

# THE SOCIAL CREDITER

Volume 74 No 6

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

November - December 1995

*The Global Plantation is coming upon us. LLOYD WOOD describes The Disaster that is GATT and the World Trade Organisation. We face*

## The Surrender of Sovereignty

Liberty Lobby, 300 Independence Ave, Washington D.C. has published an extensive report - *The Disaster that is GATT and the World Trade Organisation*. Sub-titled "Elites' Plan for the Global Plantation", this has been prepared by its legislative advocate Trisha Katson. The report outlines the origins of the WTO and its expected effects on US trade and its circumvention of the Constitution. [Unless otherwise stated, all quotations are from her report.]

GATT 1994 with its full title of "Final Act embodying the Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Negotiations" was signed by the leaders of 125 nations on April 15, 1994 at Marrakesh, Morocco. The Act contains 26,000 pages. It is estimated that its compilation would have occupied 1500 people fulltime for seven years, the length of the Uruguay Round of Talks. As GATT was first introduced in 1947, it is likely that the Act has been in preparation for much longer than seven years.

A 500-page summary of the Act has been prepared for public subscription but apparently is not easy to obtain. Few have read even the summary of a short synopsis distributed to members of the US Congress. In fact, it is doubtful if the eight million words in the Final Act will ever be read and fully understood by one person. It is equivalent in length to 100 books each of 260 pages.

Katson claims that "GATT 1994 creates the World Trade Organisation (WTO), a central trade authority which will be the most powerful economic and political body in the world". She says it further advances the Council on Foreign Relations / Trilateral Commission objective of a world government. President Clinton's adviser, Strobe Talbot, is one who advocates world government for, in an article for TIME in 1992 called "The Birth of the Global Nation", he happily predicted that someday all nations will bow to one global authority. As the IMF virtually dictates fiscal policies of a nation, even deciding a nation's taxes, so GATT will regulate how much duty each nation may levy on imports.

"The WTO was created to get around Congress". This point is made in an article by Daniel Esty of the global-making elitist group, the Council on Foreign Relations, in the November 1994 issue of the CFR journal Foreign Affairs. "... by enshrining the principle of liberal trade in the international regime" says Esty, "the creators of the GATT elevated the commitment to freer trade to a nearly constitutional level, thereby

limiting the power of governments around the world (and legislatures in particular) to give in to the pleadings of domestic special interests seeking to hide from the rigors of the global market place."

That this is so is confirmed by Article XVI-4: "Each member (nation) shall ensure the conformity of its laws, regulations and administrative procedures with its obligations as provided in the annexed agreements".

The text requires federal governments to "form, regulate and implement positive measures and mechanisms in support of the observance of the provision by other than central government bodies", i.e., state and local governments are also bound by the Act once signed by the federal body even though it may have no legal right to control state and local governments. The importance to the One Worlders of a High Court decision, using the Foreign Affairs section of the Australian Constitution, to over-ride the Tasmanian government in the Franklin Dam case becomes more evident every day.

So restrictive are the provisions of the WTO Act that any local laws advocating, say, "Buy Australian", could be considered by any other country as an unfair trade barrier and result in the threat of trade sanctions if continued. In fact any law could be challenged if "the attainment of any objective (of that Agreement) is being impeded" by that law. Its very vagueness allows the inclusion of laws and policies unrelated to trade issues. This will result in countries drafting their legislation to comply with GATT/WTO regulations and ignoring national interests for fear of being considered in breach

*(continued on back page)*

### 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.

#### 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 air mail \$16.00.

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

The Social Crediter is printed and published by:  
KRP Publications Ltd, PO Box 13855, Edinburgh, Scotland, EH15 1YD.  
[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.

*Upon the breaking and shivering of a great state and empire, you may be sure to have wars; for the subdued, resting upon their own protecting forces; and then, when they fail also, all goes to ruin, and a*

*The great accessions and unions of kingdoms do likewise stir up wars; for when a state grows to an*

*When a warlike state grows soft and effeminate, they may be sure of a war; for commonly such states encourage a war.*

**EVERY war is about money, really. Indeed, there is no war if there is no money to fight with. There can be no war if there is no "defence procurement", as our political euphemists put it. In short, no money - no weapons - no war.**

This is as true of Westminster as it is of Bosnia. There is a war on, but is there anything we can do about it? Can we save our sovereignty, what we call our democracy, and our sanity? Are there enough ears to hear a voice crying in the wilderness - that of Sir James Goldsmith whose Referendum Party needs to be heeded now if it is to draw away from the field of the Monster Raving Loony Party and such. Sir James proposes to put up a candidate in the next general election in Britain wherever no other candidate pledges to seek a plebiscite on "Europe".

