

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



A BLESSED AND HOLY CHRIST-MASS SEASON TO ALL OUR READERS by Betty Luks

As we approach the time of year when we stand back and look at what the year has brought us; what we have achieved over that period of time; and seek to 'recharge our spiritual batteries'; we contemplate the very reason for the Season in the first place – the celebration of the Nativity of Jesus in Bethlehem all those centuries ago.

But the Christian message is more than 'the Nativity of the Baby Jesus' 'born in a stable' as there was 'no room at the inn'. As the year progresses the story of the Incarnation becomes clearer. The word incarnation means "*the act of being made flesh.*" It comes from the Latin version of John 1:14, which in English reads, "The Word became flesh and made His dwelling among us."

And what about the Magi who came to worship the Child? Smith's Bible Dictionary reads: The story of the wise men in Matthew 2: "*Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Judeans(?) for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him?*"

Matthew 2 echoes the story from 1 Kings 10: "*When the queen of Sheba heard about the fame of Solomon and his relationship to the Lord, she came to test Solomon with hard questions. Arriving at Jerusalem with a very great caravan—with camels carrying spices, large quantities of gold, and precious stones—she came to Solomon and talked with him about all that she had on her mind.*"

Christmas. 11
Gloria in excelsis Deo. OLD FRENCH MELODY.

10. 1. Angels we have heard on high, Sweet-ly singing o'er our plains,
2. Shepherds, why this ju - bi - lee? Why your rapturous strain prolong?
3. Come to Beth-le - hem, and see Him Whose birth the angels sing;

And the mountains in rep-ly Ech - o - ing their joy - ous strains.
What the glad - some tid - ings be Which in - spire your heav - en - ly song?
p Come, a - dore on bend - ed knee Christ the Lord, the new - born King.

Unison.
"Glo - ri - a in - ex - cel - sis De - o!"

4. See Him in a manger laid,
Whom the choirs of angels praise
Mary, Joseph, lend your aid,
While our hearts in love we raise.
"Gloria in excelsis Deo!"

During her visit, the depth of Solomon's wisdom took her breath away: "*In wisdom and wealth you have far exceeded the report I heard*" (1 Kings 10:7). Laying her gifts of gold, spice, and precious stones before him, she blessed the Lord for making Solomon king.

Maybe you prefer to call the visitors bearing treasure chests of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, wise men this Christmas. As you do, follow them in the footsteps of the queen of Sheba across the wilderness in search of the wisdom of God in Jerusalem.

However, as Matthew tells it, the wisdom of God was not to be found in the king's palace in Jerusalem, but in the small town of Bethlehem. As you watch them lay their gifts before baby Jesus, realize that "*something greater than Solomon is here*" (Matthew 12:42).

The Child is himself the Wisdom of God.

OUR ROOTS ARE IN THOUGHTS, NOT THINGS

As far back as 1953, social creditor Geoffrey Dobbs wrote that the conception C.H. Douglas left for them was a balanced conception. He explained, "... it took a weary time before this inherent balance was grasped by others". One of the last things Douglas left for them – and those who followed later - was known as *The Chart*, a diagram setting out certain relationships in the real world. At its focus is the word *Policy*, which more than any other single word, summarises what he had to teach. Geoffrey insisted the *Policy* is *implicit* in everything Douglas said and wrote on Social Credit, especially in his first book *Economic Democracy* and that later it became *explicit* in which he defined Social Credit as "the policy of a philosophy" and defined *philosophy* as meaning a "conception of reality". In another context Geoffrey reminded his readers that it is the outcome in practice of thinking which carries the consequences of both life and death. This concept is quite clear in Christian teaching: "*Whoever would love life and see good days must keep their tongue from evil and their lips from deceitful speech...*" 1 Peter 3:10. "*A wholesome tongue is a tree of life...*" Proverbs 15:4.

