

- So I'm going to dive in today with propaganda and looking specifically at a bit of Leni Riefenstahl. I'm sure everybody knows the remarkable and complicated film director that Hitler mostly used, responsible for so many of the images that we also used to seeing of the whole 30's into the early 40's period. And then in the idea of propaganda, what I wanted to look at with some of the key ideas of Goebbels and how propaganda is manufactured, how it works, and then from him and some examples of that period in the 30's, then stretched to our contemporary times with social media and the internet, and how some of the ideas, in my opinion, in a sense, speak to our times. But then how some ideas have also changed in the use of propaganda with the internet and social media, which gives quite a different sense of it in a way.

*Slides are displayed throughout the lecture.*

Okay, so to dive off, I'd like to start with this guy, Bernays. Now come into a bit of his interesting life a little bit later and his connection with Freud. But he really is regarded as having founded public relations and advertising and understanding in the 30's, in the 20's, in fact, the connection between psychoanalysis of the time, in particular the unconscious. And I mean, he was related to Freud and also, but went to live in America. And also how the distinctions between that and propaganda, which is much more obviously dealing with when we look at Goebbels. So two key phrases, which I'm going to come back to, is how do people in power, or people who wish to be in power, how do they engineer consent in Bernays' phrase, how do they manufacture or in another great philosopher's phrase, how do they manufacture consent? Bernays, how do you engineer consent in a democracy?

That's the fascinating question. Whether you want to turn it into a totalitarian or a semi-fascist state, or whether you want to just change people's minds. How just really sway them so they really will believe they will vote for A or B. And then, dear old Mr. Goebbels, Dr. Goebbels, I'm sure everyone knows this phrase, "The bigger the lie, the more the masses believe it." And you know, reading this many years ago and in rereading to prepare for it today, it just struck me. And I'm not talking about any particular country, you know, I remember growing up in apartheid, obviously, you know how we all were and just thinking of the lies, the slogans, and then looking at England and the Brexit and the referendum, just anywhere different places in the world, in democracies in particular is what's interesting.

And to see how these ideas possibly can be perceived, you know, in our times today. Okay, so the first thing I want to do is look at Leni Riefenstahl, as I said, remarkable and complicated movie, "Triumph of the Will", which she did in the early 30's, just after the Nazis got to power. And everybody, I'm sure has seen many of the images. And I want to show a few here in still's form, not in moving form, 'cause then we can look at it a bit more closely. And there we go. Triumph of the Will. First of all, that's the poster for it. This is done in the early 30's and this is now 2020, nearly '21. And yet I look at that. On the one hand I look and I see Kitsch, I see corny as hell, but I also see Star Wars, I see Darth Vader.

I see on the one hand a bit of a chilling horror, on the other hand, ironic, close, modernist kind of Kitsch and cliché. And yet something is riveting, can't deny it, is something that is emotionally riveting in that image. You know where the words are, you know everything about it. The colour, the face, I mean, obviously the Nazi insignia on the bottom, that steel helmet, steel style, that face, I mean, something about it is still chilling for me, even though it should just be relegated to historical realms of Kitsch. Leni Riefenstahl's, just to give you few little bits about her life. This film won the award, the gold medal at the Paris World Fair in 1937.

First she was slated by the French and then later wins the Paris World Fair Gold Award. And I mean, she was invited to Hollywood. She really was seen as one of the most innovative, technically and almost visionary gifted filmmakers of her time and perhaps of the last a hundred years. She had an extraordinary ability to understand how the camera could work to produce an amazingly powerful emotional effect on the audience or the spectator. And that's the key phrase for me, how you do produce an emotional effect that will rivet the unconscious and influence it, if not partly colonise it. Much later, of course, in her life, she tried to downplay her relationship with the Nazis and Hitler and all the others.

But as we will see, it was anything but, it was the opposite. Fascinatingly in 2004 at the Hollywood Academy Award ceremony, she was honoured in the "In Memorium" section, which is dedicated to prominent film stars and Hollywood figures who have died in the previous year. 2004, Leni Riefenstahl gets the Hollywood, one of the highest accolades possible. This is what Hitler wrote after he saw *Triumph of the Will* for the first time. "This is a totally unique and incomparable glorification of the power and beauty of our movement." Incomparable glorification of the power and beauty of our movement. And she wins these awards later.