It is not our place to recommend a vote one way or another but it is incumbent upon us to maintain principles and dispel misconceptions.

Primarily, we have to recognise that Sir James offers a short-term measure to stall a seemingly inexorable march toward political and monetary union. It will not be enough for him to succeed, he must succeed overwhelmingly. The Referendum Party would require at least 30 million votes, with the crosses struck in strategic places. It is unlikely but not impossible - and it could be done with the intervention of a fickle press.

But on past evidence, and the inflexibility of our electoral structure, our general governance is liable to fall back into its usual form of trite and easy answers, shibboleths, sound-bites, posturing, promises - and voter apathy.

Faced with the nightly horrors of televised world crisis, it is small beer for the man-in-the-street to confront the petty jealousies and jolly japes of Westminster . . . so small beer, in fact, it is not worth swallowing. Yet in the midst of the great turn-off, those concerned enough about their nation are apt to resort to braggart figures emerging under any new brand-name that sounds good.

This is the picture world wide - whenever *vox pop* is allowed. Note the latest from Canada, Australia, New Zealand, America, Italy, France and countless other zones of ready rhetorics.

In a trenchant assessment back in 1984, Geoffrey Dobbs wrote:

"Anyone who has stayed up on an election night to listen to the declarations of results and the running commentary on the state of the parties must have realised that they were spectators at a game or sport, not unlike a Test Match or the Grand National.

"It is of course, a war game . . . which has actually been substituted for civil war as a means of deciding who shall govern us.

"What our electoral system does is to substitute a numerical record of partisanship, as manipulated by the

# The Battle of

propaganda 'campaigns' of the parties, on one day every few years, for the armies of vassals and mercenaries which in former years could be summoned to the fray by rival contenders for the power of government. The 'rule' now is that the biggest battalion wins and takes the jackpot (the power of office)."

The underlying belief, says Dobbs is in the 'fairness' of majority rule - what they call democracy.

"This assumption is that every elector is a cypher, equal and identical in every respect, possessing no human qualities except that of ability to make a mark in the space provided to supply the numerical feedback required by his would-be rulers. No human quality, such as courage, skill, intelligence, loyalty, wisdom, will-power, experience, responsibility or even commonsense, counts for one iota. The vote of a vicious hooligan or doped out drug addict is precisely equal to that of a responsible citizen. The vote of a bitterly anti-British Irish republican is equal to that of a loyal subject. And this, which is a mere electoral convention, has long and far overstepped its bounds and has become a violently promoted ideology of egalitarianism, since de-personalisation is absolutely essential to the collective manipulation of mankind."

It can thus be seen that the act of 'politics' has little substance: it is what drives politics that matters - and who drives those who choose the eventual driver.

The system ensures we are voting, in effect, not for our own aims but that of the candidates. We are voting for their policies, their temper, their lusts, their ambitions, their bias, their bigotries, their morality, their compromising, as if they were all our own.

With personal qualities at a premium in an age of sleaze, we fall prey to an emphasis upon 'issues', 'policies', the 'agenda' and what we are assured is 'the greater good'. By this reckoning, we are told to ignore avarice and adultery in parliamentarians and concentrate on the way they vote. If they obey the whip, that is all that matters; what they do in their spare time is none of the constituent's business.

Thus strategies worked out by an elite require no individual thought or even consultation by the Member of Parliament, all that is required is attendance when the division bell rings.

The practice is perfected in the so-called European Parliament. Here it is freely acknowledged that all

*Great empires, while they stand, do enervate and destroy the forces of the natives which they have  
they become a prey . . .*

*Over-power, it is like a great flood, that will be sure to overflow . . .*

*are grown rich in the time of their degenerating; and so the prey inviteth, and their decay in valour*

Lord Chancellor Bacon, 'Of Vicissitude of Things'.

