

# Why Capitalism Doesn't Work

Sam Fryman © 2006

In the movie *Gentlemen Prefer Blondes*, 20<sup>th</sup> sex icon, lover of a president, and legendary glamour queen, Marilyn Monroe, tells us in song that *diamonds are a girl's best friend*.

Seeing as how her own life ended in tragedy, which the world still debates whether was suicide or murder, just like Princess Diana we observe, perhaps in her own case *she was right*.

But either way that is pretty much the belief system of our current world, the world of Hollywood, of the glamorous celebrities and their husbands and wives, and the business classes who long for “the good life” packed as it is with expensive flaunted jewellery, designer labels and fashion clothes.

This is the world that is being placed before us as the ideal, and on the throne of the capitalist world is this glamorous woman dripping in the diamonds who are her best friend, this woman who is on sale *for the right price* and hence a kind of modern “whore of Babylon.”

She is the figurehead on the prow of the capitalist ship of free enterprise, but in the galley the engine that drives her is propelled by armies of slaves rowing tirelessly to an ever faster and louder drum beat.

We have pointed out in our earlier work *What is Intelligence?* how the increasingly frantic, atonal and percussive nature of both modern pop, jazz and rock music, and modern (i.e. post 19<sup>th</sup> century) classical music has reflected the increasing tension, rampant sensuality and destructiveness in society as a whole, which view we are glad to have confirmed in the words of Plato:

*When the modes of music change, the walls of the city will crumble.*

So the capitalist world is a kind of unholy music, and the baton to this mostly bitter rather than sweet symphony, is the accelerating and pounding drum beat battered out as if by some kind of ugly giant Auk from *The Lord of the Rings*, forcing the already exhausted slaves to strain ever more and row faster upon their oars.

As we have so many times explained elsewhere in our various works, modern Western society is not the “free democracy” that is claimed, but is rather collectively a slave labour camp ruled over by *hypnotic force* that allows true freedom (materially speaking) only to a rich and celebrity elite, whom the rest of us are all encouraged to bow down to and worship.

By *hypnotic force* we mean *the power of suggestion*.

We mean, there is a famous psychological experiment in which a line of twenty people are all shown a *blue* object, and the first nineteen all report when asked that it is coloured *green*. But the first nineteen people in the line, unbeknownst to the twentieth person, have been told to *lie*, but nevertheless, invariably the 20<sup>th</sup> innocent person also reports that the blue object is *green*, simply under this peer pressure, this power of hypnosis, this constant *suggestion* that reality is not what he or she imagines, and that amazingly causes this innocent dupe to *disbelieve the evidence of his or her own senses* and accept the lie as if it were the truth.

We are all *hypnotised* to a greater or lesser extent to *accept the status quo*.

We are made to feel the unjust and mad rules of modern society that are placed upon us are set in stone like Moses' tablets, and are to be revered as if they all fell

under the jurisdiction of a concept such as in the original American Declaration of Independence:

*We hold these truths to be self-evident.*

But of course this original Declaration of Independence went on to say that the “self-evident truth” was that all men should have *the right to Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness*.

But what we find in practice, as George Orwell explained in his marvellous allegorical novel *Animal Farm* (which we would modestly wish to point out that we emulated and parodied in our earlier work *Feminal Farm*) is that in this “equal rights” for all, *some men (and women) are more equal than others*.

And why is this? Is this the natural state of affairs? Is this pyramid shaped society with Pharaohs and Emperors on the top cracking the whip upon all the slaves at the bottom what the author of this *Declaration of Independence* really had in mind?

The truth was that at the time of this Declaration of Independence, those fundamentally speaking *immigrants* who considered themselves “Americans” as opposed to British subjects, felt they were being usurped and dominated by a foreign power thousands of miles away, who wanted to see what they saw as *their nation* as merely a colony to be controlled and exploited.

So where is the difference between that empiricist colonial power, and the modern global capitalist multinational organisation that has its outposts aggressively invading every corner of the planet?

For like the colonial power, the common factor is that distant powers do not much care about the people they rule over.

If some multinational corporation whose owners and head office are in New York or London decides that their division in Rome, or Bombay, Tokyo or even now Shanghai or Moscow is not what they deem adequately profitable, they will not hesitate to close it down.

Thousands of people will lose their jobs overnight. Where they live – as opposed to one of these big cities – there may well be little or indeed *zero* alternative work.

They may once have been fishermen or farmers who could live off the land, but now they are only factory workers, and when the big bosses close their plant down and *the machine stops*, they are most likely instantly driven into poverty, and may be lucky to even survive.

Poverty then frequently causes strife between husband and wife. He isn't *Superman*, but his wife still believes he must somehow provide for her and their children, but the capitalist society has taken his power away. He is nothing unless they will reopen their factory, and let him punch his time-clock once again.

For the truth is, because of those who live by *greed*, he no longer can get what he *needs*.

As poet/lyricist Pete Sinfield put it in the famous King Crimson song *21<sup>st</sup> Century Schizoid Man*:

*He's got everything he wants  
BUT WHAT HE REALLY NEEDS,  
Twenty-first century schizoid man.*

We might stop and ask *what is capitalism?*

Let us quote the online encyclopaedia *Wikipedia* which gives as good a definition as any:

Capitalism generally refers to an economic system in which the means of production are mostly privately or corporately owned and operated for profit, in which investment is determined by private decision, and in which distribution, production and pricing of goods and services are determined in a largely free market.

So let us précis this paragraph and bring it down to its essence in one easily digestible and therefore significant line, just as we bring some mathematical or statistical result with numerous decimal places down to some shorter *significant figures* which register *meaning* in our brain.

Capitalism is the pursuit of *private interest* as opposed to *the public interest*.

Of course, most of the world's politicians have long been giving us a process of denial, of *hypnotic assertion* or *suggestion* which seeks to *deny* this essential fact and explanation, i.e. *capitalism is against the public interest*, it is "*the pursuit of life, liberty and happiness by the few at the expense of the many.*"

But *the truth remains*.