It's complicated because one cannot deny the visionary and technically remarkable innovations that she brought in particular *Triumph of the Will*. And the other great film of hers, really, and I use the word "great" in inverted commas. *Olympia*, which was about the 1936 Berlin Olympics, which she also filmed and edited. Growing up before the 30's, she had Jewish lovers, her first major boyfriend in her own estimation, in her own words, was Jewish. And then discovered that he was not quite welcome as the Nazis were gaining power. Interestingly, Goebbels, his first love that he talks about in his diaries was also Jewish. In the end of the 19, the teens into the early 1920s, right at the beginning.

There were Jews who helped her, helped her career, helped produce, finance. There were lovers, there were writers until the late 20's and early 30's when of course everything changed. She was in one sense the ultimate artistic opportunist, no question about it. And how she managed to combine documentary with fiction in technique to produce piece of works of which straddle the blurred boundary between art and propaganda, which is a fascinating area for all of us with the internet today. And and how that has influenced mainstream media. She read "*Mein Kampf*" shortly after Hitler they had written it in, well she read in the late 20's and she wrote to him and she said, "I was absolutely spellbound. I had an almost apocalyptic vision, which I could

not resist, Mr. Hitler." This is what she writes to Hitler.

She then engineered a way to meet him. And afterwards, I'm not going to use her words, but afterwards, it's so clear, she was totally infatuated whether she had affairs with this guy on and off, we don't know, but, you know, seems possible. The one phrase that struck me was that, and we were talking about Speer the other week. She says, "Albert Speer, I have just met him." This is in a letter to a friend of hers. "He is the second most fascinating man in Germany," after Hitler, of course. The second most fascinating man in Germany.

And the other ways that carries on writing is she's glorifying, sensationalising these guys, these absolute thugs, you know, evil cruel creatures or representatives of humanity in my opinion. And yet they're fascinated and one cannot deny, there is something fascinating about her filmmaking with a kind of walked artistic sensibility. She understands what is fascinating about the grotesque, what is fascinating about evil, what is sensationalist about violence and what isn't, or the potential of violence, the potential of war of mass groups of the individual strong leader, et cetera. She understands it from a technical vision point of view.

And by that I mean the visual as well in the ways of combining what up to then we are pretty rough, raw approaches. You know, this is documentary, this is fiction, this is art, you know, sort of more categorically defined, I suppose the legacy of art and literature of the 19th century would categorise those qualities more. What she does is pulls them all together and says, "What I'm doing is art." She denied that it was just documentary. She filmed, this is of the Nuremberg Rally. And then later, as I said, she did the Olympics in 1936. For the Olympics, she had 400 kilometres of film. It's extraordinary. So this is 1936, the Nazis been in power for three years. She had unlimited resources, financial, technical, unlimited cameras, cameramen, unlimited, you know, people filming all over everywhere.

And then, you know, spend a year in post-production editing the work. So it has to see that for the first time we get underwater filming, first time ever. And all swimming is filmed influenced by her. We get the moving camera on the trolley, the camera, you know, at the side of the runner, a hundred metres or the 800 metres at the Olympics, 400. And we can see them running, you know, as if we were right next to them. It was her innovation. She put the camera on wheels, almost like a small railway set to go around the circle together. She put cameras on elevators, she had cameras on cranes all over everywhere.

She had access to all the resources imaginable. But then of course to pull that 400 kilometres of film and to, you know, come out with a movie of it in the end. She goes to Hollywood and she was hoping that all of this would, in particular the Olympic film and Triumph of the Will, would catapult her into Hollywood. And she goes there. But unfortunately for her happens to be there at the time of Kristallnacht. She denies that it's happening. She says that it's Jewish slander. The only studio moguls who meet her are the Disneys, Walt Disney and others.

The others refuse. And she writes back to Germany at the time. She says, "The Jews have

taken over America, typical of them." Then she writes another letter, which I found, which she wrote to Hitler. And this is after he's come to power, when she's filming *Triumph of the Will*. And you know, she's got everything from him imaginable. Sorry, this is written after the conquest of France. And she writes to him, "You have achieved things without parallel in the history of mankind. Mein Führer, mein Führer, mein Führer. You're the greatest German to have ever lived, mein Führer, mein Führer." At the age of 100, she was interviewed.

