

"All that is necessary
for the triumph of
evil is that good
men do nothing . . ."
— EDMUND BURKE



THE NEW TIMES

SURVEY

THE AUSTRALIAN

LEAGUE OF RIGHTS

Vol. 19 No. 01

Registered Australia Post - Publication PP343214 / 00016

January 2018

CONTENTS

Policy - Why is it So Important? by Arnis Luks	1
What's Wrong with the Financial System? A Social Credit Perspective by M. Oliver Heydorn	4
Same-Sex 'Marriage' and the Triumph of Unbridled Power by Tom Bothwell	6

POLICY - WHY IS IT SO IMPORTANT? by Arnis Luks

UK Government to Pay Off WWI Debt: 3 December 2014, <http://www.bbc.com/news/business-30306579>
Chancellor George Osborne is to pay off the UK government's remaining debt from World War One, the Treasury has announced. The government will repay the outstanding £1.9bn of debt from a 3.5% War Loan on 9 March 2015. The move goes further than October's announcement that the government would pay off £218m of debts from World War One.

More than 120,000 investors hold War Loan bonds. Issued by then Chancellor Neville Chamberlain in 1932, the War Loan was used to **refinance government debt accumulated during World War One. It replaced an earlier bond** which paid 5% to investors. It is the first time the government has paid off a bond of this kind in 67 years. The Debt Management Office estimates the government has paid about £5.5bn in total interest on the 5% and 3.5% war loans respectively since 1917.

The government added it would look to remove all six of the other remaining undated gilts in its portfolio, including some debt originally issued in the 18th Century. One of these bonds was issued by William Gladstone in 1853 to consolidate the capital stock of the South Sea Company, which was founded in 1711. The South Sea Company collapsed during the South Sea Bubble financial crisis of 1720, leaving behind it a lot of debt.

Current low interest rates mean the Treasury will be able to refinance the £1.9bn debt with new bonds, saving up to £30m a year in interest payments, according to some estimates.

George Osborne said: "This is a moment for Britain to be proud of. We can, at last, pay off the debts Britain incurred to fight the First World War. "It is a sign of our fiscal credibility and it's a good deal for this generation of taxpayers. It's also another fitting way to remember that extraordinary sacrifice of the past."

Full Autumn Statement documents here: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/382327/44695_Accessible.pdf

The tune *Waltzing Matilda*, written by Banjo Patterson 1895 depicts the life of the swagman camped by a billabong. The swagman's plight of sleeping it rough and having to travel from town to town in search of work or in order to collect charitable relief (the dole of that time), was a direct result of the policy of exploitive banks which imposed the financial depression of 1893-1897 and 1929-1939 by withdrawing credit and calling in loans.

POLICY - For men who faced constant rejection by employers in the inner city, they had no choice but to pack a swag (or 'matilda') and travel to country areas in search of work. Swagmen were entitled to receive food-ration coupons at country police stations if they could produce a traveller's ration card showing that they had travelled at least 50 miles (80 kilometres) during the week. If not, they went hungry or had to cadge for food. The traveller's ration card was established by Governments to discourage unemployed men from forming hobo camps in country towns.

As a result, 'Swaggies' trekked vast distances – sometimes more than 5000 miles (8000 kilometres) – over several years. Travelling by train was the quickest way from one country town to another. Many a swagman lived by his pocket-sized train timetable (also known as the 'bagman's bible') to ensure that he didn't miss a ride to his next destination. They routinely evaded the fare by jumping onto passing trains, risking injury or death. Those who were caught by police were locked up overnight in the 'clink' (gaol cell).

Ref: <https://sydneylivingmuseums.com.au/stories/skint-making-do-great-depression>

The history of Australia has it that for a 12 year period, (including the First World War preceding the Great Depression 1929-1939), the Commonwealth Bank of Australia ¹ was the People's Bank. During this 12 year window Australia had a period of relative prosperity.

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) There were major infrastructure projects undertaken, including the construction of the East-West Trans-Australian Railway line, Australian Fleet of Steamers, Wireless Service, Woollen Mills, Oil Refineries and the search for oil.

