

Rhetoric and The Masonic Oligarchy

By Barry Albin

In the Fellowcraft Degree, we are taught that there are seven liberal arts with which we must become familiar in order to be able to ascend to the Middle Chamber of King Solomon's Temple. We are taught that they are requirements of speculative masonry. One of those liberal arts is called Rhetoric. The On Line Dictionary says that rhetoric means:

The art or study of using language effectively and persuasively or a style of speaking or writing, especially the language of a particular subject or language that is elaborate, pretentious, insincere, or intellectually vacuous.

Mackey says of rhetoric: "it teacheth man to speak fairly in subtle terms." Volume 1, pg. 18. Thus we are talking about an art that is much used today for both good and bad.

Aldous Huxley, the author of Brave New World, gave a speech in 1962 in which he talks a great deal about the nature of oligarchies and how they maintain their power. He was speaking to the Berkeley Language Center, at the University of California at Berkeley, at the time, one of the most prestigious universities in the world. I consider the vision he painted of the future to have been quite prophetic. He begins to talk:

"Today we are faced, I think, with the approach of what may be called the ultimate revolution, the final revolution, where man can act directly on the mind-body of his fellows. Well needless to say some kind of direct action on human mind-bodies has been going on since the beginning of time. But this has generally been of a violent nature. The Techniques of terrorism have been known from time immemorial and people have employed them with more or less ingenuity sometimes with the utmost cruelty, sometimes with a good deal of skill acquired by a process of trial and error finding out what the best ways of using torture, imprisonment, constraints of various kinds. But, as, I think it was Mettenicht said many years ago, you can do everything with people except

sit on them. If you are going to control any population for any length of time, you must have some measure of consent, it's exceedingly difficult to see how pure terrorism can function indefinitely. It can function for a fairly long time, but I think sooner or later you have to bring in an element of persuasion an element of getting people to consent to what is happening to them.”

It is this consent which is the subject of rhetoric for it is with the use of rhetoric whether with good purpose or bad purpose that gains the element of consent by the people.

Huxley continues: “It seems to me that the nature of the ultimate revolution with which we are now faced is precisely this: That we are in process of developing a whole series of techniques which will enable the controlling oligarchy who have always existed and presumably will always exist to get people to love their servitude. This is the, it seems to me, the ultimate in malevolent revolutions shall we say, and this is a problem which has interested me many years and about which I wrote thirty years ago, a fable, *Brave New World*, which is an account of society making use of all the devices available and some of the devices which I imagined to be possible making use of them in order to, first of all, to standardize the population, to iron out inconvenient human differences, to create, to say, mass produced models of human beings arranged in some sort of scientific caste system. Since then, I have continued to be extremely interested in this problem and I have noticed with increasing dismay a number of the predictions which were purely fantastic when I made them thirty years ago have come true or seem in process of coming true. A number of techniques about which I talked seem to be here already. And there seems to be a general movement in the direction of this kind of ultimate revolution, a method of control by which a people can be made to enjoy a state of affairs by which any decent standard they ought not to enjoy. This, the enjoyment of servitude, Well this process is, as I say, has gone on for over the years, and I have become more and more interested in what is happening.

It is precisely this creation of a standardized mason that present today. There is the mason who cares not about the nature or government of the Order. There is the mason

that cares, but has no desire to personally become involved in changing the Order. There is the mason who willingly accepts that oligarchy and seeks to be part of the oligarchy. And then there is the oligarchs, themselves, the Past Grand Masters. We have standardized the Order by creating these classes.

Huxley continues: “And here I would like briefly to compare the parable of Brave New World with another parable which was put forth more recently in George Orwell's book, Nineteen Eighty-Four. Orwell wrote his book between, I think between 45 and 48 at the time when the Stalinist terror regime was still in Full swing and just after the collapse of the Hitlerian terror regime. And his book which I admire greatly, it's a book of very great talent and extraordinary ingenuity, shows, so to say, a projection into the future of the immediate past, of what for him was the immediate past, and the immediate present, it was a projection into the future of a society where control was exercised wholly by terrorism and violent attacks upon the mind-body of individuals.

