

## Austrian-Keynesian Dialectic: Economics as Psyops

Money represents human time, energy and claims of ownership.

To control people, you need to control their time, energy and claims of ownership.

The monetary system is the basis of our society. You can control almost any person or organisation to a very great extent by leveraging their need of it. Everybody, in practice, believes in it.

We know propaganda and psychological manipulation is rife. The above suggests that monetary systems are an area that would be focused on intensely. The facts agree.

To be maximally responsive to money, people need to believe intensely in scarcity. So we should expect psyops to focus upon enforcing scarcity by maximally obscure and maximally ubiquitous means. Again, the facts agree.

This is a thread for discussing economic psyops as the basis of social control. Feel free to contribute whatever. I'll lay out how I see it working in the post below. This will inevitably verge into party-politics, in that almost the entire spectrum is a massive distraction from this. That includes all the political movements you find represented on 8chan: identity-political rightism, redistributive Marxism, libertarianism, and, most laughably of all, Neoreaction.

---

There are two stages to understanding this situation. The first is sufficient and convincing. The second is more obscure and ostensibly sensitive to challenge, but important.

The first is the private central banking class and system, and the manipulation of political dialectics over the past two hundred years at least. The second is the suppression of alternate energy technology and consequent abundance by that class.

To understand the first, begin by considering Usury. Usury was universally shunned before the modern age, and regarded as a form of slavery. But both all mainstream and Austrian economic theorists today vouch for it. The Salamancan school of Jesuit economic theorists (no, this isn't a Jesuits run the world narrative) began challenging traditional stances on Usury before Adam Smith.

Usury funnels wealth upwards. From the 90% to the 10%. The 10% to the 1%. The 1% to the 0.1%. And so on.

Usury exists on the gold standard, as advocated for by Austrian theorists, and in modern mainstream central banking. It exists in neoliberal Reaganism and Thatcherism, and it exists in the most far left Western governments.

The Federal Reserve is a privately owned central bank. It is not true that the owners of the Fed own central banks globally. Many countries have publicly owned private central banks (independent from the government, but in a sense owned by them). The point is that they remain controlled. For insight into how this works, take the example of the Bank of Japan. The film *Princes of the Yen* (watch it) demonstrates how an entire advanced economy, full of intelligent people, was raised up and crashed over decades for the purpose of pursuing the agenda of one banking institution with strong international connections.

Private central banks such as those in the US create massive and unresolvable debt at the basis of the financial system. The balance sheet is the issue here. Money comes into existence with debt. There is no such thing as balancing the budget. It is mathematically impossible. This creates a constant black-hole of money at the source of the economy, which has to be filled by government taxes paid to banks. These taxes are levied by more pressure on the populous: more time and energy has to be expended to gain more credits to feed into the black hole. It can never be filled. All that can happen is that more and more material and human wealth can over time be represented as money and fed into the hole, until the system collapses. Before collapse, this motivates expansionism, emerging any market that can be emerged, and translation of all possible wealth into money. For the people, this will be experienced as part of the race to get ahead and get individually established.

Austrian economic theorists point out many of the scams and financial games which a private central banking system involves. But they focus on the root of this being that the money isn't 'real'. If it isn't 'real', that means it can be manipulated. Big government and crazy socialists manipulate this created-out-of-nothing conceptual forgery, preventing the business cycle and the market from showing the true value of economic sectors and the reality of the country's finances. What a scam! Right?

(example of a full analysis of the Fed from this position. The 'not real! Buy Gold! FREEDOM!' part comes at the end: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iFDe5kUUyT0>)

Actually, no. Gold is well-liked by the private central banking class. It was pushed for as a replacement to the far more troublesome Greenbacks (government printed, non-private, fiat currency). The people of the United States were subjected to great hardship as currency was removed from circulation to implement the Gold standard. And, more importantly, a Gold Standard is both easy to manipulate and excellent for defending the interests of the same people who are beneficiaries of the debt and usury in a private central banking system.

How? Well, firstly pegging all currency to Gold limits the circulation of currency, so that inflation and central alterations can't reduce the debts of common people over time. Secondly, this limited circulation (not enough money to go around) motivates people to take out loans for their needs, and the burden of the debt on these loans constantly increases, so that you end up with the same black-hole of energy where people are struggling to give all they can to the owners just to stay afloat.

So people have the 'freedom' of choosing what economic activity they engage in. But, functionally, the strain distributed over society acts to enslave people's energies. It's obscure, and people can be made to blame their own success or failure, so it's immensely more sophisticated than classical slavery. This applies to all the systems discussed so far.

---

Gold is also already largely owned by big oligarchical players. Interestingly, the estimates financial institutions give for how much gold is in circulation are far lower than those you get by analysing how much has been mined. Which suggests that large and undeclared private holdings could be used to manipulate the core variables of the economy in the case of a gold standard.