Secure long-term low-interest loans were made available for home ownership, businesses and farms and also drought relief. The CBA POLICY was directed for the benefit of the community and especially the nation as a whole, by its then sole director Denison Miller.

The story of the Commonwealth Bank begins with the South Australian 1896 election of the colourful character King O'Malley for the electorate of 'Encounter Bay' on the Fleurieu Peninsular. An (alleged) Canadian born American, property salesman and former banker, he set about to establishing himself as a politician, campaigning against 'stagger juice', this issue being popular amongst the conservative women voters.

After failing to be re-elected again in 1899, O'Malley moved to the West Coast of Tasmania and after another vigorous campaign was successfully elected to the 5 seat Division of Tasmania in the fledgeling Australian Federal Parliament of 1901. With Andrew Fisher's Labour government, O'Malley and the future governor of the CBA Denison Miller fought against all odds to establish the bank. In 1912 the CBA legislation was passed.

This legislation saw the issuing of 12,000 shares, of which 6,000 shares were to be allocated to the Commonwealth Government and 1000 shares to be allocated to each of the State Governments. The value of the shares was about £100 each, so the establishment of the CBA requiring a cash injection of £1.2 million. The CBA's main branches were located in the general post office (GPO) buildings within each major city, thus costs were kept to a minimum.

British Bank Policy

At the onset of the First World War the Fisher Labour government approached British banks for finance and were offered loans at 7.25% for the processing of the war. Denison Miller, using the fledgling CBA was able to provide £340 million of loans at less than half of one percent for the same purpose. In fact the printing of the money alone realised sufficient profit to finance more than 50% of the construction of the East-West Trans-Australian Railway line with no further debt to the nation.

The infant CBA was able to finance the First World War, provide credits for significant infrastructure projects and also offer long-term low-interest loans for housing, businesses and farms. The CBA POLICY was directed toward benefiting the individuals of the community, hence the nation as a whole, by its then sole director Denison Miller.

As has been shown, bank policy can be for good or for evil. Bankers treat money as a commodity for exploitation, instead of a 'method of measurement'.

The American Federal Reserve system (1913) is a hybrid, formed by private bankers and the government to protect a cartel, being devised in secret to protect the international banking monopoly with the force of law. Similarly, the Bank of England established in 1694 as a privately owned institution discretely within the Tonnage Act, was also devised to protect the international banking cartel with the force of law.

“The bank hath benefit on the interest on all monies which it creates out of nothing.”

Quote from the Bank of England Charter (1694)

The current Australian central bank (RBA) policy is to maintain full employment (this is in spite of automation, advanced control, robotics and the like) and also to 'control' inflation - inflation being the erosion of purchasing power of the consumer. Modern economics (industry policy) is all about labour saving and efficiency. So economics and central banking policy appear at odds with each other, or at least that is what appears to be the policy - cognitive dissonance. But in actual fact the policy achieves exactly what it is designed to achieve - centralising of power in the hands of the few (private bankers).

Current Bank Policy

Denison Miller, with the Fisher Labour Government, demonstrated that a benevolent policy can secure a favourable future for the community. But should the Reserve Bank of Australia board not demonstrate benevolence, but rather exploitation, the community (the nation) can be stripped of their assets.

Under Denison Miller debt was redeemable. Today under our existing reserve bank board debt is irredeemable. Our Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA) board is controlled by private banking interests.

Our current Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull is a former private banker. The outworking of the RBA POLICY is to centralise power further into the hands of the banking monopoly using inflation, and by not offering secure long-term low-interest loans, nor issuing of new credits (debt free) for significant infrastructure projects.

1937 Royal Commission

Private Banks give little or no consideration to the public interest, but do so only under significant pressure through public opinion. The 1937 Royal Commission findings 'Dissenting View', Chifley points out that preceding the depression (1929) banks actively encouraged unhealthy economic conditions by unsound advancing of loans and then producing the (great-ed) depression by a policy of contraction of loans, thus intensifying the evil (exploitation-ed). (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

Chifley adds further: “private banking systems make the community the victim of every wave of optimism or pessimism that surges through the minds of financial speculators”.