(continued next page)

Necessary Metaphysic is Threefold – The Creative Power of the Universe

Another early social creditor, Hewlett Edwards, father of Geoffrey Dobbs' wife Elizabeth, wrote that Social Credit "reverses the prevailing materialistic assumption of the modern world by insisting that society is primarily metaphysical; that its roots are in thoughts, not things. By 'metaphysics' Hewlett Edwards explained, "the word was used in the wide sense of other than physics; (i.e.), the working of the mind: thought: ideas: belief." He continued:

"This necessary metaphysic is threefold, holding that Truth, ascertainable but unalterable, exists; that Truth is accessible to human beings (however difficult its verbal formulation may be); and that Truth, ascertained and sustained, provides the common focus necessary to joint activity. "Without adherence to this triple belief – and enough adherence to cancel out the opposing metaphysic – society must fall apart; or be held together only by some form of arbitrary tyranny. These beliefs, which are basic in Christian doctrine, form the prototypes of a stable society, the degree of whose stability varies directly with the presence, quality and strength of this metaphysic. Social Credit holds that society must have regard for the organic relationships of its prototype, its original model. This is imperative rather than optional. As gravitation sustains the bricks and beams of a building so long as their constitution and arrangement conform to gravitation's own laws, so, inherent in the prototype there are organic relationships which govern the development and stability of society, the disregard of which carries certainty of damage to society and the perversion of its individual members..."

"Out of the one prototype stability grows; an organic growth primarily intensive in respect of quality; and out of (the materialistic/humanistic assumption...) instability is organised; primarily an extensive organisation in respect of *numbers* and *equality* (without quality)... The organic relationship which in the prototype supersedes all others is that laid down in the doctrine of the Trinity: a statement of the 'structure' of metaphysical reality.

Social credit, - Edwards insists – must have regard for this relationship in and throughout every phase; each *drawing Authority, engendering Power, and performing Works...*

It was Geoffrey Dobbs who reminded his readers that Marxism/Leninism had a fundamental identity to the ancient doctrine of **Manichaeism Dualism and quoted that famous statement of Lenin's:**
In its proper meaning dialectics is the study of the contradictions within the very essence of things."

While most Christians do not see the link between the two doctrines/beliefs, the following website certainly sees the importance of Lenin's statement and that of a society: (Dialectical Materialism: Definition, Nature and Basic Laws)

"The development of society and also of the idea is caused by the existence of two opposite forces. The development comes through the struggle."

Geoffrey wrote:

"If the 'contradictions are within the very essence of things' then the creative power of the universe is not love, but conflict, and the Ultimate Reality is divided against itself, whether we think of it as a personal God, or an impersonal and misinterpreted Darwinian struggle for existence. Because Marxism-Leninism with its materialism and atheism, rejects both God and Satan, it is not thought of as a religious heresy and its fundamental identity with Manichaeism Dualism and the belief in an eternal dualism between God and Satan is not grasped."

The Athanasian Creed was 'hammered out' all those centuries ago to come against this ancient myth/heresy of an eternal dualism of conflict between God and Satan as the ultimate reality. In this 21st century, Marxism/Leninism towers over and threatens the Western world with complete collapse. How many times have we heard so-called Christian leaders promoting what are in effect Marxist/Leninist and/or Collectivist/Capitalist policies while envisaging a philosophy of the Trinity, i.e., Father, Son and Holy Ghost, as the Ultimate Reality?

Reality: the state of things as they actually exist, as opposed to an idealistic or notional idea of them. Natural Law consists of the Physical Laws, such as the law of Gravity, but also the undergirding spiritual values as expressed in the New Testament.

Eric D. Butler wrote in "The Essential Christian Heritage":

"William Blake, the English poet and mystic grasped the necessity of any system of law being related as far as possible to reality when he said:

"One law for the lion and the lamb is oppression." Shakespeare also understood the issue. Justice as seen by Shylock demonstrates the unsuitability of the strict, rigid legal process to anything but a purely static situation. There can be a vast difference between the letter of the law and the spirit of the law, a difference which Christ attempted to demonstrate to the Pharisees of His day". It was in the 1950's that Geoffrey wrote of the 'one and two legged monstrosities' that were appearing in various publications as 'social credit'. Towards the end of his life (died suddenly in 1952) Douglas published *The Chart* specifically to counteract the tendency to disproportion in

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) the Social Credit Movement. That Chart was republished in *The Social Crediter* Saturday April 11, 1953 and is available on the League's website in the Library section. Geoffrey refers to The Chart as an "immensely massive and condensed statement. It is not permissible to alter it, but it will often be necessary to abstract from it, and to consider special cases in its application to current situations..."

