

Valérie Bugault — **Why is the British model anti-democratic?**

Behind Liberalism, the Dictatorship of British Institutions

Presentation of Valérie Bugault, entitled “Derrière le libéralisme, la dictature des institutions britanniques (***Behind Liberalism, the Dictatorship of British Institutions***). The presentation can be found at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M5sT4Jg34u4>. It was given as part of a conference organised by the Schiller Institute (<https://www.institutschiller.org/>), held in Paris on Tuesday, 4 February 2020.

Valérie Bugault is a doctor of law and a geopolitical and economic analyst. She is the author of “Les raisons cachées du désordre mondial” (*The Hidden Reasons Behind the World Disorder*; <https://lesakerfrancophone.fr/valerie-bugault-les-raisons-cachees-du-desordre-mondial>).

TRANSCRIPT

Hello, thank you for inviting me. My talk will follow on from what Jacques Cheminade has said so well about empire, domination and, in particular, the struggle that needs to be waged if we want to have a future in Europe, France and the rest of the world.

So my talk today is going to be about why the British model is anti-democratic and, behind liberalism, the dictatorship of British institutions. So my talk consists of three parts:

1. How English law is structurally at the service of the powerful.
2. How we have gone from political power to economic power.
3. And what the consequences will be.

So it's a bit more academic than what you have heard in the previous presentations, but I think it's quite structuring for the mind to understand where our institutions come from, both European and American institutions. So let's start at the beginning and I'll show you that the British parliament is a political organisation that serves the powerful.

What are we talking about? Well, first of all we're talking about the Magna Carta, which appeared in 1215, was almost immediately repealed, only to reappear in 1216 before being amended and supplemented by a domanical law in November 1217. A fourth version appeared in February 1225, validating the disappearance of half of the version promulgated in 1215. This new version of the charter, formally confirmed on 10 November 1297, would henceforth be known as the Magna Carta.

This Magna Carta, much vaunted as an absolute democratic instrument, was in reality the manifestation of a struggle between the feudal system against centralising royal power. It was not an instrument of the people against the powerful, but an instrument of the powerful lords against the unifying royal power.

In reality, it served to take away most or all of the king's prerogatives, the king being the central political body, and to give them to a council of feudal lords or aristocrats known as the council of barons, in order to limit and ultimately control royal power. The people, who had nothing to do with this war among the great aristocrats, gained absolutely nothing from the Magna Carta. It was precisely this council of great feudal lords, initially known as the council of barons, which was gradually transformed into a parliament.

From the outset, this parliament was functionally as little a founder of democracy in the sense of government of the people, for the people, by the people as slavery could be said to be the ultimate cause of freedom. The principles of the right to a fair trial and universal equality before the law were introduced in the Magna Carta in 1354.

It should be noted that this latter principle is a mere statement of intent that is not really sanctioned by law, since it was unable to justify the abolition of slavery in England in the seventeenth century. Furthermore, it must be emphasised that the proclamation of the right to a fair trial had as little to do with the people as did the composition of parliament, which was formed from the Council of Barons of Magna Carta. Only the powerful, and increasingly from the twelfth century onwards, also the wealthy townspeople, had the procedural weapon at their disposal, because English medieval justice was built ab initio as a class form of justice.

To regard the English parliament as a body representing democracy is simply a political sham. In reality, the English parliament has always legally danced to the tune of the powerful, first the feudal powers, then the financial powers that replaced them. The law that emerges from the English parliament is, in reality, the law of the inner circle, an oligarchic law that surely emerges more from the City of London, the financial and economic centre of the kingdom, or in the gentlemen's clubs so dear to the English, than from the official confines of a parliament representing the popular interest.

In reality, in accordance with its original mission, parliament most often merely ratifies solutions that have been preconceived in the silence of corridors and offices. This is known as lobbying. This general analysis is not linear, and here and there in England, as elsewhere, you can find members of parliament openly expressing their opposition to draft legislation. The more frequent and numerous these aberrations are, the sooner the institutional straitjacket of parliamentarianism will be shattered and real democracy will be able to emerge in England and elsewhere.

English law is a principle of regulation at the service of the powerful. Let's come back to the specific features of Anglo-Saxon law as a direct descendant of English law and to the conditions under which it developed from the sixteenth century onwards. Over time, a fundamental conceptual divergence emerged in the development of law between England and continental Europe. This is about methodology.