The probable Royal Commission 2018 outcome may take the heat off the private banks for now but will not change the existing system or policy, which, I might add, is highly lucrative for them. In fact the current Royal Commission into banking 2018 (ROYAL COMMISSION INTO MISCONDUCT IN THE BANKING, SUPERANNUATION AND FINANCIAL SERVICES INDUSTRY) may provide a bloody nose for a few individuals or managers but ‘the caravan moves on’. The outcome will not alter banking policy that exploits individuals and the nation for the benefit of the private banking cartel - OLIGARCHY.

Finance

The *Bank of England Working Paper 1st Quarter 2014* shows the process of issuing loans and repaying of debts is how all new money comes into existence and is then subsequently destroyed as the loan is paid back with interest.

Should you take the time to visit the website the “Debt Clock” you will immediately see that the level of indebtedness for every single nation on earth is progressively irredeemable. In fact, as an instrument of power, money creation has become the perfect tool to control the world. The international banking cartel are now lining up to manage ‘carbon credits’ as a new form of finance, or exchange - again a monopoly. There has to be a better way.

Political Party POLICY

It is noted that in Australia a new Conservative party in its regular newsletter highlights that we are progressively moving towards a cashless society. Not only are they discussing this, they are actively promoting it. The newsletter makes no mention of the Constitutional responsibility of our federal government to manage finance. Nor make mention of the handing over of this constitutional responsibility into private hands.

Other politicians are proposing that our national assets be exchanged for historical debts - debts for equity swaps - similar debts that Britain needed 100 years to pay off after the first world war ended. Not only is this unnecessary, but as a result, the assets of the nation are again transferred into private hands - OLIGARCHY. This is not new and in O’Malley’s time he was also facing the same problem of Bank Policy (profits) over National and Community Benefit (redeemable debt).

Policy and Parties

No existing political party is dealing with the root cause. In fact each party offers a different form of Band-Aid. Some want a debt ceiling on local government

loans. Others want a debt ceiling on state government borrowings. In USA, every so often, they (the Federal Government) go through this exercise to lift the debt ceiling to continue on with the function of government without any discussion of how it is possible for the most productive nation in the ‘history of mankind’ cannot redeem (clear) its financial debts?

Finance mobilises the communities real credit (raw materials, technology, know how, individual initiative, and manpower). It is proper that ‘finance’ (tickets to ‘produce results the consumer desires’) should vest with the community in a localised form. In fact the original CBA branches were located in the GPOs for each city and so it should be today.

Money, or credit creation as it should be correctly termed, should be decentralised, vested at the individual. This can only be achieved by ensuring that the financial side of the economy and the production side of the economy is balanced i.e. sufficient purchasing power is in the hands of the individual to purchase what the community’s industry makes (manufacturing).

Luddites, Job Losses and the Basic Income Guarantee

Since Stephenson’s rocket and the industrial revolution, this question of how to distribute the results of industry in a fair and equitable fashion has remained unresolved. In fact the Luddites went around smashing those machines that made them redundant in order to continue to work so they would receive a wage.

With Artificial Intelligence - robotics and advanced control - there are realistic projections that up to 50% of existing jobs will be lost in the next 20 years. The basic income guarantee (BIG) offers no long term solution because the ‘tax pool’ used for funding this proposal will be reduced to as little as 25% of the existing workforce. Those still working cannot carry that huge burden of tax for everyone. There has to be a better way.

New Money System

There needs to be a complete review of the financial relationship to the economic system and as an outcome a new money system developed. A Money System that accurately assesses the value (cost) of the continuous stream of automatic/robotic/AI/Advanced Control (PRODUCTION) coming out of industry, and at the same time, balancing a continuous stream of purchasing power (CONSUMPTION) in the hands of the public. CH Douglas presented the solution 100 years ago in the form of Social Credit - the National Dividend and the Consumer Price Discount.

This battle will never be won, once for all time, but rather must be fought by every generation. Avoiding this battle ensures the future for our children and our grandchildren is increasingly perilous. Freedom must be ‘the first cause’, not ‘power’ for the central banks. It must be ‘fought’ again and again by each and every generation!