Now well into the 21st century, much of Christianity has made Jesus into a denominational saviour figure, but Fr. Richard Rohr, a Franciscan priest of the New Mexico Province has insisted Christians must look deeper into the matter. He asks: "How far back and forward in time does the Christ figure extend, and who exactly is Christ?" and proceeds to provide answers:

"Christian scripture, in fact, gives us (Jesus) Christ's place in that history -- in the prologue to John's Gospel, for example, or in the Pauline hymns of the letters to the Colossians and Ephesians, or in the opening of John's first letter. All speak of Christ existing from all eternity. We just don't see those references. They've never been unpacked for the majority of Christians, and we don't have theology to know how to see it. Christ is not Jesus' last name. The book of Acts says God has raised up Jesus and anointed him as the Christ." The Gospels are about Jesus the Man and His time slot in history. "... Paul, however, whose writings make up a third of the New Testament, never talks about (the historical) Jesus. He is talking about the Christ. Jesus is the microcosm; Christ is the macrocosm..."

The Athanasian Creed spells it out clearly:

"... The Father is made of none: neither created nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone; not made, nor created, but begotten. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son; neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding..."

The work of Dorothy L. Sayers in "The Mind of the Maker" was of tremendous help to me as I tried to 'get my mind around' the concept of the Trinity. After all, we are cautioned in that Creed to "neither confound the Persons, nor divide the Substance". As a professional writer she explained the importance of a trinitarian balance in her work and that of the characters in the story.

"In art, the trinity is expressed in 1. the creative **Idea** – the **Imagining** of the work. 2. the creative **Energy** – the making **Incarnate** of the work. 3. the creative **Power** – the **Meaning** of the work."

SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS IN RELATION TO MENTAL HEALTH

At least one group is twigging to the fact that

social institutions must be studied in relation to the mental health of the individual person. David Morgan, consultant psychotherapist, psychoanalyst with the British Psychoanalytic Society writes about a book edited by Roderick Tweedy ("God of the Left Hemisphere" fame):

"Tweedy has edited an excellent book that brings together some of the best analysts and academics who are integrating the profound insights of psychoanalysis with the social and economic malaise of our times." Morgan continues, "We can no longer aim to treat the individual alone when the social fabric they are living in requires our attention..."

The 'blurb' for "The Political Self" reads:

"This book explores how our social and economic contexts profoundly affect our mental health and wellbeing, and how modern neuroscientific and psychodynamic research can both contribute to and enrich our understanding of these wider discussions. It therefore looks both inside and outside - indeed one of the main themes of The Political Self is that the conceptually discrete categories of 'inner' and 'outer' in reality constantly interact, shape, and inform each other. Severing these two worlds, it suggests, has led both to a devitalised and dissociated form of politics, and to a disengaged and disempowering form of therapy and analysis."

This is a matter Social Credit was concerned about 100 years ago, i.e., "the science of social adjustment". An excellent little book on the subject is Michael Lane's *Human Ecology & Social Credit: the Legacy of Tom Robertson*, available from Heritage Books.

Robertson wrote: "No section of the organised Church has grasped the vital fact that men's mutual relations are no longer direct and personal, but are conditioned by the interposition of social mechanisms and therefore all, even Christians, automatically serve the ends towards which these mechanisms operate, no matter whether these ends are known or otherwise, and no matter what the moral or spiritual status of those who use them... "The majority of the clergy... state that human conduct cannot be changed without first changing human nature, or, as it is often put, changing men's hearts. A corollary of this view, which is very important, holds that there is nothing wrong with our social mechanisms and that if men were only good enough, these mechanisms would work perfectly. The whole of this book is based on the thesis that it would not matter how good men were, the money, political, or any other existing social mechanisms, would in the long run achieve the same results as they achieve now."