Following the collapse of the Roman Empire, law developed in Europe around the double helix of temporal power on the one hand and spiritual power on the other. By temporal power, we mean the aristocracy organised around the king, understood as first among equals, *primus inter pares*. By spiritual power, we mean Catholicism hierarchically organised in Rome - with a few historical exceptions – around the Pope.

In 1531, England seceded from this continental socio-political organisation when King Henry VIII, the representative of the temporal order, decided to override spiritual power by subjecting it to his own will. The Anglican Church, known as the Reformed Catholic Church, i.e. halfway between Catholicism and Protestantism, was the result of England's split with Rome decided by King Henry VIII when Pope Clement VII stubbornly refused to annul his marriage to Catherine of Aragon so as to enable him to marry Anne Boleyn.

From this date onwards, the English Church was no longer subject to the authority of the Roman Catholic Pope, but to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who was in fact totally dependent on the temporal power, i.e. the King of England. This unification of temporal and spiritual powers did not happen in continental Europe, where on the contrary each of the two temporal and spiritual powers remained, at least until the revolution of 1789, competing and independent, of relatively equal strength.

If we read this history, during which one or the other of the two orders was successively pre-eminent, the structural porosity linked to the fact that the great aristocratic families occupied de facto dignitary positions in these two orders, a political order in the sense that it effectively structured the organisation of society, did not result in a standardisation of the interests of these orders, which have historically remained distinct and competing. In continental Europe, temporal power always had to come to terms with spiritual power, and vice versa.

What's more, these two powers were organised hierarchically, i.e. vertically, which gave them equivalent social and political power. As a result, the normative power of the temporal authorities, including lords and kings, was always limited by the normative power of the spiritual authority centralised in Rome under the authority of the Pope. Since the disappearance of the Roman Empire, this dual structural normative jurisdiction has undoubtedly been the only real common ground among the different European countries.

Therefore, in continental Europe, in ontological terms, we had a political organisation naturally authorised around the idea of countervailing power. This political and social organisation that characterised the Middle Ages in Europe is the main reason why the ancien régime was structurally much less absolutist than today's so-called democratic regimes, which are discreetly based on the domination of capital and modelled on the precepts derived from English law and anonymity.

If Anglo-Saxon law is today based on financial and economic supremacy, it has been ontologically at the exclusive service of the powerful since the sixteenth century. This law is not the result of any intellectual or collective effort to make life in common smoother and easier, it is quite simply the written expression of the domination of the powerful, aristocrats at first, then financiers since Cromwell. The merger of temporal and spiritual powers in England in 1531 led to the emergence of an imperial will through the alliance of power and money.

Against this backdrop, Oliver Cromwell devised a political system in which imperial hegemony was financed by bankers. These bankers, who had previously settled in Holland following their expulsion from Spain under the reign of King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella, began to integrate massively into English temporal political power.

According to what I call the natural law that he who gives is above he who receives, this alliance of power and capital has in turn historically and mechanically given rise to the supremacy of the holders of capital over political power. This supremacy was asserted during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries by the financing by the money powers of the various India companies, which acted on behalf of the States by benefiting from a monopoly on law enforcement. Anglo-Saxon law was historically at the service of temporal power alone, but it has gradually come to be solely at the service of the main holders of capital as political power has been taken over by the money powers.

We should not be surprised, therefore, by the absolutism of current domination. It developed in England, and France was its first victim in 1789. During the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, it spread throughout the world. This revolution, which took place in France in 1789, gradually spread to Europe and the rest of the world, eventually challenging the post-Roman empire political balance that emerged from medieval Europe. The new world order called for by the managers of the global economic system who took effective power in the eighteenth century is the result of the long evolution I have just described.

It should also be noted that the Novus Ordo Seclorum motto from the Great Seal of the United States, drawn in 1782, was used on one-dollar notes in 1935. The New World Order, which is not new at all, is tantamount to the complete annihilation of what has traditionally been understood by the term 'civilisation', which presupposes collective development and is fundamentally based on a balance of forces and powers.

No civilisation can emerge and prosper in the long-term absence of an effective political counterweight. It is important to understand that the merger of spiritual and temporal powers in England in the sixteenth century in the hands of the King of England paved the way for an imperialism dominated by the money powers. The English road, in turn, paved the way for absolute financial imperialism, via monetary domination and the British ideology it imposed on the rest of humanity.