The rich and celebrities don't "work" as we do.

One almost laughs out loud to hear best selling authors, rock stars and movie actors talking of their "work."

That is, if they *really* create works of the calibre of Beethoven or Salvador Dali or Shakespeare or whoever, we will give them the credit as due, we will say that is *work*.

Anyone for example who has seen a concert by artists such as *Emerson, Lake and Palmer* which is of a fiendishly difficult technical nature, as well as creatively inspiring – particularly in their heyday – could not fail to call that "work", as one would regard the work of a highly trained classical musician such as violinist Nigel Kennedy or whoever.

Those guys and girls who play in concert orchestras do a whole lot of suffering and "hard work" to keep their standards up so high, so we wouldn't say they are working any less hard than the man who digs the roads or lays the bricks, though obviously in a different, more cerebral rather than physical way.

But we are just asking the question – why do *any* of us have to work that hard? Why do we have to accept even the 9 to 5, knowing that most people are now being forced to do much more than that, responding to this ever increasing drumbeat as we have mentioned.

Most of us are now familiar with the concept of *divide and conquer*.

And once again that is what the slave masters of the world now employ, no longer being able to simply crack a physical whip as the original pyramid builders in the times of Moses and so on used to do.

We are made to *compete* against each other, as a means to get us to work harder. We are encouraged to egotistically battle with our fellow man and woman to get one up on them, we are made to be gladiators in the arenas of modern business and even governmental administration.

Every work place we go, there are *deadlines and targets*.

A skilled tradesman wants to do a good job. He wants his work to be a thing of beauty, done with precision, finished to a high standard of quality of which he can be proud.

He wants to work *slowly* and carefully, taking his time to do a good job.

But the modern competitive capitalist world cannot tolerate that.

It says – there is a *deadline*. We have a *target*. That work must be done *yesterday* as they like to say. And we must have done one hundred more such jobs by the coming Friday.

And if we want to do the job properly and therefore *more slowly*, they say speed up and synchronize to this drumbeat, or *you are out, you are sacked*. And next week they are going to increase the drum tempo a few beats more.

And then they send their workers off to their clients, and the workers have tense faces, repressing their inner anger that they are being forced to work so much faster and harder than they feel comfortable with, than feels natural to them, and then they cut corners and they make mistakes.

Then the customer barks angrily at the supplier of the labourer upon the telephone, and says “This worker you have sent me is no good. He does not do his job properly, he is incompetent.”

And then the slave master says: “Do not worry, please do not give up on us and take your business elsewhere. Rest assured I will crack the whip harder. I will make him work harder and make up for his deficiencies.”

And after the poor overburdened worker has done what he is told, in fear of losing his job and his wife turning against him, denying him sex and throwing him out of the home as “useless”, as “a failure”, in his awful anxiety and exhaustion he goes and drowns his sorrows in the bar, or becomes a gambling addict or commits adultery or whatever.

People do what they do – good and bad – because it's all *cause and effect*. It's simply how the world is organised, what people are made to believe is the right thing to do.

Society place massive stresses and burdens on people, and then the effect is they crack up, they do crazy things.

And that is what the average citizen is now being driven to. And hence they do crazy things.

Capitalism is a house divided against itself which must sooner or later fall.

It thinks only of the short term.

For example, most of us are now subjected to abusive tactics in order to be sold various things. After being shoved around or harassed all week by our managers, customers, clients or even patients in the case of the medical services, in our evenings and weekends we are involuntarily subjected to some cheeky, disrespectful person phoning us up unrequested, thus illegitimately invading our private space, and trying to sell us a new holiday, or double-glazing or god knows what else.

This is also a direct consequence of capitalism. To make his or her living, this *capitalist stalker* accosts us in the street and even pursues us to our own home, and because what they try to sell us we either don't want or even need, they have to bully us into buying, they have to try to leave us no peace until we surrender and say “yes” to rid ourselves of them. Of course, that doesn't mean they go away. On the contrary, if we *ever* give in, we will be placed on a list of “known mugs” and passed on to the next bullying, disrespectful and intrusive salesperson.

Then there is the effect of all this on our *relationships*. The aggressive and manipulative salesman or woman thinks they can be tough and deceptive and tread on moral principles all day long in order to win in the business game, but then naively imagines they can be the kind and caring person who will be a success in human relationships.

But it's a fallacy. When we give up our principles in the daytime, in our relationships with the wider world, we have lost our integrity, we have become animalistic beasts rather than *civilised sensitive human beings*, and our potential partners and lovers see that, and the only person who will accept us is someone who is equally or even *more* corrupt and abusive, and therefore in the final analysis will cheat, mistreat and be disloyal to us, which is the reality that countless men and women are now experiencing in their partners.

Capitalism is therefore *fundamentally abusive*.

This man or woman may not *want* to harass us, but he or she is given no choice, by having it appears no other way to get the money they need to satisfy their needs.

Likewise in the UK now, British chancellor – i.e. he who is in charge of the *taxes and purse strings* – and likely to be the next prime minister, Gordon Brown, is “going green”, getting all concerned about “saving the planet” and “environmental issues.”

But nobody with a mind of their own thinks that this is anything more than another opportunity to *raise taxes*, to *fill the government coffers*, so this is yet more disrespect and deception of the public, yet more *abuse*.

Gordon Brown is imposing “green taxes”, using road tolls and taxes on air travel and all the rest, which in the final analysis are just more taxes on the slaves, the poor. It costs £8 flat fee (i.e. currently around \$16 US) *every trip* just to be *allowed* to drive your car in Central London now.

As usual, the wealthy just pay it without a thought, while the other hard pressed “equality enjoying citizens” living on the edges of their finances are driven out of the city centre and must leave their cars at home, and use the typically dirty, socially dubious, sometimes dangerous (e.g. sex perverts, thieves, attacks by hooligans) and unreliable buses or trams to enter the city, or even go on foot.

And this man has got the nerve to call himself a *socialist*.