Now we must get the organised Church to grasp that fact!

Can you not see the potential for Freedom? ***

Thus far, we have looked at the whats and the whys of the financial domination of liberal democracy. It is now time that we turn to a more detailed examination of the hows.

Let us begin with the general observation that, in a society operating under the Monopoly of Credit, organized political activity, like most other activities, is largely dependent – directly or indirectly – on Finance. Money, both in the form of producer credit and in the form of income, is maintained in a state of artificial scarcity, and Finance will naturally be inclined to ration it to those who do its will and to punish those who resist by denying them access to the life-giving credit. Credit, in turn, is a necessary means for obtaining most of the material and human resources required for political action.¹ In this way, Finance can condition political activity to the point of completely controlling it.

The first objective which Finance must secure in attempting to impose its own policy on political association is the capturing of the coercive power of the state by obtaining control of the governmental system. The general method applied in pursuit of this aim is to employ financial power to so shape the environment in which the standard mechanisms of conventional democracy must operate that the latter will serve – more or less automatically – to deliver the sort of control which is desired by High Finance.

The financial induction of the right sort of political environment is typically achieved through the use of a pincer movement consisting in the application of pressure (*via* a system of rewards and punishments) to those groups and individuals who are formal components of the political system, such as governments, politicians, political parties, etc., and secondly, in an application of pressure (*via* various techniques of manipulation) on the voting public. The right sort of pressure from above combined with the right sort of pressure from below can, if adroitly managed, force a political association to deliver (*de facto* if not *de jure*) control of its governmental system to financial interests. In this way, increasing power over the governmental system eventually equates to control over the coercive power of the state.

Pressure from Above - Control of the Formal Components of Political Organization

The Control of Governments

Under the present financial regime, governments are dependent on Finance in order to bridge any gap which might occur between expenditures and tax revenues. Indeed, government contracted debt-money expended on public services, public works, wars, etc., is one of the chief ways by means of which the macroeconomic

gap between consumer prices and consumer purchasing power can be filled and some semblance of economic equilibrium maintained. The provision of this service to an economy over many years means that governments at all levels are typically heavily indebted.

In keeping with the axiom ‘the borrower is the servant of the lender’, the first thing that must be realized in dealing with the relationship existing between governments in conventional democracies and the money power is that governments operate from a position of profound weakness *vis-à-vis* Finance and, without the full support of an awakened electorate, are not in a position to adopt policies which are authentically socially progressive in place of their anti-social alternatives:

“As no government can carry on for a month without money, it is not necessary to labour the point that the visible government of a country is obliged to take its orders and to shape its policy, and particularly its financial policy, in accordance with the dealers in this indispensable implement, so long as they hold a practical monopoly of it.”²

Political possibilities are narrowly limited by financial exigencies (both structural and political). Any government which decided to work against the financial powers would, unless a change in the financial system itself could be enforced, be rendered impotent by Finance’s power over the purse:

“Two or three great groups of banks and issuing houses controlled by men, in many cases alien, and even anti-British alien, by birth and tradition, international in their interests and quite definitely anti-public in their policy, not elected and not subject to dismissal, able to set at naught the plans of governments; producing nothing, and yet controlling all production.”³

The power of Finance to thwart independently-minded governmental action was demonstrated most clearly in the case of William Aberhart’s Social Credit government which had been elected in the Canadian province of Alberta and which, under Aberhart’s leadership, had held power from 1935-1943. Every attempt to introduce some aspect of the Social Credit reforms (even those which did not obviously fall afoul of the parameters of federal vs. provincial jurisdictions as laid out in the BNA act) was prevented by the Lieutenant-Governor of the province, and/or the Federal Government in Ottawa, and/or the privy Council, and/or the Supreme Court of Canada, and/or the Imperial Government in London.