Whereas my own book which was written in 1932 when there was only a mild dictatorship in the form of Mussolini in existence, was not overshadowed by the idea of terrorism, and I was therefore free in a way in which Orwell was not free, to think about these other methods of control, these non-violent methods and my, I'm inclined to think that the scientific dictatorships of the future, and I think there are going to be scientific dictatorships in many parts of the world, will be probably a good deal nearer to the brave new world pattern than to the 1984 pattern, they will a good deal nearer not because of any humanitarian qualms of the scientific dictators but simply because the BNW pattern is probably a good deal more efficient than the other. That if you can get people to consent to the state of affairs in which they're living. The state of servitude the state of being, having their differences ironed out, and being made amenable to mass production methods on the social level, if you can do this, then you have, you are likely, to have a much more stable and lasting society. Much more easily controllable society than you would if you were relying wholly on clubs and firing squads and concentration camps. So that my own feeling is that the 1984 picture was tinged of course by the immediate past and present in which Orwell was living, but the past and present of those years does

not reflect, I feel, the likely trend of what is going to happen, needless to say we shall never get rid of terrorism, it will always find its way to the surface. But I think that insofar as dictators become more and more scientific, more and more concerned with the technically perfect, perfectly running society, they will be more and more interested in the kind of techniques, which I imagined and described from existing realities in BNW. So that, it seems to me then, that this ultimate revolution is not really very far away, that we, already a number of techniques for bringing about this kind of control are here, and it remains to be seen when and where and by whom they will first be applied in any large scale.

The oligarchs of Freemasonry have used the technique of constantly repeating what they want masons believe, namely that if we do not have all these programs to increase membership, Freemasonry will die, and they have said it long enough that now masons believe it is true. There is no indication whatsoever that with the passing time and the constant decrease of total membership, that the members who are included in that class which cares about the good of the Order have decreased. In fact, that number I would claim has increased. What the oligarchs are truly concerned about it is their inability to maintain a large Grand Lodge office so that each signature program created by each individual Grand Master must have a staff to govern it. However, those programs exist merely to increase membership. Take the programs away and you would not have a need for the staff. The programs have not had a significant effect on membership and their claim that the new mason wants a social program is neither Masonic nor supported by a study of any sort.

After talking about terroristic methods of population control, Huxley continues to milder forms by saying: "But then we come to the consideration of other techniques, non-terroristic techniques, for inducing consent and inducing people to love their servitude. Here, I don't think I can possibly go into all of them, because I don't know all of them, but I mean I can mention the more obvious methods, which can now be used and are based on recent scientific findings. First of all there are the methods connected with straight suggestion and hypnosis.

I think we know much more about this subject than was known in the past. People of course, always have known about suggestion, and although they didn't know the word 'hypnosis' they certainly practiced it in various ways. But we have, I think, a much greater knowledge of the subject than in the past, and we can make use of our knowledge in ways, which I think the past was never able to make use of it. For example, one of the things we now know for certain, that there is of course an enormous, I mean this has always been known a very great difference between individuals in regard to their suggestibility. But we now know pretty clearly the sort of statistical structure of a population in regard to its suggestibility. Its very interesting when you look at the findings of different fields, I mean the field of hypnosis, the field of administering placebos, for example, in the field of general suggestion in states of drowsiness or light sleep you will find the same sorts of orders of magnitude continually cropping up. You'll find for example that the experienced hypnotist will tell one that the number of people, the percentage of people who can be hypnotized with the utmost facility, just like that. is about 20%, and about a corresponding number at the other end of the scale are very, very difficult or almost impossible to hypnotize. But in between lies a large mass of people who can with more or less difficulty be hypnotized, that they can gradually be if you work hard enough at it be got into the hypnotic state, and in the same way the same sort of figures crop up again, for example in relation to the administration of placebos.