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

The POLICY of the RBA Reserve Bank of Australia must be: “that sufficient purchasing power (credit) must be placed into the hands of each responsible adult so as to achieve a balance between PRODUCTION (industrial output) and CONSUMPTION (purchasing power), for the benefit of each and every individual over and above privately owned industries and banks (monopolies) and by doing will stabilise and benefit the nation as a whole”.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE FINANCIAL SYSTEM? A SOCIAL CREDIT PERSPECTIVE by M. Oliver Heydorn

At the very heart of the modern economy we find this thing called ‘finance’. Finance is to the economy what an operating system is to a computer. For it is the financial system which allows an economy’s ‘hardware’ (i.e., its raw materials, labour, machinery, etc.) to be actualized in the service of specific ‘software applications’ (i.e., production programmes). As far as the formal economy is concerned, it is true to say that finance is the essential interface and animating principle.

But the financial system, i.e., the banking and cost accountancy system, is also a purely human artefact composed of institutions, laws, and conventions. This means that it can function more or less adequately. If it is properly designed, it will serve the common good in an effective, efficient, and fair manner. If it is not properly designed, it will tend, instead, to serve the vested interests of those who own and operate the financial system, thus transforming financiers (both national and international) into an economic and political oligarchy.

Social Credit holds that the conventional financial system is not properly designed and that, in consequence, it has become impossible for any economic association operating under its rules to fulfill its true purpose (i.e., the delivery of those goods and services that people can use with profit to themselves with the least amount of labour and resource consumption) to the extent that such a fulfillment is physically possible.

In other words, because there is a ‘bug’ in the economy’s operating system, the economy’s hardware is artificially constrained and its activity is misdirected. Chronic dysfunction in the form of poverty, servility, the recurring cycle of boom and bust, constant inflation, heavy taxation, economic waste and sabotage, forced economic growth, ever-increasing indebtedness, and the centralization of wealth, privilege, and power in fewer and fewer hands is the inevitable result.

In general, a financial system may be described as a system of double-entry bookkeeping involving both money values and money. It is a system of numerical representation that is meant to measure our physical economic assets on the one hand and the calls that we make on those assets on the other.

The basic design fault with the conventional system

1..The Reserve Bank of Australia (RBA), on 14 January 1960, became the Australian central bank and banknote issuing authority, when the Reserve Bank Act 1959 (23 April 1959) removed the central banking functions from the Commonwealth Bank.

“I am only one, but I am one. I cannot do everything, but I can do something. And because I cannot do everything, I will not refuse to do the something that I can do. What I can do, I should do. And what I should do, by the grace of God, I will do.”

Edward Everett Hale ***

is this: it is not an honest system. That is, it is not designed to provide an accurate representation of our physical wealth, both potential and actual. Instead, it systematically underestimates our wealth, always making it appear, in financial terms, that we are poorer than we actually are in physical terms.¹

Perhaps it is easiest to grasp the general nature of the problem in the case of potential production. In the big wide world there are many goods and services that are never produced even though there is a) a great need for them on the part of various individuals on the one hand, and b) more than sufficient raw material, labour, and machinery, etc., to bring these goods and services into being on the other. The required items are not produced because sufficient producer credit to set the economy’s hardware in motion is not forthcoming. But how can there be a lack of money? Money is simply a matter of accountancy numbers.

In principle, we should be able to create as much or as little of it as we need. If the financial system were properly designed, society’s real credit, i.e., its physical potential to deliver needed goods and services, would be automatically and isomorphically represented by an adequate flow of financial credit for production. Finance would dutifully respond to the legitimate demands of the real economy, rather than acting as the great limiting factor. Ironically, sufficient producer credit is often made available for wasteful, redundant, or destructive production, such as low-quality, throw-away appliances, competing brands whose only noticeable difference lies in the packaging, and armaments for export.

Thus we see that the existing rules of the financial game interfere with the catalytic function of the financial system in two ways: by artificially limiting the volume of desired production and by simultaneously inducing the production of many other things that would not be sanctioned by the truly independent and autonomous citizen in his rôle as worker and consumer.

When it comes to actual production, a parallel problem can be observed. In addition to its catalytic function in facilitating new production, the financial system also serves a distributive function with respect to already existing production.