The only real “green” or “planet-saving” policy is to *declare war on capitalism*, to declare war upon those *few* who have declared war upon and enslaved so many.

All we have in our modern Western world is the Roman empire in disguise, i.e. disguised as *democracy*.

But we are brought up from birth with the lies that we are free people, that we elect the government, but as we have pointed out in our earlier works the *party political system* is itself the antithesis of democracy, by creating an *us and them* of Labour and Conservatives or Democrats and Republicans or whatever badges we want to put upon the *eternally opposing* parties.

But then of course, if you say you are “anti-capitalist”, the assumption is that you are a “communist” or a “liberal socialist” or whatever, and of course once again, the forces of hypnotic propaganda are busy demonising these groups, our point being that *neither* the “conservatives” *nor* the “liberals” are right about *everything*, they are both right about *some things*, but *not others*.

Talk show host “guru” Roy Masters categorises the basic principles of government in our society as fundamentally *female* or *male* in character in the form of at the extremes either *socialist liberalism* or *fascism*.

The *fascist* is an over-the-top typically *male* disciplinarian who seeks *order* at all costs, even if it means a few public floggings and hangings and round up and extermination of dissidents and so on, who likely corresponds to the *Emperor Crassus* figure played by Laurence Olivier in the *Spartacus* movie.

The *socialist/liberal* in theory supports freedom, and we would say that *true* socialism would *theoretically* be the ideal.

Our problem with that is we don't believe that secular socialism or "communism" can ever be free of corruption, as we have seen in the long established communist states, which end up being arguably far more authoritarian and tyrannical than the so called "fascist" ones, as in Stalin's Russia, and Communist China.

The rulers of society have to be motivated by a noble ideal, and though those who claim socialism itself provides such an ideal, we see *in practice* that like the above mentioned Gordon Brown, current chancellor of England, and more widely the whole British "New Labour" party which has had scandal after scandal in it, and has currently the British prime minister Tony Blair as potentially on criminal charges of corruption for accepting illegal contributions for honours, the so called "socialists" appear to sell out to big business and corruption, despite their *claim* to high ideals.

The New Labour government have also proven themselves as much war hungry and enthusiastic as any previous Conservative government – their "sworn enemies" – has ever been, and indeed far more draconian in imposing all kinds of surveillance and restriction of individual freedoms.

One of their chief current proposals under the excuse of the threat of terrorism and out of control illegal immigration is the introduction of a massively expensive and intrusive identity card scheme, which would put biometric data of all British citizens onto a national database, effectively giving all citizens the status of potential criminals under permanent surveillance.

Under such a scheme any number of likely dubious and publicly unaccountable officials somewhere would be able to track our every movement by satellite surveillance and all our purchases in shops and so on.

But as usual, few of the slaves are showing much signs of rebelling, as Peter Gabriel, formerly of the rock group Genesis put it in the fine song *Firth of Fifth*:

*The sheep remain inside the pen  
Though many times they've seen (i.e. been shown) the way to leave.*

And who is it who will liberate the slaves? Who is the "shepherd" who will lead the flock away?

So it is the *socialist or revolutionary* we are told. But what happened in the Russian and Chinese revolutions?

We don't see that the people really got *freedom*.

For example, though we have difficulty understanding why, communists and socialists are not very favourable to *freedom of religious* expression, i.e. that is the freedom to *believe in a cosmic intelligence* or *not so*, whatever one chooses.

(our best guess is that serving *God* and *the state* could create a conflict of loyalties in the individual *comrade or sister* that the state doesn't want; as usual, it wants *obedience* from rather than *freedom* for its citizens)

And surely, that must be *the ultimate* freedom.

For what greater questions are there than *what are we*, and *are we more than just the human body*?

Do we have a "soul", a "spiritual life"?

Because if we don't, what's the point of it all? To pursue "life, liberty and happiness?"

Just what kind of a *fool* can be "happy" when he knows by the overwhelming evidence of the ages and the cemeteries full of the dead, that he can be "cut down like a flower" at any time?

How can a man *imprisoned* by his body, by his decaying and vulnerable flesh, who can be victim to a thousand maladies and ailments and killer diseases, and car crashes putting him into a wheel chair, or in some countries get some infection or parasite that can cause blindness, or even be careless swimming in the ocean and get eaten by a shark, or blown to pieces by a terrorist bomb, or stabbed to death by a desperate drug addict, *ever* consider him or herself free?

If that were not enough, we are imprisoned by a thousand *desires*.

Man is largely the slave of woman, as he is mostly controlled by the sex desire. He is led around by it all his life, just as an ox is yoked to a heavy wagon and driven on by the lash, and this “freedom loving” government does everything in its power – licensing hypnotic woman worshipping TV and pornography, approving women to behave and dress in a scandalously teasing way in public, and legalising and endorsing (e.g. via so called school “sex education”) unbridled extra-marital sex – to see that he is equally enslaved and never breaks free.

Woman is largely the slave of her insecurities and her vanity. There is no *God* to take refuge in any more, as women of past generations placed their trust in and surrendered themselves to, so now she has only her typically equally enslaving career, neglected children and crazy friends to take her refuge in, and is even being encouraged to believe that all that is missing in her life and thus the cause of her insecurities and anxieties is “great sex.”

The greatest hypnotic force is regarding this denial of death, and consequent failure to deal with the religious or “spiritual” or even philosophical question of *the meaning of life*.

Has life got any meaning?

Nobody answers that *truly* for a woman.

They say, the meaning is *your children, your career, your status* in your peer group, the loyalty and entertainment value of *your friends*.

We recently mentioned a British TV reality series set in the Australian outback in which a group of celebrities had to live on bare rations of rice and beans and could only win extra rations of food by successfully completing various mostly unpleasant and difficult challenges, such as jumping out of a plane and parachuting down onto a target, or eating some disgusting jungle slugs and bugs without throwing them back up, which must really be very difficult indeed if one is not at the literal point of starvation.