A big experiment was carried out three or four years ago in the general hospital in Boston on post-operative cases where several hundred men and woman suffering comparable kinds of pain after serious operations were allowed to, were given injections whenever they asked for them whenever the pain got bad, and the injections were 50% of the time were of morphine, and 50% of water. And about twenty percent of those who went through the experiment, about 20% of them got just as much relief from the distilled waters as from the morphea. About 20% got no relief from the distilled water, and in-between were those who got some relief or got relief occasionally.

So yet again, we see the same sort of distribution, and similarly in regard to what in BNW I called Hypnopedia, the sleep teaching, I was talking not long ago to a man who manufactures records which people can listen to in the, during the light part of sleep, I mean these are records for getting rich, for sexual satisfaction, for confidence in salesmanship and so on, and he said that its very interesting that these are records sold on a money-back basis, and he says there is regularly between 15% and 20% of people who write indignantly saying the records don't work at all, and he sends the money back at once. There are on the other hand, there are over 20% who write enthusiastically saying they are much richer, their sexual life is much better etc, etc. And these of course are the dream clients and they buy more of these records. And in between there are those who don't get much results and they have to have letters written to them saying "Go persist my dear, go on" (laughter) and you will get there, and they generally do get results in the long run.

Well, as I say, on the basis of this, I think we see quite clearly that the human populations can be categorized according to their suggestibility fairly clearly, I suspect very strongly that this twenty percent is the same in all these cases, and I suspect also that it would not be at all difficult to recognize and point out who are those who are extremely suggestible and who are those extremely unsuggestible and who are those who occupy the intermediate space. Quite clearly, if everybody were extremely unsuggestible organized society would be quite impossible, and if everybody were extremely suggestible then a dictatorship would be absolutely inevitable. I mean it's very fortunate that we have people who are moderately suggestible in the majority and who therefore preserve us from dictatorship but do permit organized society to be formed. But, once given the fact that there are these 20% of highly suggestible people, it becomes quite clear that this is a matter of enormous political importance, for example, any demagogue who is able to get hold of a large number of these 20% of suggestible people and to organize them is really in a position to overthrow any government in any country.

And I mean, I think this after all, we had the most incredible example in recent years by what can be done by efficient methods of suggestion and persuasion in the form

of Hitler. Anyone who has read, for example, Bulloch's Life of Hitler, comes forth with this horrified admiration for this infernal genius, who really understood human weaknesses I think almost better than anybody and who exploited them with all the resources then available. I mean he knew everything, for example, he knew intuitively this pavlovian truth that condition installed in a state of stress or fatigue goes much deeper than conditioning installed at other times. This of course is why all his big speeches were organized at night. He speaks quite frankly, of course, in Mein Kampf, this is done solely because people are tired at night and therefore much less capable of resisting persuasion than they would be during the day. And in all his techniques he was using, he had discovered intuitively and by trial and error a great many of the weaknesses, which we now know about on a sort of scientific way I think much more clearly than he did.

But the fact remains that this differential of suggestibility this susceptibility to hypnosis I do think is something which has to be considered very carefully in relation to any kind of thought about democratic government . If there are 20% of the people who really can be suggested into believing almost anything, then we have to take extremely careful steps into prevent the rise of demagogues who will drive them on into extreme positions then organize them into very, very dangerous armies, private armies which may overthrow the government.

This is, I say, in this field of pure persuasion, I think we do know much more than we did in the past, and obviously we now have mechanisms for multiplying the demagogues voice and image in a quite hallucinatory way, I mean, the TV and radio, Hitler was making enormous use of the radio, he could speak to millions of people simultaneously. This alone creates an enormous gulf between the modern and the ancient demagogue. The ancient demagogue could only appeal to as many people as his voice could reach by yelling at his utmost, but the modern demagogue could touch literally millions at a time, and of course by the multiplication of his image he can produce this kind of hallucinatory effect which is of enormous hypnotic and suggestive importance.