(continued on next page)

(continued from previous page)

On one side of the equation, the financial system registers the costs that are incurred and hence the price-values that are built up as producer credit is spent to obtain raw materials and to transform them, through the intelligent application of energy, into a more useful form. On the other side, it also registers, under the heading of consumer purchasing power, the money that is distributed to consumers as a reward for their various inputs in the production process in the form of wages, salaries, rents, and dividends, etc.

Douglas revealed that in the case of the financial system's distributive function, our existing financial 'software' is faulty because any production involving the use of real capital will build up costs and hence prices at a faster rate than it distributes income to consumers.² That is, for every 100 units of cost that the financial system registers in the course of the production of some good or service, it only registers the equivalent of a smaller proportion of that 100 units, let's say 50 units, in the form of incomes that were simultaneously distributed through the same productive process.³ There is a structural imbalance where prices and incomes are concerned. Finance lags behind the physical reality and artificially limits our access to it.

Now, this situation is not right. Why? Well, in the first place, it's irrational. What's the point of producing some specified inventory of goods if the act of production does not distribute enough money to consumers so that those goods can be bought in their entirety and all of their corresponding costs of production liquidated? What cannot be consumed is waste and the production of waste is purposeless.

One may object that the existing system has various ways of compensating for this lack of purchasing power, through the continual granting of more and more loans involving the creation of additional debt-money that is then issued to consumers, governments, and firms, and through export credit. Fine, but this brings us to the consideration of a second and more fundamental problem with the conventional financial software.

The physical cost of producing something is paid for as production proceeds and is paid for in full upon completion of the good or the delivery of the service in question. Otherwise, the good or service would not exist. If the financial system were an honest system, i.e., if it were properly designed so as to mirror or reflect reality, there would be no need to borrow-into-being additional debt-money to be repaid out of future earnings in order to consume in full what has already been produced. Every unit of price-value (as measured in dollars or any other currency) attached to any consumer good or service would be automatically matched by an equivalent unit in consumer purchasing power. Prices and incomes would be in an automatic balance or equilibrium.

Unfortunately, the financial system that we have in place is not a truthful indicator of our existing wealth. The picture it paints does not correspond isomorphically to the physical reality. For it allows a certain proportion of industrial production to go unrepresented by consumer purchasing power. While it rightly recognizes production costs as liabilities, it does not recognize that the corresponding production is also an asset that could and should be automatically represented by sufficient money in the hands of consumers. If the good or service exists, it has been paid for in physical terms, and so the money needed to represent it should also exist without having to borrow it as a cost against future cycles of production. There is no physical need to earn via future work what you have already paid for physically in the past; there should be no financial need either.

Besides being dishonest, this state of affairs is also unfair. If you conceive of the community as a single agent, the structural imbalance between prices and incomes can rightly be seen as a violation of commutative justice. The community surrenders all this necessary in physical terms to bring the goods or services into being, but, in exchange, it only receives sufficient purchasing power to consume a certain limited portion of that production and not the production in its entirety. This is equivalent to doing 10 dollars worth of work and only being paid 6 dollars, let us say, in exchange for that work. The exchange is unequal; i.e., the community receives less than what it gave.⁴

In sum, the existing financial system is so highly dysfunctional because it is structurally dishonest. It does not embody the principles of honest or accurate book-keeping when attempting to carry out either its catalytic function or its distributive function.⁵ By failing to conform its figures to the objective truth of the physical economic reality, the financial system becomes the limiting factor to which the real economy and the real people it is meant to serve are routinely subordinated. This subordination is an inversion of the due relation which should obtain between the financial system and the real economy. Instead of the economic dog wagging its financial tail, as, when, and where required, the financial tail wags the economic dog.

For those who profess belief in the Christian revelation, it should be of no small consequence that any financial system which incarnates such a perverted relationship between real things and figures is rightly described not simply as non-Christian, but as anti-Christian. If there is a 'this-worldly' or mundane source to our chronic economic, political, and social discontent it lies here, in the systematic subordination of society's real credit to its financial credit, of reality to mere abstractions. Nothing has been more corrosive where both Christianity and Christendom is concerned than the conventional financial system. *(continued on next page)*

Footnotes

1. By maintaining money in a state of artificial scarcity, the existing financial conventions ensure that money will be regarded as a commodity rather than as a useful tool. Like any other commodity, artificial scarcity enhances the benefits for those few who do monopolize the creation and selling of money as debt.
2. The proper explanation for this state of affairs will be the subject of a forthcoming article.
3. The proportions here make no claim to accuracy and have merely been chosen to illustrate the general principle.
4. It is for this reason that the concern which socialists and classical distributists show for the question of equity in income distribution is regarded as being of secondary importance by the Social Crediter.
To reference the example employed in the text, increasing the proportion of the six dollars that is received by labour at the expense of capital and/or

management via redistributive taxation or by making the worker an owner in his business does nothing to increase the aggregate volume of consumer purchasing power which has been released.

