Editorial

'No' to a new constitutional convention

In two hundred years, the only flaw shown to have existed in the original United States Constitution, as to principle of law, is the "Service and Labour" provision of Section 4, Article IV. This compromise on the issue of those legacies of British law and rule, slavery and indenture, tolerated practices then opposed by the sentiment of the majority represented, but was endured as a compromise to secure the adherence to the union by the slave-holding states.

The abhorrence we have for the substance of that point of compromise, must never blind us to the fact that this simple document, this Federal Constitution, is, on point of principle and historic performance, the greatest instrument ever adopted to provide the ordering of self-government of free men and women. Taking into account the useful amendments added until the time of President Woodrow Wilson, and including the franchise of adult women, this Constitution is both the shield of individual freedom, and the wisest guide to the ordering of the relations among branches of government, and of the relationship among federal government, the federal states, and the individual citizens.

Should we ever alter those features of the Constitution, especially under stress of crisis, the freedom of every citizen were placed in jeopardy, and the kind of tyranny never possible in this republic, would become an immediate possibility.

At this moment, our republic is in just such a danger of being transformed into a tyranny. Misguided men and women are being duped into supporting the proposition, that a new constitutional convention should be held.

Some are rallied to support such a proposal, by the delusion that the constitutional provision for an obligatory annual balancing of the federal budget will curtail the woes of the taxpayer, when in fact it will oblige the federal government to raise taxes. Other, darker forces, propose to tear up the presidential system itself, and to introduce that parliamentary form of government which has shown itself such a disaster in other nations.

Some numerous parts of the forces behind this proposal are avowed fascists, who are now working to bring the leaderships of the two major political parties into such close collaboration, in such matters as allowing who is permitted to run for Federal office, that a one-party dictatorship is established in effect. They intend to use a changed constitution, to introduce a kind of fascism last seen in such cases as the pre-1936 Austria under Dollfuss or Mussolini's Italy.

The proposed change in government is called "corporativism," which some call "democratic fascism," which others call "local control." The aim is to establish "corporations" like those of Mussolini's Italy, and to use those "corporations" as means for "democratically" choosing which economic interests and which freedoms the members of those corporations and the nation shall relinquish. From such "democratic corporativism," to a tyranny like Mussolini's, would be a very short step.

The main force pushing for "corporatism" in the West today, is in the leadership of Willy Brandt's Socialist International. Inside the United States, the "democratic fascists" are centered in a bi-partisan organization calling itself, curiously, the National Endowment for Democracy, the chief culprit in arranging support for the drug-trafficking "Contras."

The operating arm of the National Endowment for Democracy is Ollie North's accomplice, Project Democracy. Project Democracy is a network of organizations, mostly social-democratic, centered around a former top U.S. agent for the Soviet intelligence services, Jay Lovestone. In the United States, it is these so-called "right-wing social democrats" who are the most important among those pushing for "corporatist reforms."

The mere calling of such a proposed constitutional convention, under these circumstances, could be the cause of the early death of this republic. If you love freedom, you will not tolerate support for such a foolish experiment.

72 National EIR May 22, 1987