for 25 copies & pro rata.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK

"One of the most striking developments in Western politics and government in recent years has been the sharp increase in the use of the Initiative and Referendum. These mechanisms allow the voters themselves to approve or disallow parliamentary legislation or to enact laws of their own choosing".

In *"Initiative and Referendum: The People's Law"**, Prof. G. de Q. Walker, Dean of the Faculty of Law, University of Queensland, closely examines the cases for and against these procedural mechanisms as supplements to, not alternatives to, parliamentary legislation. He discusses the rigidity of the party political system which denies voters direct control over their representative; the decline of parliamentary debate; the lack of real choice for voters in elections; and the rise of quasi-governmental bodies which can ignore public opinion. One of the strongest arguments for Initiative and Referendum, he points out, is "that direct legislation can loosen the grip of political parties and pressure groups".

He deals effectively with the arguments against, which variously claim that it would undermine existing forms of government; would produce a tyranny of the majority; could be influenced by moneyed interests and the media; or would simply not work. He draws on factual evidence and recent experience in Switzerland, Australia, the USA, Britain and Denmark to defeat these claims. Fears of electors' incompetence, ignorance, apathy or prejudice are all shown by actual experience to be largely unfounded, as are claims that referendums are impractical.

The continuing conflict between what is commonly believed to be, but is not, government by the people and the reality of rule by an elite has produced a rising demand for direct legislation. "In industry, in trade unions, in the universities, in the churches and municipalities, people are claiming the right to be involved in, or at least consulted on, decisions that affect the conditions under which they live or work. No longer are they prepared to assume that their 'leaders' know best in all things."

C. H. Douglas has stated that the only rights which one has are those that one can sustain. In "The Nature of Democracy", at Buxton in June 1934, he said... "nothing but the rehabilitation of democracy in a genuine sense, and with an understanding of its limits, will enable Social Credit to become an actual fact." "There is a key-word which forms the solution of this, **perhaps the greatest of all problems which confront the world at the present time. That word is "responsibility". We have got to make individuals bear the consequences of their actions**".

Prof. Walker has highlighted the mechanisms whereby this may be brought to reality, both for politicians and for the electorate at large. Direct legislation through the mechanisms of Initiative and Referendum, which provide voters with the legal means to apply either positive or negative sanctions to any proposition, and to initiate measures themselves, is at the very heart of the democratic principle. As all the forces which diminish the individual's capacity to control his own destiny grow daily stronger, this timely book is required reading for all those who are concerned to promote truly democratic government. Among other possible applications, it is particularly relevant to the solution of the constitutional questions emerging

from Britain's growing involvement with the European Community and with the questions of devolution or independence for Scotland.

V. J. B.

* *"Initiative and Referendum: The People's Law"* by Prof. G. de Q. Walker, The Centre for Independent Studies. Obtainable from Bloomfield Books, 26 Meadow Lane, Sudbury, Suffolk CO10 6TD, price £12.75 post free.

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.

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

NAME:

ADDRESS:

.....

.....

Enclosed: £