You do not make an insufficiency sufficient by re-allocating its distribution.

5. Please note that this diagnosis is completely independent of questions of profit and interest. From a Social Credit perspective, economic rent-taking, whether in the regular corporate world or in the financial world, in the form of usury, is an excrescence on an intrinsically flawed representational system and not the source of the problem.

M. Oliver Heydorn, Ph.D., is the founder and director of **The Clifford Hugh Douglas Institute** for the Study and Promotion of Social Credit. He is also the author of *Social Credit Economics*, *The Economics of Social Credit and Catholic Social Teaching*, *Social Credit Philosophy*, and *Lives of Our Own*. ***

SAME-SEX ‘MARRIAGE’ AND THE TRIUMPH OF UNBRIDLED POWER
by Tom Bothwell

In the wake of the ‘yes’ vote in the Australian Marriage Law Postal Survey and the almost summary legalization of same-sex ‘marriage’ – signed into law by the Governor General, incidentally, on the Feast of the Immaculate Conception in the Roman calendar – it seems opportune to draw attention to one of the hidden consequences or by-products of this change in the laws and hence in the very social structure of the nation.

Indeed, the particular consequence I have in mind is so grave that one must wonder whether, amongst all the other advantages that legalization affords to those who would wish to push society even further in the direction of oligarchic despotism, it isn’t the ultimate objective of the whole exercise.

In his booklet, *Programme for the Third World War*, C.H. Douglas makes a very interesting observation:

“Words are very important things – they are the only link we have in common between a fact and an idea.”

Facts are states of affairs in the real, objective, or mind-independent world. They do not depend on anybody’s perception, desires, or preferences for their validity as facts. Ideas are, at least in this context, components of a mental world and are produced by a human mind. From this it follows that whenever words are governed by facts they have the capacity to ground the ideas to which they are linked, to make sure that our ideas about the world actually correspond (however incompletely) to the nature of that world. When our words are not governed by facts they become slaves of whatever ideas we arbitrarily choose or prefer to hold,

no matter how incoherent, inconsistent, or impractical and otherwise false they may be.

Now it is one thing for this or that individual to use words as if they were or should be independent of facts, but what happens when the words we use are, in our collective consciousness, no longer governed by facts?

What happens is this: reasoning about reality or, more broadly, cognition itself becomes impossible as a collective or shared experience. The general culture is then cut off from truth, from evidence, or from any need to seek out sound justifications (arguments or explanations) to establish and cement its defining narratives.

When we erroneously believe that we have the right to make words mean whatever we want them to mean, simply because we want them to mean this or that for purely emotional, social, political or any other illegitimate reason, we cut ourselves off from the Logos, from the rationality that governs all things and by which our minds are judged:

“I suppose that there never was a time when so much nonsense was talked by so many people on so many subjects, as the present. Sober judgement was once the object of respectful attention; but nowadays none is so poor as to do it reverence. The very foundations of considered opinion appear to be undermined; words, in our new “wonderland,” mean what we want them to mean, and are used, not so much to conceal our thought as to advertise our determination to dispense with it.”

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) Nowhere today is this tendency to bend the meaning of words to suit fantasy, combined with the apparent incapacity to reason, more blatantly apparent than in the latest social upheaval to take the Western world by storm: the drive to legalize same-sex 'marriage'. With the most recent capitulation of Australia, 25 countries (all of them, interestingly enough, of European or of European origin) have lost their heads and have attempted to execute a metaphysical coup d'état by juridically redefining society's most basic institution: matrimony.