The Control of Political Parties and Politicians

To make matters worse, it is also true that, in order to get elected in our modern,

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

media-driven world, a political party or politician must have access directly to huge sums of money for the purposes of running their campaigns. Naturally, Finance uses the power of money, directly through the banks or indirectly through corporate donors, to ensure that political parties will (in exchange for financial support) pursue its interests. By backing all of the horses in the race, so-to-speak, Finance can guarantee that no matter which party is elected, financial interests will always come out ahead:

“Finance has, as usual, and by the simple method of supplying the campaign funds of all the political parties impartially, managed to make its own views prevail, ...”⁴

The same observation can be made *mutatis mutandis* with respect to individual politicians. It is a common complaint amongst the populations of ‘democratic’ countries that politicians cannot be trusted because they are, for example, forever breaking their election promises. The pervasiveness and tenaciousness of this lament raises a set of interesting questions:

“Is there some essential reason which makes it impossible to conduct the affairs of any country honestly? By honestly, I mean with a continuous endeavour to take such action as will realise a plainly set-forth objective, such objective being one which the public would itself accept as desirable, if it thoroughly understood it. And if the answer is in the affirmative, as I think it is, is there any process operative to produce a particular type of statesmen willing to conduct the affairs of the nation dishonestly?”⁵

The answer to these queries is that, under the influence of Finance, the politicians who are electable (i.e., have sufficient money to run a campaign) are almost invariably career politicians who are essentially interested in furthering their own interests at the expense of the common good.⁶ They have (quite literally) been bought and paid for and thus function as agents of the money power. This is the explanation for the general and perplexing tendency of politicians to abandon the interests of those with whom they might be expected to have some sort of natural solidarity (i.e., people of the same class, religion, race, and indeed even nationality) in favour of a solidarity based on financial interests. Persons of character and integrity who are genuinely concerned for the commonweal will not be backed by Finance and so are unlikely to achieve electoral success:

“There is nowadays no such thing as an independent ‘statesmen’. No politician can hope to attain high office except by permission of Finance; and the corruption and jobbery in high places, although only a symptom of a defective system, are almost becoming a disease fatal in itself.”⁷

By testing politicians over long periods of time with lesser positions, Finance can also carefully vet all prospective candidates where the most important offices of the land are concerned, such that, in line with what occurs amongst the main political parties, all or almost all of the choices which are made available to the electorate have already been pre-approved by the financial interests.

“... the financial system, as such, provides an effective sieve for the purpose of assuring that no individual comes into a position of considerable power, without having given, for a considerable portion of his lifetime, satisfactory evidence that he will behave in accordance with the principles which are paramount in the world to-day.”⁸

The most important of ‘the principles which are paramount in the world to-day’ is of course the political centralization of effective sovereignty in the hands of the financial oligarchy:

“... we are witnessing a gigantic attempt, directed from sources which have no geographical nationality, to dispossess a defective democracy, and to substitute a dictatorship of Finance for it. I do not think public men necessarily agree with this, but I don’t think they struggle very hard against it. They would not become public men if they did.”⁹

Sometimes this vetting of prospective holders of political offices of public offices can take more sinister forms:

“It is, of course, well known that every effort is made to prevent the rise to political power of individuals who cannot be blackmailed in some form or other.”¹⁰

Combine all of these background realities with the standard governmental democratic mechanisms and it becomes clear that not only are those mechanisms ineffective for the purpose of operating a real or effective democracy, they are actually, in practice, the very tools by means of which Finance can impose its policy-objectives on political associations in the so-called ‘democratic world’:

“We are far too prone to imagine in Great Britain that it is only necessary to have a majority of opinion in favour of a certain line of action, and that when this is achieved we have ready to our hand a Parliamentary machine waiting to translate this opinion into effective operation. It is more than doubtful if this is the case. We have far less freedom in the choice of our Parliamentary representative than we think we have; still less freedom as to the issues on which we elect them; and least of all have we the ability to ensure that when they get to Westminster their attention shall be devoted to dealing with those problems which we consider vital.”¹¹