Where's the audience participation, asks Iain M<sup>c</sup>Gregor, in

# Westminster

decisions are taken in caucus by the various groupings and only the yea or nay need be voiced in general assembly. Such a system favours lobbying by commercial and other pressure groups. Speakers get a minute or two, quite literally, to expand on what was or wasn't said in their huddles. The length of their slot depends on the size of their conclave - not the importance of their content

So the continent is our domestic dilemma writ large: the individual is subsumed into the majority, power is ceded by person to party. Then power is passed to pooled authority. Very quickly, the people do not get what they want but what the powers-that-be deem expedient.

This is how the European Union has eclipsed the Westminster Member of Parliament and his ability to represent. Has such an MP any relevance any longer?

Speaking at Westminster on March 7, 1936, C.H. Douglas said:

"The essence of it is whether or not you regard the Member of Parliament as an expert. If you assume that he is an expert then you are electing a second rate expert to control a first-rate expert. If you agree that the Member of Parliament should not be an expert, then why tie a label on him? The proper attitude of the people is: 'We don't care what your alleged name is - the essential thing is that you should do as you are told.'"

By adopting this attitude voters can negate the overweening demands of external managers in collectives such as the European Union.

But are we relevant - as voters? Are we not now in the post-parliamentary era, when we are now 'readers'.

The trend has been with us for a long time, it is now reaching fruition. For several general elections past, newspapers have urged their choice upon us and have even claimed to have won the election in one case. The *Sun* put the boot in to Opposition leader Neil Kinnock and ensured his dispatch - and has now taken a shine to Tony Blair. Indeed the News International group are set to give him a following wind as he breezes into Downing Street.

Reaching all classes of society, this trans-national media empire can determine the outcome of the next general election - with the unsuspecting connivance of the voters, i.e. the readers.

As readers, we feel our newspapers are closer to us than our politicians now. They enlarge our understanding in their news stories; they re-inforce our impressions in their editorials. Our impressions have been formed in light of these same news stories. Their impressions become our impressions; their vote, our votes. Press minds are shaping our minds, shaping our parliament.

This is recognised by parliamentarians themselves. We have eminent MPs running weekly columns in daily national papers, we have heavyweights from left and right slugging it out in the main feature pages. Even the Prime Minister gratefully accepts space to say, under his own by-line, the things he couldn't get across from Westminster.

In many respects the Press is now expected to act as tribune. It campaigns for just causes, it rectifies wrongs, it exposes public scandal, it champions the sick and needy, it speaks up for the punter, it 'gets things done'.

In all of this, the reader feels some input. More input than a voter has.

Tony Blair has recognised reality and recently grabbed victory out of surrender. He flew across the world to address multi-national editors of News International. What else could he have done, being invited?

Making himself plain to the most influential editors at home and abroad is no more than his duty to party and people. And as a duty to their leaders, it appears the editors will endorse him and his party at the next general election. It so happens that the proprietor of all of these papers, the paymaster of the editors, has a high personal opinion of Mr Blair and has made that known.

The proprietor is a media mogul. With film, video and television interests, he straddles the world - some might say he rules the world. But does he?

Scrutiny of transatlantic financial pages will show just how much he owes to the banks; just how much he does their bidding, as his newspapers do his. And we do theirs.

Caught up by such wheels within spinning wheels, can we actually do anything?

To bring down a giant, we must look for the Achilles heel. And there it is - in the humble Member of Parliament. We can save him for humanity by re-inforcing his need to save his job. We can suggest he should take Sir James Goldsmith seriously, because we do.

# The Surrender of Sovereignty *(continued from front page)*

of the Agreement, and so face unrelenting sanctions. The WTO will be an authority outside the influence of the UN but exactly what their relationship will be is undetermined. It is interesting that the UN is coming under increasing attack in all major media publications as being corrupt and ineffective. Possibly the WTO, being a much more effective de facto world government, is scheduled to incorporate the UN so as to combine trade sanctions and military enforcement of its directives in one body. The UN already has the nucleus of a world army, so what more could be needed? Unlike the UN, the WTO has no veto provisions included in the charter. All signatories to the Agreement have one equal vote. A Dispute Resolution Board of three to five members, selected from a panel of "experts" nominated by WTO staff, will rule on all alleged breaches of WTO rules, whether detected by WTO inspections or brought by one country against another. The experts vote in secret and are virtually modern-day "Star Chambers".

