

*Supply*

only not desirable but also not inevitable. The resister says that it is one world, yes; an increasingly smaller world, yes; but the resister imagines this one world as a global community rather than a global marketplace where co-operation rather than competition is the buzzword of the earth's future.

The resister says that the globalization we have now before us, and which we are asked to embrace, is nothing other than a politically sanitized concept designed to cover up reality. The reality is that the multinational corporate elite want to turn the planet into a playground for themselves, where they can play their games with each other, unfettered by nuisance factors like democratically elected governments and well supplied with the economic equivalent of cannon fodder, i.e. anxious populations ready to accept injustices or even the dismantling of existing structures of justice in order to secure investment or jobs at the expense of other equally anxious populations less willing or less able to offer the same deal.

Globalization is another name for comprehensive, integrated and very sophisticated blackmail in which governments accept the blackmailer's demands on behalf of their people and then go on to enforce the demands on their own people, all the while muttering phrases that would have us believe that this is strong medicine but will do the trick. It is not medicine, Madam Speaker, it is poison.

In Canada, as with others, the blackmail is twofold: first, we are blackmailed into these agreements in the first place by the corporate community collectively, or seduced into them by massive advertising campaigns, as was the case in the last election. The agreement then makes corporate blackmail on a corporation by corporation basis as well as collectively that much easier and that much more acceptable in the sense that the FTA and/or NAFTA make acceptable what was previously morally suspect. It is not something that Canadians have missed either. What is okay for corporations is okay for individual Canadians and so we get the cross-border shopping phenomenon aggravated by the GST and by a high dollar that is also related to the FTA. But I digress.

In the Third World the blackmail comes in the form of what is called structural adjustment which is the euphemism for, among other things, deliberately starving children in order to save the value system of the global financial world. Structural adjustment is the name given to the demands made on Third World governments

which would otherwise want to feed their own people, grow their own food, expand public health services, export their resources for a profit and other such ridiculous things, but are forced not to because such plans do not fit the economic model favoured by the IMF or the World Bank.

In Canada we are under structural adjustment as well. The difference is that we will have to dismantle where others are being asked not to build in the first place. The other difference, to some degree, is that our government seems to actually believe this is all to the good, whereas at least some Third World countries or governments have the self-respect to think otherwise and even to resist at times.

What is at stake in all of these issues is power. Who will run the world, and for what end? It is a question of sovereignty, but not sovereignty only in the narrow 19th century national or nation state sense of the word, although that is not unimportant, it is a question of sovereignty in the big "P" political sense of who and what will be sovereign not only in Canada but in the whole world. Will the marketplace be sovereign?

The problem with the FTA and NAFTA and globalization in general is that they answer this question of sovereignty in a way that puts an end to the ideological debate that has been going on in Canada and other western countries for decades. The debate between market and state, private and public, right and left, produced a balance, albeit fluctuating, between different points of view that gave us mixed economies, an admirable measure of social justice and enough of a role for government that democracy mattered to the economy. But the key thing really is that no one view or institution was absolutely sovereign.

The accommodationists, in answer to the criticism that Canadian sovereignty is sacrificed to the FTA, argued that it was an act of sovereignty to sign the agreement. The resisters agreed that sovereignty can be delegated, but sovereignty is a political thing that can only be delegated to something which is also political. National sovereignty can be delegated two ways; in a decentralizing way toward regions or provinces, or it can be delegated upward, so to speak, to an international political entity like the UN. But to delegate sovereignty to the marketplace, to a non-political, non-democratic reality like either the continental or global marketplace is not delegation of sovereignty; it is an abdication of sovereignty, an abdication of Canada's sovereignty which