Ironically, the slogan that was in vogue amongst many same-sex 'marriage' supporters in Australia, i.e., 'marriage equality', also provides what is perhaps the best point of departure for arguing that the new definition of marriage does indeed separate the word 'marriage' from the facts of the world.

For legalizing same-sex 'marriage' necessarily implies (if words are to retain any meaning at all) that same-sex 'marriage' is fundamentally equal, i.e., is essentially the same thing, as what we have hitherto regarded as marriage. But this is simply not the case. Both the intended life-long union of one man and one woman and the intended life-long union of two men or two women have an essence or nature.

These essences are intelligible to the human mind and so the states of affairs (or facts) that are grounded in them can be identified and compared. The reader will duly note that I speak of 'essences' in conjunction with this subject because I am primarily concerned with the phenomena or data in question, i.e., with the facts, and not with words or concepts/ideas.

If we examine the essences in question we will see that the two relationships, the heterosexual union and the homosexual 'union', are not equal, i.e., the same, or even equivalent. There are, in the case of the heterosexual union, certain properties or attributes that supervene necessarily on the relationship. That is, when you bring a man and a woman together, there are new states of affairs that come into being.

In the first place, a man and a woman can engage in a genital union (which is based on their biological complementarity). They can also enjoy a deeper personal union on the basis of that special psychological, affective, and spiritual complementarity which the masculine/feminine polarity renders possible.

Finally, the heterosexual union is marked (whether this be accepted or not, wanted or not, valued or not) by procreative potential, i.e., the possibility that their physical union could result in new life. By contrast, every single one of these features, which are rightly regarded as great goods where the well-being of the spouses, the stability of society, and the future of civilization are concerned, is entirely absent from the homosexual relationship.

The heterosexual union is exclusively unique. To draw a crude analogy, when you bring a key and its corresponding lock together, something new comes into existence: the power to lock and unlock doors. Two keys or two locks are entirely useless for such a purpose. Clearly, the relation between the lock and key is qualitatively different from the relation between two keys or two locks. In no way can they be regarded as equal.

Since the two relationships that we have considered are phenomenologically distinct, using the same word and concept to describe both the heterosexual union and the homosexual 'union', i.e., marriage, is to affirm an equality or sameness that does not and indeed cannot exist. It is an attempt to redefine reality by redefining our language and laws with no regard to the facts.

One can indeed argue that legalizing same-sex 'marriage' is bound to yield a number of negative consequences, such as watering down the meaning of marriage to the point of destroying its coherence as an institution and with it the natural family, further confusing young people about sexuality and gender, or endangering religious freedoms, etc., but there is a more fundamental and even more dangerous effect: its cognitive repercussions.

If people are trained, from an early age, by the law, the general culture, and the school system to regard as equal two distinct phenomena that are not equal, and to use the one word 'marriage', with all of its social, cultural, and historical associations, to refer to both as if they were equal, they can easily lose the capacity to discern, to discriminate, and to believe instead that we can and should do with words whatever we want, as the facts (if they still acknowledge facts) are irrelevant.

Should such a tendency become generalized, and there is everyday evidence to suggest that it is already widespread, the result must be the unhinging of the mass mind from any standing in objective reality. In other words, legalizing same-sex marriage is equivalent to teaching the masses to repeat that 2 and 2 is five, that war is peace, that slavery is freedom, that ignorance is strength, or any other set of absurdities that suit the prevailing power structure, and not to be disturbed or even to register the cognitive dissonance.

But this then is the great danger: if the powers-that-be, operating through the media, the entertainment industry, the educational system, etc., can easily convince the wider public of the propriety of any proposition – no matter how spurious – they are then in complete control.

Power will be free ... free of the constraints that might normally be imposed by reality and rationality as a force in our public affairs ... to pursue its own agenda, an agenda which will be hostile to the authentic common good and to a safeguarding of the genuine rights and responsibilities of the individual person:

**“Good and evil have no place in this;
Power is Lord of all.”**

Further Reading and Reference Material:

1. C.H. Douglas, *Programme for the Third World War* (Liverpool: K.R.P. Publications Limited, 1943), 29.
2. C.H. Douglas, *The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket* (London: K.R.P. Publications Ltd. 1943), 3 [emphasis mine].
3. "Marriage Equality" is a prime instance of "the remarkable facility with which well-intentioned people allow themselves to be hypnotised by a phrase" C.H. Douglas, *Economic Democracy*, 3rd Edition (London: Stanley Nott, 1931), 100.