The concept of a free trade agency acting as a world trade regulator with power to enforce sanctions against non-complying nations has been current in the USA at least since the time of President Wilson. In 1918, the President proposed a World Trade Tribunal to act in conjunction with his League of Nations. According to the Ludwig Von Mises Institute, the plan was "to entangle the entire world in a Keynesian thicket of regulation, enact international fiscal planning, and link trade with wealth distribution". It was rejected by the US Congress.

After WWII, Katson states, "The Bretton Woods conferences ... created a predecessor to WTO, the World Trade Board, later renamed the International Trade Organisation (ITO).

Jerry Mander, senior Fellow at the Public Media Center, says "the vast expansion of corporate power has actually been predicted and planned for three decades earlier at the notorious Bretton Woods meetings".

The ITO was the brainchild of the then US Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Harry Dexter White, who was later exposed as a Soviet agent. The UN charter was written by Alger Hiss, the government official revealed to be a Soviet spy by a young Congressman named Richard Nixon.

"The ITO in 1950, and in 1955 the Organisation for Trade Cooperation, and still later in 1974 the New International Economic Order were all rejected by the US Congress".

The WTO has been hailed by the New York Times as the third pillar of the New World Order along with the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund. Trisha Katson prefaces her exposure of the GATT/WTO conspiracy with: "Lower and lower wages for Americans until the wage scale here is no higher than anywhere else in the whole world . . . greater and greater profits for the ruling elite and their hirelings . . . a one world market and a world government run by international bureaucrats with the UN army to back them up . . . local government, national sovereignty and the Constitution a dim memory, only described in ancient and prohibited history books . . . centralised control of the world economy and the lowest possible

costs and highest possible prices dictated by the authority - the World Trade Organisation ... your taxes and living conditions decided by strangers in far-off countries. That's the dream of the planners and the reality of the Global Plantation ... and it's coming upon you like a freight train".

In the USA, real wages of 80% of workers have declined by 20% since 1973.

In December 1945 when Great Britain accepted Bretton Woods, C.H. Douglas wrote in *The Social Crediter*: "Only ordinary intelligence, combined with a willingness to undertake a not very arduous examination of the mass of evidence available, is necessary to assure anyone that the most gigantic, conscious and successful robbery in all history has been progressively taking place ... Its earlier stages were carried out through the Stock Exchange and Real Property markets; the later stages have been governmental and fiscal, together with currency manipulation. The penultimate stage is the "nationalisation" of such private property as remains when the final stage, the title deeds of once-great Britain will be neatly tied with red tape and handed over to the World State..."

On December 6, 1993, *The Washington Times* interviewed Anglo-French financier Sir James Goldsmith. In part he said "Global free trade will force the poor of rich countries to subsidise the rich in poor countries. What GATT means is that our national wealth accumulated over the centuries will be transferred from a developed country like Britain ... to developing countries like China, now building its first ocean-going navy in 500 years."

"... China ... can supply skilled labour for a fraction of Western costs."

"It is quite amazing that GATT is sowing the seeds of global social upheaval and it is not even the subject of debate in America ... if the masses understood the truth about GATT, there would be blood in the streets of many capitals. A healthy national economy has to produce a large part of its own needs. It cannot simply import what it needs and use its labour forces to provide services for other countries."

"We have to rethink from top to bottom why we have elevated global free trade to the status of sacred cow or moral dogma. It is a fatally flawed concept that will impoverish and destabilise the industrial world while cruelly ravishing the Third World".

## RECOMMENDED READING

- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| <b>Douglas, C. H.</b>    | The Development of World Dominion.<br>Economic Democracy.<br>The Monopoly of Credit.<br>The Policy of a Philosophy.<br>Social Credit. |
| <b>Eringer, R.</b>       | The Global Manipulators.  |
| <b>Maré, Eric de</b>     | A Matter of Life or Debt.   |
| <b>Monahan, Bryan W.</b> | The Moving Storm.<br>The Survival of Britain.<br>Why I am a Social Crediter.  |