And these typically wealthy or in some cases actually rich celebrities were seen to be almost grovellingly grateful at the receipt of a biscuit or a cup of tea or a small piece of cake, whilst in their normal everyday lives some of them even had servants who would clean their shoes and in one case even brush their teeth.

Thus likewise are *the rest of us* hypnotised into *undue gratitude* and subservience, given slogans like “Get that job!”, and when we get it, we are supposed to punch our fist in the air and cry out “Yes!” as if this minimally less subservient position on the ladder of “success” was something to celebrate, rather than the reality of it being a compulsory ticket to imprisonment in a marginally better class of slavery.

Not that we are saying people shouldn't work for a living, we are just disputing *the hours, the pay, the terms and conditions*, because work does need doing in society for everyone's benefit, and we all must surely do our fair share of such *necessary work*.

We might also ask why these celebrities agreed to live in this underprivileged state, but the answer would appear to be, that even though in most cases they were still at least relatively wealthy, to a man or woman who has once been famous, to lose that

limelight is almost as bad as death, as like Princess Diana, it has become the source of their identity, of their sense of self-worth.

And here too we have a lesson, in that this capitalist society is driven on that. It is driven by insecure people who derive their sense of identity only from their status, which is largely dependent on what they have got.

They *must* satisfy their desires, they *must* have that new or bigger car or gadget, or that more luxurious home, or better job, or they don't feel right about themselves.

And so our society is dominated by these ambitious greedy insecure people who are dominated mentally by *wants* rather than *needs*.

They want a mansion with fifty rooms, in which some rich people – apart from their servants – actually live in entirely alone, while someplace else in the same country or world some poor person has ten children in a one or two roomed shack.

Well, perhaps the latter kind of people should get some birth control aids, the rich man or woman might say.

Well perhaps they should, but that's still no excuse for such a shameless uneven distribution of resources and wealth.

I *need* my thousand acres of land and my servants, for I am *a man or woman of quality*, the rich person says.

And we ask *why, why* do you need to have all those things that others cannot logistically speaking ever have, and haven't got?

And they can't answer, but the real answer is the coldness, the hate in their eyes.

In England lately there has been a big scandal. Many thousands of parents, mostly poor or working class mothers invested their money in a Christmas savings scheme which would have provided presents for their children on Christ's "official birthday."

But somehow this company went bust, and has left them all cheated out of presents for their children.

But the big boss – this modern day *Mr Scrooge* – who ran this company was tracked down by reporters to a five star hotel in Argentina where he has fled to, but refused to say a word in his defence, he said the matter was in the hands of accountants and lawyers, and he had nothing to say, and in particular despite the repeated urgings of the reporters, he refused to say the word "*sorry*", which of course could have been interpreted as an admission of guilt and responsibility, but would not have been, had he chosen his words carefully, and shown a little *humanity*, whether he was ultimately "the villain" of this piece of not, which is our suspicion.

But as we have said, he did "say" *something*, with this cold, uncaring look in his eye, the same look in the eye of the rich man or woman in the mansion, who keeps all the "riff raff" and "unwashed masses" of the world at bay, outside the exclusive grounds of his or her ivory tower.

The governments of the world have tried to sell us this concept of "caring capitalism", but where is the evidence that capitalism – i.e. the big bosses, the slave masters and slave mistresses (remembering that there are now a growing number of *women* billionaires in the world) – really care?

For example, last year in England, an oil plant blew up in a populated area, creating the largest fire in Europe since World War Two, and disrupted the lives and partially destroyed the home of several hundreds of local residents.

Whatever the cause of the blast, clearly the oil company had to be held responsible, but not one penny of compensation has been forthcoming *one year later*, whereas when the chancellor Mr Brown raises taxes on petrol, the cost of petrol goes up *at the stroke of midnight on the very same day* he announces the price rise.

So where is this "caring capitalism" we have heard so much about?



It is just another hypnotic suggestion and fantasy to keep us all subservient, obedient and enslaved, so that “business as usual” can proceed.

So the gutless, spineless cowards whom we put into government with our “democratic free elections” bow down and worship before big business.

The trouble with modern politicians is at least partly that they themselves – the leaders certainly – become *celebrities*, and then they are understandably only too anxious to ally themselves with *the elite*.

They take bribes or favours of one kind or another, even if it's only invitations to dinner or to spend some time on some big shot's ranch, or yacht, or travel on his or her private jet, which can all be written off to some legitimate political excuse or circumstance, e.g. the politician is “developing trade links with business leaders.”

There are all kinds of ways that the rich can give these political puppets privileges and benefits the rest of us don't have.

For instance, how do we know that the male political leaders are not supplied women or whatever for their sexual purposes at wild parties and so on that we don't hear about, and then maybe they are for the rest of their political career in a compromised position of potential blackmail victims if they don't do what the big business people want?

Then within business itself are endless campaigns of dirty tricks when all the different firms are all competing for the same business and contracts.

For example, suppose two firms, let's call them Goodco and Badco both are seeking the same contract for a government project.

Goodco says we will do you a fine job, we will keep all our promises, it will take six months to complete, and it will cost \$200m. And then Badco says we will do you a great job, it will take 3 months to complete and will cost \$150m, and not only that, here is the key to a safety deposit box and inside you will find \$100,000 in untraceable small denomination bills.

Who do we think is going to get the contract with or without the bribe?

But when Badco gets the job, it turns out it takes 12 months to complete, and costs \$300m (these kinds of variations from *promises* are typical with large public works) but because they have got the potential blackmail against the official due to the bribe, that official does everything in his power to back *the bad deal*.

Even in terms of the guy who comes to our door and says he will fit us some new windows or build us a conservatory or whatever, frequently there is little reality in the promises he makes, he wants to tell us what a great, quick, cheap job he is going to do for us, and then somehow as work gets underway, things don't turn out as planned, and somehow there is always some problem he didn't expect that is going to make his job more difficult and therefore *cost us more*.

This is the inevitable outcome of capitalism, of *competition*, because when people feel insecure and threatened, like those who fear they won't pass their exams, they are tempted to *cheat*.