She never apologised, she never admitted she knew anything. She always said that she didn't know. She wasn't really sure, she wasn't in the loop. But there are pictures of her in towns in France, in Germany, in the occupied East, watching photographers do mass shootings. We're not sure who they are of. There may be civilians, there may be Jewish, mixture, we don't know. Complicate exactly, she never admitted where, but you can see her in those pictures.

All right. Okay, thanks Judi. Okay, here we see this is the opening part of the film. Hitler comes in an aeroplane, you know, as if the Messiah, the God, whatever. And we see him in the plane and we see flying in slowly descending from the heavens to the masses. And then what I wanted to show was, she carefully chooses Hitler with young schoolgirls. They look in their eyes, they look at him. Very personal with the men and the soldiers. We get the mass automatons. So we get the combination of mass automaton and the individual.

All manufactured engineered by, you know, a really brilliant filmmaker who understands the technique and the craft and art of form. We get the two going together. Then here in another slide here we get again this combination of the individual and the masses. This is all being filmed, okay? She's got so many cameras going. But we can see that how the masses are absolutely uniform, how they're absolutely conformist, automatons, you know, machine isn't even the word, it's just worker bees, ants and the three individuals there, you know, the masters of the master race obviously and how she's filmed Hitler always from underneath looking up. We are always looking up. When he is talking to some of the people occasionally, like in a previous picture with the young school girls, you know, the camera is looking down at them.

The great man has descended to speak to some of the ordinary teenagers. But the great man must always be aspired to up there, up there. Never equal, never down. The masses are always down. We are looking down at the masses, the automatons. And how the camera is shifting constantly between them and around and amongst them. What is prominent in the bottom left is the swastika. That's far more important than the thousand thousands of people inside this. More important than the thousands of worker ants here under the extreme fascism of Nazism of those three individuals. But we don't know who they are.

All that matters is obviously the one and the sky and the clouds behind the guy. So this is all original for the times is what I'm really trying to get at is that when she's doing this in the early 30's, this is all original. This hasn't been done before. We know these, they become so cliché, these images, we've seen them a thousand times. But this is her originating propaganda for the film era. For the visual era of moving pictures, taking with posters and moving pictures and radio

and how it can all be manipulated for propagandistic purposes and how she understands it completely of even the title, "Triumph of the Will", whose will? When, how, what, why triumph? Not questioned. Okay, so in a sense that just gives us an idea. Now this is not a form I want to move on from Leni Riefenstahl. This is not made by her.

This was commissioned by Goebbels, probably the most anti-Semitic or the most prejudicial and horrific propagandistic form ever made. Which shows the Jewish character as you know, the parasite as obsessed with you know, greed and selfishness and ambition and dirty and filthy and creepy and everything that one can imagine being associated with a parasite. Whether the parasite be a flea or a rat, whatever. That picture can look at us today as complete Kitsch and completely corny. But that picture I think has really still influenced many posters of today and always use of the red and those strong, bold colours.

It's all Goebbels' ideas. These are not the filmmakers in terms of uses. And then link to that, look at this here what we see, "Der Deutsche Student", there's a guy, so obvious, right? Obviously the area and the figure, everything. He's standing looking, you know, the muscular, is strong, all of that. It's obvious still the red and the black, not the swastika. The red, the black, the white got to turn somewhere.

Okay, thanks. Okay, so moving on, we get the three clear images. There's the black guy, very small, almost frivolous. You can get the animalistic connotation with the image. It's absolutely clear from the body and from the face. You know, jazz, carefree, carefree, spontaneous. And to be blunt, what it's trying to do is show the primal inverted commas, "primitive savage", who's got a bow tie put on, obviously got the star of David put on. And it's almost like being a bowler hat forced on top. But the eye and the Jewish eye, look at the combination, the white of the eyes in the Jud Süß and the white of the eye in the jazz player.

None of that exists in the Arian image. These are powerful images permeating through in the 30's. It's coming from Goebbels' propaganda, you know, at its ultimate peak in a way. For me, the use of bold colours, how the physicality, it always has to be physicalized in one person or the masses and why they choose black and the star of David and the sax. It's all putting insane things together. What the star of David has to do. And this animalistic image of a black man and the bowler hat forced on, the appearance of the mouth and the nose. You get the animal that it's connected to, it's all inside it. These are not human, Jud Süß, the green face.