Douglas also explicitly recognized that the indiscriminate promotion of equality as a social objective was a favourite tool employed by the globalist powers to distract, placate, and condition the masses so that tyranny could intensify unopposed. Cf. C.H. Douglas, *"Whose Service is Perfect Freedom"* (Bullsbrook, Western Australia: 1983), 40 [emphasis mine]:

"One of the delusions skilfully fostered by those Dark Forces which assail us, then, is the idea of human equality under a non-immanent Sovereignty. It is quite probable that this conception, held, where it is held, in defiance of everyday experience, observation, and history, arises from the inability to grasp the meaning of words, an inability which is coming under skilled observation in many quarters. It is perhaps unnecessary to pursue the disproof of the first aspect of it further than to suggest that, if no two persons in the world possess one attribute, a finger-print, alike, as experts contend, then it is hardly probable that even two persons could be found to possess every attribute alike. But this idea underlies the whole Socialist-Bureaucratic Totalitarian propaganda. They are all the same, as any observer of events in Russia and Germany can see for himself. It is insinuating itself into such phrases as 'the standard of living'. There is only one place in which there is an effective 'standard of living, and that is a gaol."

4. The obvious and most commonly raised objection to this aspect of the analysis is that some heterosexual couples are infertile due to age or health issues and thus it is false to affirm that the last attribute mentioned supervenes necessarily. The response to this claim is to note that procreative potential (not to be confused with procreation itself) is still present in principle in the case of infertile heterosexual couples. That is, it still remains true that, if everything were present and working properly, the heterosexual couple could still engage in the sort of act that is productive of new life. And, as a matter of fact, sometimes people who were thought to be congenitally infertile or too old do have 'surprise' children naturally. In the case of the homosexual

couple, by contrast, even if everything is present and working properly, they can never engage in the act that is productive of new life. Procreative potential does not exist at all, not even in the form of a theoretical possibility.

5. However, the fact that the legalization of same-sex 'marriage' is now being most often argued for in the name of 'equality' also lends itself to a type of *reductio ad absurdum* of the whole position. For, in addition to homosexuals, there are also bisexuals (or so we are told). Are they not entitled to "equality"? If we follow the same logic, bisexuals should be allowed to be in a legal three-person 'marriage' with one same-sex spouse and one opposite sex spouse. You can't 'discriminate' against bisexuals, now can you? ... And what if one of those spouses is also bisexual ... and so on?

Well, then we might have to have a long chain of married couples, that, if were extended long enough, could possibly encompass a very large group of people indeed ... "One Love".

It's ridiculous, but that's what you get when you insist on redefining marriage to suit people's irrational whims and preferences, instead of insisting that the relevant realities must define our words and concepts and also govern our behaviour.

6. The fundamental lie of the Kabbalah is that reality is a function of thought. On the contrary, while Kabbalistic thinking, what Douglas often referred to as 'black magic', can manipulate our perception of reality and even influence our experience of reality, it cannot alter reality itself.

7. C.H. Douglas, *The Development of World Dominion* (Sydney: BLOXHAM & CHAMBERS PTY. LTD., 1969), 12. ***



THE LEAGUE'S WEBSITE: — alor.org

blog.alor.org thecross-roads.org

Subscription to On Target \$45.00 p.a.

NewTimes Survey \$30.00 p.a.

and Donations can be performed by bank transfer:

A/c Title Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)

BSB 105-044

A/c No. 188-040-840

or by cheques directed to:

'Australian League of Rights (SA Branch)'

or on the Veritasbooks.com.au website:

<https://veritasbooks.com.au/cat/subscriptions>

"NewTimes Survey" is printed and authorised by K. W. Grundy.
13 Carsten Court, Happy Valley, SA.

Postal Address: PO Box 27, Happy Valley, SA 5159.

Telephone: 08 8387 6574 **email:** heritagebooks@alor.org

Head Office Hours - Mon., Tues., Wed. 09.00am - 3.00pm