(continued next page)

Pressure from Below

The second half of Finance's tactics for controlling political activity is to make the common people willing co-operators in their own subjugation. Happy slaves (especially if they are not even aware of their slavery) are so much easier to manage in comparison with discontented ones. Indeed, it is astonishing how many

“... of the injurious and tyrannical practices ... obtain support in Great Britain and America under the cloak of such words as Justice and Democracy, ...”¹²

If ‘happiness’, i.e., bread and circuses, is beyond the capacity of the financial oligarchy to deliver to the world's population as a whole (due to the various artificial scarcities upon which their system of domination relies), or if such entertainments are ineffective for neutralizing a certain segment of the population, Finance may settle with the induction of a deep-seated apathy.¹³ Getting the people living under conventional democracies to eagerly support – or at least acquiesce to – the sorts of policy-objectives that financially controlled governments wish to impose on the population boils down to controlling what the public thinks and believes about the nature of the world in which we live insofar as the particular ‘philosophy’ or conception of reality which the public may adopt has a bearing on matters of political importance. Alongside the public's perception of policies and/or methods, it is often necessary to mould the public's perception of politicians and political parties.¹⁴

In other words, inducing the right sort of pressure from below requires controlling and determining *public opinion*.¹⁵ “... [T]he exploitation of a public opinion which ... is frequently manufactured for interested purposes, ...”¹⁶ leaves the way open to the most clever form of dictatorship: policies can be imposed against the objective well-being of the population but with the public's consent or at least acquiescence. If the people asked for, supported, or at least passively accepted such nefarious policies because their whole thinking had been conditioned without their knowing it, the illusion of free choice, of ‘democracy’, can be simultaneously preserved and the stability of the system assured. Should the public at large ever awaken to the reality of what is being done to them, no amount of financial manipulation of governments, political parties, or politicians, would ever be effective in maintaining Finance's hegemony over the coercive power of the state. The manufacturing of public opinion is a necessary condition, therefore, for the retention of Finance's power over government ... until that power has been made complete.

The suitable regulation of public opinion requires control over the information to which the public is exposed. Control of information requires, in turn, control

of the means of communication.¹⁷ The mass media, the entertainment industry, and the educational centres of a nation represent the chief sources of information on the basis of which the public might form a worldview. All of these are dependent in one way or another, for their continued operation, let alone their expansion and development, on the co-operation of the financial interests:

“It is claimed, and more particularly by those who utilise it, that ‘public opinion’ is the decisive power in public affairs. Assuming that in some sense this may be true, it becomes of interest to consider the nature of this public opinion and the basis from which it proceeds, and it will be agreed that the chief factors are education and propaganda. Now, the bearing of economic power on education hardly requires emphasis. In England, the Public School tradition, with all its admirable features, is nevertheless an open and unashamed claim to special privilege based on purchasing power and nothing else; ...

But by far the most important instrument used in the moulding of public opinion is that of organised propaganda either through the Public Press, the orator, the picture, moving or otherwise, or the making of speeches; and in all these the mobilising capacity of economic power is without doubt immensely if not preponderatingly important.

When it is considered that the expression of opinion inimical to ‘vested interests’ has in the majority of cases to be done at the cost of financial loss and in the face of tremendous difficulty, while a platform can always be found or provided for advocates of an extension of economic privilege, the fundamental necessity of dealing first with the economic basis of society must surely be, and in fact now is, recognised, and this having been established in conformity with a considered policy the powers of education and propaganda will be free from the improper influences which operate to distort their immense capacity for good.”¹⁸

Naturally, Finance will favour those institutions and agencies which disseminate the sort of information which is useful in promoting finance's own interests – political or otherwise – and will punish, through the withdrawal or refusal of funding, those institutions and agencies which disseminate information which is deemed a threat to those interests. To take just one prominent example, it is not possible for the corporate media to consistently and correctly reveal the true nature of economic difficulties in the modern world without ‘biting the hand which feeds it’