These are non-human. These are, you know, subhuman obviously in the end, in the Nazi terminology. Okay? So it's all of it to put together. And the green face, the black, and then the colours on that Arian, even though this is nearly a hundred years ago, it's still for me, striking. And on the other one hand, I want to, I'm repelled. On the other hand, it is important to understand the fascination behind it and how it could have such effect on so many Germans of the time and many others. And what I want to look at in the second half of today's lecture is how this is permeated into propaganda today. Okay, I want you to show some, I want you to just say a few things about propaganda and this goes back to Goebbels before we look at how this has

influenced propaganda today.

Goebbels, "Propaganda must be limited to a few, very few points must harp on these in slogans and bold colours, in pictures, in images. So the last member of the public understands what we want them to understand. Propaganda should be popular, not intellectually pleasing. It is not the task of political leaders or propaganda to espouse intellectual truths. Our task is to rule the masses. Propaganda is our means. Always appeal to nationalism, never appeal to internationalism or the economy. Appeal to nationalism. I have devoted exhaustive study to the protocols of Zion. In the past, objection was always made that they were not suited to present day propaganda. I however, find that we can use them extremely well and I shall use the protocols of Zion. At noon, yesterday I mentioned this to the Führer.

He laughed and he said, 'Do you think the protocols were genuine?' I don't know what he was really thinking." That's Goebbels in his diary. One of the most ridiculous aspects of democracy is the fact that it has offered us the means by which to destroy it. Free speech. This is an extraordinary insight and it speaks to me absolutely with the internet and the mass circulation of any idea. Conspiracy theories, any idea, any theory of today, how free speech can be used by conspiracy theorists. How it can be used by any nut sitting anywhere in their home who happens to get a million or 150,000 likes and people on their Facebook or wherever, free speech. And they start to believe so that one of the extraordinary ironies of the internet age and social media that we are living in, is yes, it democratises free speech.

It democratises more and more that any individual can say what they want on the internet, mostly anywhere. They can generate massive audiences globally. Not only nationally, anything can become the truth. In our post-truth age, everything is equal. What we choose to believe is reality is lies, is conspiracy theory is garbage, nonsense. But anything can, because we have mass, mass exposure through the internet and social media all in the name of free speech. And we are caught in the horns of the dilemma in contemporary democratic times. And I'm not talking about one country at all. I'm talking about all democracies face in our time of creeping fascism and creeping nationalism and tribal identity politics that goes with it. We face the fundamental problem of free speech. Allow it, absolutely, but be very aware how it contains the seeds of its own destruction. Because anyone can use Twitter or Facebook or Instagram, whatever, and get millions of followers. And they believe that's reality. Millions of conspiracy theories about vaccines or whatever it is, science versus faith, truth, what is it?

Extraordinary in the year 2020. I'm stunned but not surprised. So in our times we face the horns of the dilemma of what is free speech? Do we legislate? Once we start limiting where, how and who does the limitation? And if we agree on free speech as a democratic human right, then any other theory can become the description of reality and our perception of reality. And as Wendy once always said to me, "Perception is reality." And I agree completely. The question is for propaganda in our times, in democratic societies, how to manipulate all of this into contemporary times. And Goebbels writing in the 30's talks about that. "The ridiculous joke of democracy is that they have offered us the means by which we can destroy democracy." That's

his own words, Goebbels in his diary. He understood this all those years ago and how to destroy it from within. And it's part of the reason which I discovered much later, why Hitler chose after the failure of the Munich Putsch, I can't say this is the entire reason, but it's a small part of it anyway, to go the democratic route.

Not only 'cause he couldn't stand up to the army, not only because he couldn't stand up to the German army, the military didn't have access to the Prussian generals, et cetera at the time. But he and Goebbels understood, or he understood how he could use propaganda in his own words, "As the terrible weapon to triumph over the masses." So linked to it, you found another way. You didn't have to use guns and weapons and marching armies anymore. Propaganda could do it amongst other things. The one other thing I'd say is that with contemporary work in the mass in our age, John Rawls, who is one of the most, really was one of the brilliant American philosophers. And he argued that the question in the 20th century for democracies was the question of justice and how to entrench and ensure that justice was the ultimate principle that could not be shaken in democracies of our times.