In the amusing and genuinely educational real life based movie *Catch Me If You Can*, Leonardo di Caprio showed us how a fairly ordinary man with extraordinary cheek and perseverance conned his way into taking on the roles of teacher, doctor and even airline pilot without any qualifications or prior training whatsoever, and also defrauded the banks out of huge sums of money by deciphering and defeating their security and anti-fraud systems.

This is what happens when you have an *every man for himself* society, for we actually saw what caused this real life guy to turn to con artistry in the first place, and it was *disrespect*, it was *bullying*.

i.e. it was what we are all made to believe is the way to live in the capitalist competitive society, to *get one over on the next guy or girl*.

Without retracing and recovering old ground too much we should also point out that the *vested interests* of big business are contrary to the best interests of the environment, savagely or negligently polluting and destroying it when deemed necessary, as in the needless domination of the oil industry, that is suppressing so many alternatives, for example *the electric powered car*, and the wastefulness of competitive national and international trade in general, such that products and people are needlessly sent across countries and continents when that product or person could just as easily be produced or provided locally or nationally in so many cases.

So let us have no doubt about it – capitalism is a selfish, divisive force against the public interest, hell bent against the natural environment which we all need to be healthy and survive, and favouring only the few at the expense of the many.

So what is the alternative?

Well, we aren't going to get into “-isms”, such as *socialism, communism*, and so on, because we aren't so sure of any particular “creed” in terms of its *detail*, which no doubt is a source of unending and likely fruitless debate amongst “Marxists” and “socialists” themselves, as we have seen in the case of the British New Labour party, which is continually warring inside itself about such ideas, though most dissent and debate has been effectively suppressed throughout Tony Blair's now long leadership.

We need a society and means of trade based on *cooperation*, not *competition*, and upon *need* and not *greed*.

Upon what is really *needed* in this world, and it's not a Rolls Royce, a 200 foot private yacht or a personal collection of three thousand pairs of womens' fashion shoes.

What is really needed first – as per the Maitreya's Share International site – is to *feed all the world's people*. Undoubtedly a part of that process should be cutting *overpopulation*. Matching the resources of a land or region to the population of it and so on, using various means of birth control where necessary.

Why doesn't America do a U-turn?

Let America be *the beacon of the world*.

Let America *support* people like Venezuela president Hugo Chavez who as far as we can see wants to bring justice and fairness to *all* his people.

Let America support his like in any country they can find, let them aid other countries to become self-sufficient, and in that process gain *friends*.

Oil rich Venezuela's president could be America's *friend*, not their enemy, if they adopted truly humanistic ideals of equality, of justice to all men.

We have to base our society not on what someone has got materially, but what *they are* as a human being.

That is, suppose one was shipwrecked on a desert island.

What would we like to find in our other shipwrecked fellow human beings?

Would be like to hear that they were a bunch of self-centred rich people, who probably will war on us and the rest of the other survivors to try and achieve dominance and ownership of the formerly deserted island; or would we be rather pleased to discover they are materially modest people, who have learned to make do with little, and take their real joy from their inner state of harmony and love, and their relationships with their fellow man and woman?

As the song rightly said, at least in the ultimate sense:

*People who need people, are the luckiest people in the world.*

Well, we would amend that a little to:

*People who LOVE people, are the happiest people in the world.*

Because what greater joy is there in the world than being with and sharing our lives with those whom we love?

*No man is an island*, as the saying goes. If there was a war, and everyone died but the last man or woman, we don't think that man or woman would last very long. We think the loneliness would drive him or her to madness and despair, and that person would likely soon kill themselves or just go into a state of animal survival and dementia, like any other beast in the field.

Humanity and civilisation are *group endeavours*. None of us is big enough or strong enough or smart enough to make it on our own.

There is only meaning in life in relation to the rest of mankind, and the universe.

In particular, if we don't feel *love* for others, there is little else life has to offer us but trying to saturate ourselves with sensual experiences, and delusions of grandeur via *status*, to try to kill the emptiness and pain.

And this *love* is what we see so sadly missing from the make up of the capitalism loving species of man or woman.

It doesn't matter if I have a heart of stone, because *business is good*, is their mantra.

They get pride from boasting about their achievements, of their success on the stock market, they get to feel like wonderful people, big winners in the Darwinist survival competition that overtakes society when *the music changes*, and the reverent religious music of Bach, Mozart and Beethoven gets ousted by Gangster Rap.

The walls of civilisation crumble, just as the Walls of Jericho allegedly fell down at the discordant trumpet blasts.

But let us be honest.

Civilisation in *known* human history has been a fairly rare thing. According to what historical and scriptural records are available, our best guess is that there have been at least two identifiable cultures which we would say passed for *true* civilisations, which would be the ancient Indian in the Vedic Period and the ancient Chinese.

Our guess also is that few truly civilised eras lasted more than a few hundred years, though it is hard to say, the historical records clearly being dim, due to the long time that has passed since those alleged golden days.

For example, the *I Ching*, which describes such periods is thought to be around five thousand years old, i.e. three thousand years before Christ, but we can see modern traces of such civilisations as in Tibet, in pre-Rupert Murdoch Bhutan and such places.

But apart from that, the well documented history of the world has been mostly just the history of wars and conquests, and once again, we are led to believe that this has been and *is* the only way for things to be.

However, we should not ignore the Muslim culture, which though the Western powers-that-be allege is repressive of women, may have been in many other ways a far more stable and *caring* culture than our own.

We have explained in our earlier work *The Psychology of Prejudice* how Mohammed based his vision of society on the *ummah*, a caring, sharing community that looked out for one another, i.e. a *cooperative and caring* rather than *competitive and uncaring* one, though without a likely difficult-to-ascertain study of history, and an "insider's view" of what life in Muslim states has been like over the centuries since

his death it is hard to say to what degree the Muslim nations have followed *his original intentions*.

All the pinhead eye's view of the average Westerner however sees *based on the propaganda*, is a load of wailing, belligerent anti-Western Muslims, bowing down and praying to "Allah" five times a day, but what we don't see is *the rest of their lives*.