This imperialism was perfectly described by Jacques Cheminade earlier. Today's financial fundamentalism, materialised legally by the supremacy of Anglo-Saxon law, is the direct descendant, the inevitable heir, of the absolutism of English power, which in 1531 merged temporal and spiritual powers, thereby doing away with the reality of checks and balances.

In 1600, the East India Company marked the beginning of the replacement of the landed aristocracy by the moneyed powers within the English State. Since the beginning of the fifteenth century, the Age of Discovery and great maritime exploration, the holders of capital have continued to develop their discreet control through the general implementation of the concept of anonymity.

This concept of anonymity, set in motion at both the economic and political levels, had its first real major success with the India companies, which eagerly confused political and economic power. Unsurprisingly, the first India company, the East India Company, was English in origin. In a way, the India companies foreshadowed the distinction between largely private profits and publicly funded costs that has now become part of Western economic standard practice.

With the advent of the various India companies, the civil, criminal and political responsibilities of those involved disappeared under the State monopoly. The India companies were the first model in which the real holders of power, those who ultimately benefited from the profits of the operations, were largely sheltered from any legal challenge. Today, the holders of capitalist power, conquerors of political power by chaos, naturally demand political and legal formalisation of the reality of their seizure of power. It was inevitable that this economic power, hidden behind multiple deceptions of capitalist anonymity and representative parliament, would sooner or later lay official claim to the power it had unofficially vanquished over the centuries. The supporters of the Novus Ordo Seclorum, also known as the New World Order, are in reality the emissaries of hidden economic power.

As we shall see, the ongoing Anglo-Saxon domination of the world is leading us down the road from financial absolutism to slavery for all. The English-style fusion of temporal and spiritual power has wiped out the balance of power that alone in the history of the world enabled the emergence of individual freedom and, notably, of the merchant class as a political force.

In the West, popular emancipation only came about through the unstable political balance between temporal and spiritual power. More recently in the twentieth century, and still under the pernicious influence of globalist bankers, the elimination of all countervailing power has become international.

Having disappeared from the internal organisation of Western states, a countervailing power nevertheless existed in a non-institutional way after the Second World War through the international antagonism between the communist Eastern bloc and the liberal Western bloc. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, this informal countervailing power, which nevertheless existed de facto on the international scene and which in particular enabled the development of the National Council of the Resistance (CNR) and the Gaullist period in France, in turn disappeared, once again highlighting the cruel non-existence of political countervailing powers within Western states.

Paradoxically and ironically, Western civilisation, characterised by individual freedom and the political freedom of the masses, is disappearing under sustained battering by individual freedom, itself manipulated to the extreme. The ultra-individualism advocated by movements such as LGBT, children's rights, and sex education from the earliest age is the logical outcome of the absolute political domination of the main holders of capital. They use to their exclusive advantage the principle of good politics: divide and conquer.

Dividing each human being into an entity isolated from any lasting social component, and beyond that dividing human beings and life into autonomous physical entities, is one of the most formidable weapons used by the holders of global economic power to enslave humanity. This method of enslavement, known as divide and conquer, is not only used geopolitically to divide peoples and nations, but also in a much more insidious and dangerous way from a political point of view, to turn every human being into an unstable entity devoid of any stable emotional or affective support.

The human being then becomes an easily manipulated atom, just like an object to be used. The control of politics by the main holders of capital has enabled them to become absolute masters of the regulatory concept of law – what they call the law. In this way, they have gradually imposed the anonymity of their shares across the globe by institutionally developing opaque capital intermediation.

I am referring to tax havens and all the legal structures based on the anonymous trust model, which enable a whole range of forms of anonymity and impede any pursuit of liability for the other side.

The exponential growth in the number of financial intermediaries has in turn mechanically enabled a lethal tightening of the grip of financiers on all aspects of communal life, both economic and social. By imposing their economic and financial rules of the game at international level, the globalist bankers calling the shots have accomplished the feat of imposing a unification of moduli that were the prerequisites for the development of a world government.

In this context of monopolisation of power, it is important to understand that Anglo-Saxon law is a weapon brandished as an anti-social and anti-national shield by the holders of real economic power. Anglo-Saxon-style regulatory law serves both as a pretext and a justification for strengthening financial absolutism.

Thank you very much,