He's writing of, you know, the late 20th century. And what I would argue to what Rawls leaves out and which has become apparent to us in our time is the question of free speech. In the internet, social media age in the way I'm describing it, because it has the seeds of its own destruction within and does not want to stop it or legislate. But one has to be aware that that is the propagandistic tool for every conspiracy theory, if it's about vaccines or whatever it's about on the planet in any democracy anywhere. For it to take root and start to from within, destroy democracy. It's an important and I think crucial question of our times and how we perceive, you know, the notion of living with free speech. This here is being done, these images here from Goebbels, you know, starts to speak a bit to me of some of the things being done on the internet today. All right? I want to show something very surprising, okay?

And you're going to, I'm being provocative here intentionally and people can get upset with me no problem if we can't question things, you know, this is from the 30's, The Greatest Mother in the World, you know, et cetera, et cetera, all of that. You can, that's pretty obvious, the stereotypes that are here. You know, the mother figure linked to the Mary, the Christ figure, the red cross, of course all of that, The Greatest Mother in the World, those three words, right? This is, you know, where propaganda used as the tool to take characteristics of a group, whether they're Jews, whether they're woman, men, whether they're black, whatever, young, older. And you find one dominating physical and intellectual idea and characteristic.

And that becomes a definition of that group. Always personalised propaganda must personalise it in one figure and one physical figure needs that physicality, it needs personification, and it needs the individual is represented of the entire group, the ultimate stereotype, the use of stereotype in propaganda and of course with those couple of words. But they're powerful and as Goebbels said, "Repeat the lie as often and often and often as possible." Show this on the internet, a million, 10 million, 20 million times, what starts to happen? We are repeating it through the internet. We don't have to repeat it through radio or speaking, we can repeat it

through social media.

This year, I wanted to show this because this is these three guys talking about in England, obviously giving, you know, the three wise men, what for me resonates. And it's so subtle and intelligent. They're talking obviously about the virus and the British approach. He, oh, first of all, what resonates for me, three wise men. It's got a religious connotation. There's the wisest in the middle, the true leader's with the blonde hair. Then one of these two on the side are looking at him. I'm not saying it's all consciously choreographed, it may be a lot unconsciously choreographed and it's a bit lighter. It's obviously nothing as pernicious as the other images that I've shown.

We see, you know, NHS UK, coronavirus, boom, it's got the stamp of scientific approval. On the one hand is Mr. Moneybags, The Chancellor of the Exchequer, Rishi Sunak. In the middle, everybody knows the gentleman. On the right is the chief scientist of the UK, Sir Patrick Vallance. So we have the scientific, we have the leader in the middle and we have the financial guru on the side, we have these wooden pillars. This is stately, this is sombre, this is severe. This is very important. Obviously it is, it's corona, it's life, it's death. Totally. I'm just looking at the image, very covertly portrayed to us in Edward Bernays' word, "engineer consent". Not only influence the unconscious but frame the narrative of the unconscious. I'm paraphrasing Edward Bernays from this writing in the 20's and 30's about advertising and propaganda. S

o we have the other two on the side. You know, the only one of the eyes is us. The only one with the visible hand is us. The two flags, the nationalism of the two flags behind, absolutely clear message. The leader, democratically elected, obviously. And then it is wooden panels, which have gravitas. They have weight, they suggest power. You know, we have to have a theory of power to convince us. If we have a theory of knowledge, which gives rise to power, we will buy the power. We will accept power is giving us knowledge. Why are these three guys the experts? Why don't we have three brilliant immunologists or purely scientists or doctors who are only working in the field? Why do these three have to be, you know, every day?

Yes, we need leaders, of course, and we need the science and the money, of course. But I cannot help somewhere thinking the three wise men, the way this is stated, the flag at the back. It's intentionally, at least partly consciously or unconsciously choreographed to give us this impression, you know, and repeat it again and again and again. I'm not saying they're repeating lies, but get the message. Get the message as simple slogan ways, as simple as possible. We start to get a sense of how democracies, the ideas of Goebbels permeate. And let's never forget he did most of his writing and most of the important work before the Nazis came to power.