For example, let us ask the question – do Muslim men and Muslim women love each other in a respectful way? Are their children cared for, happy and well behaved, their lives more secure, peaceful and crime free than our own?

Consider the *millions* of women and girls and even boys whom the Western feminist influenced or controlled authorities and institutions claim have been sexually abused or raped or murdered in the West. Do the Muslim countries have anything like that amount of abuse? We seriously doubt it.

In the UK at present, we have a serial killer on the loose who has killed five women, mostly or all prostitutes, in just a few short weeks, and has already been dubbed as a 21<sup>st</sup> century version of the infamous *Jack the Ripper*.

Our governments try to deal with "law and order" (i.e. *crime*) as if it were just another department like *health care* that could be dealt with separately, so they have a minister for "business development" and another one for "law and order."

But this division cannot be because the crime is inextricably linked to the culture of capitalism. They scratch their head and promise us more police officers, more "bobbies on the beat" as they like to mock affectionately say to give people false hope, but the reality is you create an uncaring, self-centred, *competitive* society, which makes all its citizens mutual enemies, i.e. a capitalistic, vanity, and envy based one, and then *crime* is the inevitable result. As usual, it's simply *cause and effect*.

The politicians continually lie to use that they can solve such problems as crime *without touching the fundamental values of our society*. Thus decades and centuries pass by, and *none of their promises come true*.

So as to Jack the Ripper and his kind, have they got any such people in Muslim countries?

Perhaps not, they say. But they stone women to death and flog adulteresses and so on, they quickly point out.

Well, perhaps there are *some cases* of that sort of incompatible-with-modern-times barbarism – though it's hard to say exactly *how many* out of an estimated 1.4 billion Muslims worldwide – but here, all we have is Jack the Ripper and teenage girls who batter old ladies to death, or stand by laughing as their teenage boyfriends kick some man to death at a bus stop, as happened a few months back here.

So perhaps that means *our way* is superior, that we are more *civilized* than they, does it?

Or is it rather, that in Muslim countries the women don't have the right to cut off a man's sex organ if they suspect him of adultery, or the right to use *sex as a weapon* to control and dominate their men, as Western women *freely confess* to doing.

One woman on a TV chat show recently admitted:

"I use (the giving or withholding of) sex as the ultimate weapon against my boyfriend. It works and gets me my own way every time."

Several other women admitted to the same tendencies and practices. Such is the vast disrespect of men in the West, though the mostly hypnotised and dehumanised Western male population, who willingly accept their position of humiliated subservience and powerlessness, predictably do not even realise this is going on, or else, even worse, see it as the natural state of affairs.

As we have said, we think that if women used the *real* Madonna, *the Virgin Mary*, for their role model, rather than *the pop singer* of the same name, as was formerly the case before this celebrity circus came to town to hypnotise and exploit everybody, and stop them dwelling on their powerlessness and slavery – you know, in war times, they send out celebrities like Marlene Dietrich or likely nowadays Sharon Stone or Halle Berry or whoever to “raise the morale” of the troops – the whole world would be a whole lot better for both men and women, and yes, in particular, *for children*, the ones we all start out as.

But as to the Muslims, as we have also pointed out in our earlier work *Saying No to Peer Pressure*, they have a real problem with the Western banking system, because they are not allowed by Muslim law to *charge interest on loans*.

But in the West we have role models like now deceased big businessman Victor Kiam who tell us to *get into debt* is a laudable thing, is just a legitimate means to get respect and credibility in a world that depends on credit, that *lives in debt*.

Your author is probably somewhat naïve in the mystical intricacies of modern economics, but he finds it quite difficult to believe how the so called richest country in the world – America – can have such a huge “national debt.”

Indeed it seems all our prosperous Western countries have some kind of huge national debt.

What the hell is going on?

That is, imagine that any of us as individuals had huge amounts of personal debt that we couldn't service. Well, clearly they would take our home away, wouldn't they, and likely just prior to that happening some burly looking guys who wouldn't take no for an answer would come and take all our possessions away.

But somehow that doesn't happen to *a country*, at least one of the powerful Western ones. Somehow it's just “business as usual.”

Well, clearly, the explanation at least on one level is that everybody (almost) is living on credit. Everybody is in the habit of satisfying desires for material things that they can't actually afford.

This is the sole identifiable difference *in practice* between those whom we might call “good” and those we might call “bad.”

The “good” person has learned to *limit their desires*. The “bad” person *must* have everything they want, they can't take no for an answer. They are *addicts*.

We see the countless millions shopaholics, probably most of them women, who are clearly not able to control their desires for material goods such as clothes, holidays abroad, cars and so on.

The result is that millions of people are buying things they don't need, and likely fundamentally don't even want or will never use, but they just buy compulsively anyway, because *it's all they know how to do*.

They are satisfying their inner hunger, the inner core of misery that is all that is left in a loveless capitalist society in which almost everyone is competing with one another, and therefore either potentially or actually enemies, and in which therefore one can trust no one.

So is that the world we want to live in?

The *winners* are “happy” as they are, stuffing their faces with sensational material pursuits, getting all the toys and houses and cars and possessions and sex they want, and the poor just complain enviously about *what they haven't got*.

But the slave masters of the world have been having a few problems since Karl Marx and his like.

The people were uniting against the dictators and despots, against the elite.

Armies of *men* in particular, were *striking*, i.e. *withdrawing their labour*, they were rebelling against their state of slavery, forming powerful *unions* that could demand fair pay and rights and working conditions for them.

The powerful elite were threatened. Something had to be done.

So in England the answer was twofold. Appoint Mrs Thatcher to savagely batter the unions into submission and get them to betray one another, by bribing some small factions of the workers at the expense of others – you know, *divide and conquer* once again – and then the other thing to do, seeing as it was *the men* who were causing the problem was to take away *working men's power*, which basically was simply achieved by destroying all mens' jobs – i.e. in manufacturing and so on, and replacing them with a culture of *working women*.