I am sure that you can see the political importance of Aldous Huxley's vision of the world from 1962 and how much it has come to be the reality of today, but I want to look at Freemasonry and see the effect of the oligarchy here. In Kansas, we have a system of choosing our leaders, which is called the self-regenerating oligarchy. The system works something like this: an incoming Grand Master proposes a name to the past Grand Masters and the Grand Secretary. If that name seems acceptable to the combined Grand Masters, then the Deputy Grand Master asks the candidate whether he has the money and time to work for five years to prepare to be Grand Master and whether he will be able to put in the time to be Grand Master in the sixth year. This system accomplishes several goals: first, it guarantees that there will be a continuity of the traditions and theories that the current oligarchy, the Past Grand Masters, believe; second, it will be a method to assure that the same persons will be indoctrinated into the problems and difficulties that these oligarchs see looming on the horizon and to the proposed solutions to these problems, and third, it assures that the person who comes in will be the least likely to cause problems when he gains the power of the office because he has been a mild and supportive Mason previously.

I will not suggest that the oligarchy that controls Freemasonry in Kansas is inherently terroristic. They do not use the tools of torture or murder to accomplish their goals. But they do use intimidation, deceit, lies, half-truths, and fear as tools in their arsenal. They constantly talk about the possibility of the Order dying. They concern themselves with the failure to get new blood to supply the money for the Grand Lodge office to function and therefore their power base and try to convince the brethren that failure to provide that money will in some way destroy the Order. They never tell us what the effect of simply closing the office would be. If a person wishes to be Grand Master, they can dissuade that person by painting pictures of the necessity to spend time running around the state and acting like a good politician. They can show him ways in which he can become involved in the community and make himself feel useful and important by helping others. He can do things that Aldous Huxley says "will help the Craft enjoy their servitude." The oligarchy in Freemasonry regularly uses the same techniques that they learned to teach the mason the philosophy of Freemasonry to maintain themselves in

power. They understand that repetition is a powerful tool. So every year we hear a theme: we need a new program that will bring in new masons. We hear that some new program will increase interest. We hear that some new program will increase our public presence. We hear that some old program is no longer necessary but this new one will increase membership so that we can pay the bills in Topeka and for our local lodges. This constant repetition is then enhanced at Grand Lodge where speaker after speaker talks about what happened in the past year with glowing words and vacuous meanings. Finally, we are asked to increase the funding and/or the power of the beauracracy. Hypnotically, we follow the lead of our past Grand Masters who stand and tell us why we need these new funds: but we never ask the ultimate question, what would happen if we just closed the Grand Lodge office.

The need for more programs is a placebo. The need for more members is a dodge. Rhetoric is the art of twisting the truth or telling the truth. It is up to the speaker to decide what is right and to try to sell it. Freemasonry is by its nature a philosophy that is meant to make men more democratic. It seeks to teach them. It requires men who have learned how to think. This is not the training ground for thinkers; Freemasonry is the forum in which thinkers express themselves. Rhetoric is suppose to be a method in which honest men tell why things are the way they are. One of the supposed benefits of college is to expand the ability of the person to think. Colleges are failing miserably because we do not teach rhetoric or logic. The Masonic oligarchy is like John Wesley. It preaches that the Order will fail just as Wesley said everyone would go to hell if they did not do what he said. But the Order existed for 400 years in secrecy, from 1314 until 1717. It did not need the trappings of modern men to accomplish its task. The growth of the pagan movement indicates that modern people are interested in what we believe. Most of the pagan cults are founded on Masonic principles. Are we being hypnotized into believing a falsehood by the oligarchy? Are we being given placebos in order to keep us in line? This lodge has locked itself away from the real world, but we have the answer. We need to start telling people about a lodge that does not need the Grand Lodge programs in order to exist. We need to start advocating for thinking people to take the leadership roles in the

Grand Lodge. Freemasonry is in danger of dying in America, because it has failed to live up to its goals of teaching the liberal arts. Let us change that.

I hope that you will find that Aldous Huxley's speech was itself a form of rhetoric. I hope that you will see that it applies to our country as well as to our order. I hope that you will begin to think more deeply about the things we take for granted and will look to see if those things have a basis in truth. I read this speech and I knew that I had to tell you about this prophecy and how true it is.

W.: Brother Barry Albin, 33°, KYCH, Past Grand Prelate of the Knights Templar of Kansas, Rabbi of the B'nai Or Qahal in Kansas City, Missouri