And then in the early days of the 30 years before they had fully established that total power, you know, by the time of the late 30's Riefenstahl and all the others, it's still the Berlin Olympics. People are coming from all over the world. 1934 Triumph of the Will, you know, it hasn't yet maybe been completely established as absolute totalitarianism. So he's really about shifting a democracy into an extreme fascist state. And that's why he interests me to look at the ideas. We



must understand his mind and the mind of propaganda makers in order to contest and counter them. Going back here to this here, what of Goebbels. "Christ is the genius of love. We must show Christ as love. The opposite is the Jew, the incarnation of hate. An eye for an eye, we must push that single slogan. We must push love our neighbours."

This is all in his diaries. Simple slogan of madness and nonsense. You know, if you have the vaccine, you'll have a genetic malfunction in your body, whatever. The most brilliant propagandistic technique is to confine yourself to a few points, a few images, and show them and repeat them again and again and again and build and make each one more and more incomprehensibly, unbelievably influential. Hmm, this is Goebbels in his diary, he says, "I have examined the English and their use of propaganda. I have noticed how they repeat their lies endlessly until it became the truth."

I have read about the colonial exploits, about their imperial desires. They speak of colonialism, hospitalising the black as bringing religion, civilization, running water, education to the black. They speak of the black primitive savage because he has a spear and an arrow. They do not speak of themselves with guns and bullets and bombs. They have mastered true propaganda in a democracy." This is Goebbels, "If you just repeat the lie, so many times people are bound to start believing in it. Once they start believing in it, in the end, you might believe it yourself." T

his is all Goebbels, for me how it speaks to so many places around the world today is powerful. "What I have learned from the English is that they accuse the other side of that which they are guilty. We in Germany must do the same whether it's about their colonial blacks or whether the way they won the war. Their cleverest trick in propaganda that they used against us Germans during the war was to accuse Germany of what they themselves were doing, whether it was gas, bombs, tanks, or barbaric viciousness and savagery."

To go on, he writes about the Soviet system, "Does not endure because it is bolshevist or Marxist or international. It endures and will endure because it is nationalistic, it is Russian in character. It is not Marxist in character. Notes are ever aroused national passion of the Russian people, in the way that Lenin did or the way that Stalin is doing." And he understands the twist that Stalin has made, you know, into finally arousing, using nationalism of the Russian people as well. Then interestingly, Goebbels, this is Hermann Göring being interviewed, by Leon Goldensohn on the May 24th, 1946 in the Nuremberg Prison.

And Leon Goldensohn together with Goebbels were two psychologists who the Americans brought to interview the Nuremberg prisoners before they were either sentence or during the trial. You try and understand the psychology of these Nazi leaders, and this is what Goebbels said to Goldensohn. And these, by the way, were separate interviews, one-on-one where Goldensohn and Goebbels would go just individually and sit in their cell and just interview them. And these prisoners had the choice of whether they wanted to speak or not, and none of this could be used against them in the trial. So these are Goldensohn's notes which go into the, it's a fascinating book called "The Nuremberg Interviews".

This is Göring. "Personally, I think Goebbels was using anti-Semitism merely as a means of achieving personal power. Whether he had any deep-seated hatred against Jews is highly questionable to me. I think he was too much of a thief and a dishonest opportunist, but a brilliant propagandist, but a brilliant opportunist to have any deep seated feelings for or against anything. You couldn't discuss anything with Goebbels. You couldn't discuss anything with Hitler, Goebbels were so dishonest, it didn't pay to discuss anything with him. And I avoided him as much as possible." Whether Göring is saying the truth on this would have no bearing on his trial.

So there's no reason to think he's not speaking what he thought. I've spoken out the need to personalise, the need to physicalize the idea of parasite, the idea of linking animals to humans, the stereotyping where you take dominant characteristics and you push that as being, this is the entire group, all black, all Jewish, all Christian, all women, all you know, English, all American, all German, whatever. That is how you create pledges, obviously through stereotype, how you make one characteristic and a couple of phrases the defining core and the tools of course of the propagandistic means, posters, phones, and in our day, the internet.