“Unfortunately, the means of enlightening the general public as to the real cause of these [economic – OH] difficulties,

(continued next page)

(continued from previous page) by which I refer to the public Press, organised speechmaking, and broadcasting organisations and mass publicity in general, are all dependent for their existence on financial support. Consequently, to put it quite bluntly, they dare not indicate the cause of the trouble.”¹⁹

As a result of this sort of situation, the conventional means of social communication cannot serve the politically independent role which an authentic democracy demands from them:

“The control of publicity renders it easy to circumscribe the reputation of the unorthodox. Modern organised publicity in its various forms is a product of costly machinery and is controlled by financial mechanism, so that, in general, any information circulated through such agencies is orthodox, while any authority recognised and advertised is a witness for the defence of things as they are, or as those at present in control of finance would desire them to be. It is therefore perhaps not astonishing that public opinion is in much the stage of economic enlightenment that we should expect as the result of the suppression and distortion of the essential facts.”²⁰

Let it be emphasized that the control of information achieved by the financial control of the means of communication does not simply result in the general public adopting one world-view in lieu of another (as if all world-views were of equal worth), but rather, given the fact that the overriding political policy-objective of finance is at odds with the objective nature of reality, it results in the public adopting a world-view which is composed of half-truths and outright lies. People must come to believe in a *Weltanschauung* that is substantially false, i.e., distorted, if they are to give their support to a false and fatal political policy-objective. Hence we are bombarded daily with “... the distortion and suppression of facts by the Financial Hierarchy ...”²¹ Douglas described the resulting political arrangement as “... a system of world organisation ... based on the deception of the general public, ...”²² Under such a system it is inevitable that “... the primary object of politics, industry, trade, advertising, and journalism, is to sell delusion; ...”²³

In other words, if by your domination of the means of communication, you can endlessly repeat over and over again one viewpoint as though it were self-evident, or continually present one frame of reference for debating a particular issue or set of issues as if it were the only one conceivable, you can control what people perceive as the ‘public opinion’, i.e., what everybody knows and believes to be true. Given the well-known psychological tendency of people to ‘go along with the group’, the mere perception that the public consensus consists, for example, in x, y, and z, very quickly turns that

perception into a reality. Combine this with the standard ‘democratic’ mechanisms and you can either prevent any dissent from ever arising, squelch it as soon as it shows signs of becoming threatening, or else so contextualize debate that any dissent which does arise will only be channelled into profitless directions:

“A democracy of a thousand voters can be personally approached and convinced on any subject within a reasonable period of time, but if you enlarge the franchise to include everyone over twenty-one in a population of 45,000,000 you can be reasonably sure that any general conclusion at which it will arrive, it will arrive at twenty-five years after that conclusion ceases to be true. If you can super-impose upon that by means of a controlled Press, Broadcasting, and other devices of a similar nature, something that you call ‘public opinion’ (because it is the only opinion which is articulate) you have a perfect mechanism for a continuous dictatorship, and moreover, it is the form of dictatorship which is fundamentally desired by the collectivist mentality – a dictatorship which has power without responsibility.”²⁴

In a similar vein, the tendency of the current governmental system to focus the attention of the electorate on purely technical methods when mingled with the power of Finance to fashion public opinion means that Finance is in a strong position to ensure that the technical means which are adopted by government are also those which will best serve its own anti-social policies:

“Most people of necessity, and especially in these days of mass propaganda, form their opinions at second hand, and a great deal of opinion formed in this way is purely passive. Little or no critical faculty is applied to it, but on occasion, it is regurgitated as though it had been formed as a result of personal experience. This is always true, but when the opinion refers to a complex or subtle problem, it is a mathematical certainty that what is registered is either a minority opinion popularised, or has no intrinsic value. Legislative action based on proposals submitted to a large electorate must, from the very nature of the case, place the population at the mercy of a trained bureaucracy, and if, as in the case of the British Civil Service, this is irremovable and, to the public irresponsible, the result is indistinguishable from a dictatorship of a most undesirable character.”²⁵

There are two specific areas in which the control of information in order to mould public opinion is incredibly important as far as the maintenance of the present political and governmental systems are concerned.