Anti-fed sentiment is hugely co-opted by this Austrian 'only gold money isn't real money' doctrine. This is what Ron Paul is all about. If you really think about it, it's absurd. Money is a conceptual tool. There's no indication that pegging it to a particular metal is the best thing to do. In fact, that results in scarcity.

Abundance has arisen more easily in a few situations historically, all using government-backed public fiat currency:

England's Tally Stick system.

National Socialist Germany's fiat money.

Lincoln's Greenbacks.

Colonial Scrip.

These were more successful for the reason that the medium of exchange wasn't inherently bound up with constant and extreme wealth transfer from the poor to the rich.

This relates to mainstream political discourse as follows:

Left-centrists advocate Keynesianism, in which the central bank remains under the control of the private banking class, who can still profit from manipulating its variables and from Usury and money-as-debt.

Right-centrists agree mostly but focus more on austerity.

Austrian-Libertarians and Goldbuggers advocate for what would LOOK like a radical change in the system but would just perpetuate the wealth of the banking class.

So, you have the possibility of revolutionary-LOOKING changes in the system over decades, which are actually within one well controlled dialectic.

It relates to fringe discourse as follows:

Identity-politics is a distraction.

People argue over extreme redistribution versus extreme absence of it, without focusing on the core scarcity and how it's generated.

Most new movements weave back into this. Tech-comm NRx, for example, is just Austrianism with a futuristic patina. For more on that, see below.

In the case of Austrianism, we know that it was created by oligarchical Social Darwinist with this purpose in mind. But Social Darwinism (the rich are rich because of superior genetics, and should be given maximal free reign) isn't in the common person's interests. So you have to come up with something they do value that it ostensibly achieves. Freedom!

NRx is strange in that somehow its followers have dropped the 'freedom' but kept the economics. Perhaps they don't realise they're not aristocrats? I really do hate to use the word, but it's essentially a form of cuckoldry, if you're not mega-rich. 'I don't think this promotes freedom, but you're amazing and deserve all my stuff and my mating prospects and country and children'.

Freedom vs. Give more to the poor. With each failing to realise that the back and forth and manipulation of the core variables of the system are just transferring ever more wealth into private central bankers' hands over time. And each failing to focus on the core scarcity which allows this, and motivates people to be slaves to money.

---

We've seen how this scarcity is enforced by different centralised banking systems. The next thing to consider is that the economy runs largely on physical energy.

Whether or not you believe in Tesla's tech, his interactions with J. P. Morgan are a parable here. The private central banker who has the alternate energy inventor blackballed, intimidated and has his lab physically attacked.

Since that time, patent offices have essentially functioned as branches of intelligence agencies. Inventors want patents. And are unprepared. Maybe even naive enough to think they'll be welcomed. And the highly prioritised intelligence units dedicated to shutting down potential disruptors to the energy scarcity inevitably scare, kill, or integrate them. Which ensures the continuation of belief in money and therefore control over most humans by a very few humans (the ones with vast wealth and financial system control).

Vast numbers of National Security Orders and equivalent have been served on energy inventors over the past hundred years. And the academic discourse has been manipulated to make the area one of career-destroying ridicule.

This is the reason nuclear power is constantly attacked, and probably also behind several of the nuclear 'accidents'. Believe that or not, it doesn't change the root motives, cui bono, follow the money, and how the banking system works.

Another thing to consider is that, even if any particular alternate energy system is bogus, the fact that society isn't obsessed with this and devoting huge budgets and attention to it is telling. It is at the root of social inequalities and at the root of the scarcity which drives almost everybody to have to work constantly to fulfil the public debt (or private gold-standard, scarcity motivated debt) which, functionally, is a form of distributed slavery.

---

Evidence of psyops:

Austrianism:

[http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=view\\_all&address=389x1989989](http://www.democraticunderground.com/discuss/duboard.php?az=view_all&address=389x1989989)

<https://thedailyknell.wordpress.com/>

i.e. Austrianism was bought and paid for. Created out of nothing.

Another psyop to consider here is faux-environmentalism. Obviously, we are devastating the environment and causing horrific despeciation. Although this system is perhaps THE primary driver of that.

Environmentalism is pushed particularly by figures like David de Rothschild and the Windsors. Leaving aside theories about just how powerful those two are, the first is at least a powerful private banking family, and the second have shown many times to be feudalistically inclined. This is the same group which pushed the 'limits of growth' report, and who, via the House of Orange Nassau, set up Bilderberg. It's a matter of historical fact that Bilderberg was set up by the the House in cooperation with an ex-head of the CIA.

Major environmental organisations like the WWF are supported by the Windsors. And the Windsors know what is going on with energy and banking. Just like the highest in the international think-tank class do. These people are privy to intelligence agency analyses, to friendly conversations with the right people. To knowing.