For based on substantial personal experience, reliable reports, and viewing of women in the publicly visible arena, the difference between working men and working women is that generally speaking women *in the workplace* are far more subservient to employers and *bad authorities* generally than men, willing to put up with all sorts of ridiculous abuses of authority that men collectively – before their dignity was lost, as now – never would, and indeed to impose unjust authority on those below them when they get promoted.

This is clear just from the behaviour of the women politicians like current New Labour Party chairman Hazel Blears (yet another *lawyer* incidentally), who mindlessly and slavishly defends everything Tony Blair does without any concern for morality, which might result from the workings of an independent mind, which she clearly does not possess.

Thus Mr Blair has filled his party likely *not on merit* with these kinds of power hungry, insecure, ambitious women who don't have minds of their own, and don't "rock the boat."

Again, where do we see these powerful *unions* of working women equivalent to those of men?

They simply don't exist. The typically catty and ambitious working women are more concerned with getting one over on each other, they just seek promotion to become an abusive slave mistress, not too dissimilar from the professional sadomasochistic women we have repeatedly mentioned as being symptomatic of the underlying sickness and abusiveness in our society.

The cruel masters of the world are thus happy to use the abusive aspect lurking in countless womens' personalities, to ensure that justice is not done in the workplace, to keep the long chain of pyramid builders in line, slavishly carrying out their orders in fear of the consequence of not doing so.

So on this illusory agenda of *the heroic working woman* has this new Babylon been built, with an alliance between the capitalists and the feminists who though for wholly different causes and motives both were united in the goal of *disempowering men* and *empowering women*, even the good women amongst were foolishly hypnotised into believing that having jobs as slaves replacing the men as slaves was some kind of *freedom* for them.

You know, we are back to George Orwell again, and his famous *doublethink*, in this case expressed in view of women's "career seeking" agenda as:

*Slavery is freedom.*

Or shall we be even more "in your face" about it? Perhaps the mantra that women really should have been given to explain to them their *true* status as "empowered and privileged and heroic working women" is:

*Arbeit macht frei.*

(i.e. the sign above the door of the Nazi labour/death camps).

How long is it going to be before countless millions of Western and Eastern women who have been conned into working for a living, who formerly were free to stay at home, take care of their children and let the men do all the hunting and gathering, are going to realise they are just pawns of the capitalist system, that cares nothing for them or their children, and as time goes by they will see just wants them to work and serve it endlessly until they die?

The opinion polls on female *unhappiness* despite all this so called “empowerment” show that a very great number of women *are* waking up to this mistake they have made.

But of course, we don't hear *their* voices, all we here is the super-privileged celebrity women on TV, for whom life is mostly just an endless party and ball (well, you know, in between the marriage and relationship break ups and bouts of drug and alcohol addiction).

Whether we believe in a god or we don't, even though most of us have been made to think (i.e. hypnotised by the long line of liars or unwitting dupes we earlier mentioned who believe and state *blue is green*) that God and religion are dirty words, only to be uttered in a positive way by those deluded or mentally deficient and not scientifically educated, we have to see that the prophets like Moses, Mohammad, Buddha, Christ and the rest all had the same agenda which was:

*Set my people free.*

And unlike the politicians, when they say *my people*, they mean and meant *the whole world, every human being in every land wherever they may be*.

That is why whatever our modern scientists say, whatever unwitting fools like Richard Dawkins say, people will return to a religious or spiritual belief and respect for those who care about *all* humanity, and want *true* justice, peace and freedom in every land, because there is *nobody else* who is offering that, *there is nobody else who really cares*.

*They* alone are the unselfish people who have ever lived on our planet, who are out true parents and leaders who won't just *promise* peace and justice like our hypocritical and useless politicians, if we follow their principles, guidance and leadership, but will actually *deliver* it.

We have a modern example in the case of kundalini guru, Gopi Krishna, who lived modestly and unselfishly, and sought to point out we were going the wrong way – i.e. *the law of the jungle* – and that we had to create a world based on moderated desires and respect for other human beings, or else not only would we not prosper, we would not even survive this nuclear age.

For example, let us look at the current growing and numerous crises in the Middle East.

Just why is Israel so important to the Jews, when the Jewish Diaspora thrives and prospers throughout most of the world?

Don't give us this nonsense about “the Holy Land”, or even “the Promised Land.”

We don't deny the right of the resident Jews to live there, but why in such an aggressive and isolationist way?

The real crux of the Jewish situation is not religion, but *Arab Oil*.

And why do we need this dirty polluting stuff, without which we would not now be in danger of initiating a potentially Armageddon-like Third World War?

(all our ignorant political leaders can talk of is “reducing carbon emissions” they can't “think outside the box” and say, let's find *an alternative*, let's create *zero* fossil fuel carbon emissions, which is the *only* genuine and long term solution).

Because *big business, capitalism* won't keep its fingers out of the industrial pies, and allow *progress* to something cleaner, safer and better, like this clean and almost unlimited supply of nuclear fusion energy that scientists have been predicting will be developed for *too many decades*, and doesn't ever seem to come to pass.

*This* is ultimately what the capitalist, consumerist, competitive society is going to do to us all if it isn't stopped or at least seriously curtailed in good time.

We are all going to die horribly. Either in a nuclear conflagration, or in terrorist atrocities, or maybe even as a result of biological warfare, or even just by our own folly in polluting and destroying the environment so thoroughly that we upset the food chain, and the food either becomes too poisonous to eat, or we have mass starvation by upsetting the balance of nature, causing our crops to fail and livestock to die.

It may not come to every country in the world, it may come only to a few, who knows?

Isn't it bad enough already what is happening to so many tens or hundreds of thousands or even eventually millions of people in the Middle East? And of course all the starving millions in Africa, whom once again we are led to accept is just a fact of life, and the status quo, when in reality there is no need, and the Western capitalist world could easily feed *if it cared, if it wanted to*.