The first has already been touched on. The financial system uses its influence to control (continued next page)

(continued from previous page)

the information which the public is exposed to regarding the true nature and operation of the economic system as a whole and of the financial system in particular:

“Particularly in regard to finance, which may be termed the nerve system of distribution, most people hold, with some persistence, ideas which are both incorrect and misleading, and are supported in their disinclination to change these views by sectional interests of great potency and ability in the attainment of their own objects, which superficially seem well served by the prevailing ignorance.”²⁶

It must be more widely recognized, for example, that the bulk of economic and financial ‘experts’ are subject to a sort of conflict of interest. Their academic disciplines, insofar as they qualify as *bona fide* intellectual enterprises, require them to search for and faithfully represent the truth about economic and financial realities. The condition of their continued employment, however, often rests on their willingness to either suppress information which could threaten the interests of the financial classes or else to distort essential facts in order to attack anyone who wishes to shine a light on hidden realities:

“Finance, i.e., money, is the starting-point of every action which requires either the co-operation of the community or the use of its assets. If it be realised that control of its mechanism gives to a major extent, control of both personal and organised activity, it is easy to see that education, publicity, and organised Intelligence (in the sense in which the word ‘Intelligence’ is used in military circles) can be controlled, first to minimise the likelihood of criticism arising and should it arise, depriving it of all the normal facilities for effective action. ...

The results of this state of affairs can be seen somewhat sharply defined in the case of professional economists, necessarily in the direct or indirect employ of banks or insurance companies. It would, of course, be improper and probably unfair to attribute anything but intellectual honesty to these gentlemen. Moreover, such an assumption would deny due appreciation to the ability of their patrons. Their failure to make any noticeable contribution to the solution of the problems within their special field can, I think, be explained by the incompatibility of any effective solution with the credit monopoly which is at once their employer and critic.”²⁷

The power of Finance to either co-opt, or else manufacture, the financial and economic ‘experts’ is just one instance of a broader pattern. It is generally true that ‘experts’ in any field of human endeavour who might have something to say which could endanger financial interests can be co-opted or manufactured:

“... all the brains in the world which can be bought with money are at the disposal of the banking system.”²⁸

In spite of the seemingly impregnable position which finance would appear to be in, it is remarkable that many people continue to resist swallowing the official position on economic realities (and on a whole host of other issues) hook, line, and sinker:

“A powerful minority of the community, determined to maintain its position relative to the majority, assures the world that there is no alternative between a pyramid of power based on toil and ever-increasing monotony, and some form of famine and disaster; while a growing and ever more dissatisfied majority strives to throw off the hypnotic influence of training and to grapple with the fallacy which it feels must exist somewhere.”²⁹

This brings us to the second area in which control of public opinion happens to be extremely important: the maintenance and the intensification, if possible, of that belief, i.e., that faith, of the average individual in the reliability of his own political institutions. He must be persuaded that we do indeed live in authentically democratic countries and that any dissatisfaction which he experiences with the political process is inseparable from the human condition. He should, after all, be grateful that he is living under the best available system!

The best means to this particular end is to either popularize false ideas about democracy or to convince people that the true democracy is already embodied in their public institutions. It is as if referring to the system as ‘a democracy’, using the adjective ‘democratic’ to describe it, and then lauding its many magnificent advantages were somehow sufficient to make it a real and effective democracy:

“At the present time, we use words for political purposes which either have no meaning, or, if correctly defined, describe something which does not exist. We do this at our peril. Democracy is such a word.”³⁰

In reality, the forms of political participation and representation which a conventional ‘democracy’ operating under the Monopoly of Credit is able to provide to the citizenry are unnecessarily limited and what is permitted is all too often co-opted in one way or another. ***

Article including reference sources is available here: <https://www.socred.org/>

“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