So why are they pushing an environmentalism that advocates for scarcity? To acclimatise people to it, and to the right reaction to a crash of the present system, and to believing that are at fault and increasing scarcity is a proper response.

Interestingly, Austrian shills/useful-idiots like Land heavily reference shills of this movement like John Michael Greer.

---

Useful sources:

Princes of The Yen: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p5Ac7ap\\_MAY](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=p5Ac7ap_MAY)

Shows a historical example of manipulation of an entire economy by central bank control of economic variables. And of how easy it is to deceive most people about what's happening with this.

Damon Vrabel: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=96c2wXcNA7A> and [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7\\_yh4-Zi92Q](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7_yh4-Zi92Q)

Unfortunately populist and angry, but he's a well-educated man who understands the basic lie at the foundation of our monetary system.

realcurrencies.wordpress.com

Best overall source for understanding the economy.

The Money Masters: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iDtBSiI13fE>

An introduction to real history. I.e. the history of the manipulation of the core variables of a society's economy, and the wars to control them and understandings of them.

---

One final additional factor, introduced in the modern context:

Traditionally, control over fundamental economic variables gave those who had it the ability to profit from fore-knowledge.

Token effort regulatory bodies are designed to stamp out this insider trading. The markets run on information, so can't run fairly if somebody can leverage consistent access to advanced information.

But now we have a total surveillance system, which is itself completely opaque.

It would be extremely naive to expect the parties controlling the intelligence agencies which form this system not to try to profit from their endless access to fore-knowledge of deals and policy decisions. And,

given that intelligence agencies aren't externally regulated, it would be trivially easy to do this and to hide the profit via obscure corporate ownership structures or anonymous tip offs given to allies.

So the market itself has been turned into a rigged casino, where outsiders can't hope to compete with insiders.

---

I was thinking of including the destruction of the cryptocurrency myth in the post, but decided it would be funnier to wait for some Austrian to try to save their dignity with it.

So, let's look at why Austrians love Bitcoin:

If Gold, in conjunction with the business cycle, allows spontaneous market order and accurate representation of value, and if government is the interfering autocratic enemy of this process, then deregulation is the answer. Small government. But if small government can't be achieved reliably via central political implementation, then another way is needed. Cue Bitcoin/cryptocurrency, the decentralised, limited supply digital Gold Standard. It's backed by the computational mining and the algorithm that prevents the supply from being inflated, and it forces deregulation by, to an extent, preventing government and banking control over individual transactions.

That's meant to be revolutionary. If government and socialism (see Land's constant references to 'democracy moves left') are the enemy, who create a 'fake' reality to distort the 'real' economy of Gold, then this is a new technology that could permanently limit their power, outside the scope of legislation to remedy.

But that's bullshit.

It's bullshit firstly because the new cryptocurrency will be measured against and used to purchase existing items of value. Vast amounts of value already exist in pre-existing distributions of wealth. Those with massive amounts of this wealth will, whenever a potentially relevant currency like this arises onto the scene, be able to make the hedge of buying vast amounts of it early on. At that point, the share of the value in the total global economy which the whole of the supply of the currency in circulation could buy will be very small. And control of the economic system is a goal worth spending a LOT of money on.

Those people also HAVE the greatest amount wealth others would seek to purchase with this new cryptocurrency.

And this wealth was accumulated through the old private central banking system, among other dynamics NOT subjected to the Austrian business cycle. There is no way to remedy that, and start again from some fair starting point, without extreme redistribution, which is a very unpalatable prospect. That is, unless you're going to focus on abundance for all via non-deflationary measures combined with a focus on new means of energy abundance, which Austrian/cryptocurrency fanboys don't talk about.

The richest people right now control the private banks, which in turn control the private central bank. Those same people will be able to dominate a Gold Standard, as demonstrated in the OP. And it's a matter of fact that they as a class have historically pushed for the Gold standard as preferable for pursuing their interests over non-usurious fiat money.

A cryptocurrency is revolutionary ONLY in the sense that, if successful (and that's a dubious prospect), it moves the dialectic back to the enforced scarcity Austrian side, in which wealth is funnelled upwards by Usury and by the exercise of the power granted by pre-existing wealth structures.

Do you know how much of the land of England and Canada is owned by the Aristocracy? Do you have any idea how much Gold is unaccounted for? Do you have any idea of the vast wealth generated by the present banking system each day, and how far the wealth generated by that outdwarfs libertarian pet projects like bitcoin?

So, bitcoin probably got a few libertarians rich. The ones who got in early. And it genuinely does have some importance, in allowing covert and unregulated transactions. But that's not new. Cash did that during the era when present inequalities and systems were developing. And deregulation of that kind is a mild, not a fundamental change.

- Anon, 32