But as we have said, for the capitalist – i.e. he or she whose *desires* are out of control – *enough is never enough*, and having lots on your plate whilst someone else's plate is empty seems to the capitalist just a *need*, whereas the reality it is just *greed*, and is yet another undeniable proof that the capitalist West collectively *does not care*.

So what's the answer?

As multi-instrumentalist 70s rock star Todd Rundgren said at the end of one song:

*No, no, no – a little more HUMANITY please!*

The public, the *mass of the people*, and in particular *the educated ones*, have got to see that their governments are just mostly the puppets of the greedy grabbing ones who care nothing for the planet, who care nothing for your children, and ultimately care nothing for *you*.

You, I, Tom, Dick, Harry, Mary, Julie and Jane, we are all just fodder for their capitalist consumerist cannons and campaigns.

If we all did only the work that was really needed to feed, clothe, house and take care of everyone, the amount of work done in the world – mostly for things we don't really need – would likely decrease by about 50% to 90%.

Women would not be badgered, bullied, hypnotised and even *shamed* into working if they didn't want to, particularly those with children.

Those who did *have* to work, i.e. for the common good, would likely have to work perhaps only fifty percent or less of what they do now.

The average working man or woman might only be expected by society at large to work for twenty hours a week, maybe even less.

Imagine you are a doctor or a nurse or a building site labourer or a bus or taxi driver and you can live comfortably and with dignity by only working fifteen or twenty hours a week.



Wouldn't that cut down your stress?

Wouldn't that make your life easier, happier, more worthwhile, giving you so much more time to spend with your wife or husband and family and children and friends, and to devote to your own private interests and even to the question of *the meaning of life*?

Your author for example is aware of many people who go through phases of working and not working, and they find that their anxiety and drug problems such as alcohol or cannabis use *increase* when they *are* working, and *decrease* when they *are not*.

We are not talking idleness. We are talking *comfort, moderation, ease* in work, and abundant time for *personal development*.

Even if one has no "spiritual or philosophical inclinations" one would have time to learn to do or explore that thing one has always wanted to do, maybe it's learning to play a musical instrument or to paint pictures, or to become a *true* martial arts expert, learn a foreign language or whatever, all of the above we pretty much guarantee most working adults will *never* achieve, because their life is dominated by work.

But *leisure* interests apart, why should work be so "hard" in any case?

Why should we be worked to exhaustion?

There's no *need* for it.

It's just *the greed* of the capitalist elite who are driving this situation, who are hypnotising the masses and cracking the whips, and making the vast majority of us do virtual slave labour that we don't want to do.

What is our life?

Forty eight or fifty weeks of the year of 9 to 5 or more, and then a few weeks in a short-lived holiday paradise.

And home every night to sit hypnotically in front of the TV, and if we are lucky for a frantic bout of sex to take away the pain and enable us to face the next day, or at weekend we get blasted out of our minds on drink and drugs or lose ourselves in porn or spectator sport, trying to cram as much pleasure as possible into our short free time – you know, with the agenda of *work hard, play hard*, and other such slave mantras.

Why do the rich and celebrities get to do whatever they like, but we have to groan as we get up way too early, bite our lips and face the hostile environment of another grinding day, day after day, year after year, till we are old, tired, depleted, exhausted, weak, and likely impoverished due to inadequate pensions for the elderly, and just left alone without anyone really caring about us to die?

We have all got to wake up to the truth of life.

We have to see what puppets we are of this system – i.e. of this small elite that profits vastly at the expense of 99% or more of the people – and *call a halt*.

We want to work *easy*, not *hard*. There's *no need* for this hard labour, as if we were all a bunch of prisoners on a chain gang from the movie *Cool Hand Luke*. Just because we can't see the chains and the prison walls, it doesn't mean they are not there. That's the clever part.

And most of the chains are on *the inside*, the hypnotic barriers that have been planted in our minds to get us to accept and hunger for *the status quo*.

As Ramakrishna's chief disciple Vivekananda said in his work *Raja Yoga*, over a century ago:

*A few golden balls are rolled, and the whole world chases after them.*

Is that all we are? Dogs panting with loyalty, chasing after our master or mistress's stick that he or she throws?

Any true civilisation, any society that truly seeks to base its life upon proper ideals, such as those expressed in the original American Declaration of Independence we earlier quoted from, such as *the right to Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness*, clearly cannot base itself upon private interest alone, upon the capitalist system.

It is the fault of our governments to allow this situation to continue – that is, the exploitation of the many by the few – and indeed, the fault of us all *for letting them*.

**Also by the same author**

*A Mens Liberation Guide to Women 4th edition*  
*An Innocent Woman's Guide to Men*  
*How to Meditate*  
*Kundalini - Preventing the Apocalypse*  
*A Mens and Womens Liberation Update*  
*The Myth of the Teenage Rebellion*  
*What Is Intelligence?*  
*Kundalini - A Personal Experience*  
*Feminal Farm - a short satirical novel*  
*The Innocent Persons Guide to Law*  
*Understanding Female Sexuality and Porn*  
*Freedom of Speech & Maitreya*  
*An Innocent Persons Guide to the Da Vinci Code*  
*How the Feminists Stole Psychology*  
*Hearing Voices and Psychic Phenomena*  
*The Psychology of Soaps*  
*Is Competition Necessary?*  
*On Drugs and Alcohol*  
*The Importance of Thinkers*  
*The Demonisation of the Innocents*  
*The Psychology of Prejudice*  
*Science and Fear*  
*The Scientist and the Guru*  
*Respect for Age*  
*A Waste of Paper*  
*Saying No to Peer Pressure*  
*Smashing the Da Vinci Code*  
*If Men Went on Strike*  
*A Message to Readers*  
*Why Size Doesn't Matter*  
*Afraid of Women*  
*The Feminist Offenders Register*

*All Sam Fryman's works are currently available free of charge via the link*

*<http://www.geocities.com/thmlplx/>*

*as .lit files which can be read with the free Microsoft Reader*

*<http://www.microsoft.com/reader/downloads/pc.asp>*