How one takes over the narrative of the other and he talks about English colonialism and how they frame the narrative of the other, obviously the superior, inferior. And he talks about, you know, also the aristocracy in England and the working class middle, you know, et cetera. And to try and learn from that for Germany. This bizarre relationship between the two and I'm not saying he's accurate or not, I'm just trying to understand it from this evil mind of propaganda's perspective, okay? The idea of what this suggests to us also is a, that we have to choose where we'll have our communal bond do we bond with who? And in this image, it's obvious, but what, looking at it, if you're Jewish looking at it, if you're black of any kind, anywhere in the world, and it's only German, that's the only area. That's the only one there. Okay?

I want to just speak a bit about here, because these changed it a bit, here. And this is, I want to speak at Edward Bernays, the guy I mentioned in the beginning, the master, the father of public relations as he's become known, he wrote a book in 1928 and interestingly called it propaganda and argued about engineering consent. Edward Bernays was born to an American Jewish family. His great-grandfather was Isaac Bernays, the chief rabbi of Hamburg. His mother was Freud's sister and his father's sister was Martha Bernays Freud, who married Sigmund. And he really spoke about taking the ideals of, speak to the emotion, speak to the unconscious, personalise it, physicalize it, find the stereotype. All of this is interestingly in a semi-academic book, is in his book, and it's called Propaganda. And yet it's about public relations, advertising and so on. And that book is really revolutionised.

I want to suggest together with, you know, Goebbels' ideas and given in a sense the groundwork for the later architecture of propaganda, the ideas. And the question for our time, of course is are these ideas limited of course is are these ideas limited to our internet mass information age? "This year, be a man, fight for your land." be a man fight for your land. but it's "be a man, fight for your land". Okay, Dad, you know, it's trying to be folksy, Okay, dad, you

know, it's trying to be folksy, lovey dovey daddy, be a man. It's not hammering it as much obviously as the Germans, but it's still, "be a man, fight for your land". but it still be a man fight for your land. That's the definition of manhood, huh? That's what every man and masculinity has to deal with. And I would suggest today as well, no question about it. Interestingly, that is much more prominent than the American flag as opposed to the other one.

The swastikas much more. But the gun in black, the machine gun, there it is, you know, That black gun. Britons, "Your country needs you". These two images are still so relevant and powerful today, you know, over a hundred years later from the first World War, the Kitchener image that Albert Leichter came up with in England. After this image came out in 1914, recruitment into the English, the British Army rocketed by fivefold within a couple of months. After this image, a poster was sent everywhere in the UK. It speaks to the person, it's again, personalised in the image of Kitchener, the finger pointing like the grandfather, the image, et cetera, the colonial, you know, the master, the man understands, the leader, et cetera. We need you. It's not just anybody, it's you. Let's personalise it.

Join your countries, God save the king. Obviously the link to ideologies is pretty obvious and clear. God, the king, country, you individual, Britons. I'm not saying whether it's needed or not. The second word rule, the first or whatever other war. I'm just trying to analyse and understand how propaganda works in our times and why it still works so effectively. This other image of Uncle Sam, "I want you for the US Army". This came from a guy, from a guy called Joseph Flag. And he had to reach a deadline fast. And the deadline was, you had to come up with some image for the army, for the news, for the magazine that he worked for. This is his own face, he didn't have the money to hire a model.

So he used his own face, he had no clue when he did it. This was become one of the most iconic propagandistic images of the last hundred years. No clue, he was pressed for time, pressed for money, used his own image. He understood, he took the influence from the Kitchener, the English image, but he had to find his own way in. Obviously the influence is obvious. But these two became the most powerful iconic images of the first World War and how they stretched into all different variations throughout the century. And I would suggest even up to now in all sorts of modern ways and contemporary ways. The prominent use of red, again, the use of black in the first image is not only Goebbels, so understood, bold, red, black and white for him with the crucial colours.

Well, red, black, look in the Kitchener image. Here, he's using the slightly lighter blue, you know, linked more perhaps to the flag, et cetera. This was done so fast. And his own image, as I said, going instinctively, one doesn't have to have read and understood Goebbels and Edward Bernays or anything that came after anyway for this guy to do this. But instinctively, unconsciously, he understood it and how to make one of the most extraordinary iconic images of propaganda ever with all those elements I'm speaking about. It also by the way, stereotypes England and stereotypes America in a fun way, in a perhaps lighthearted way. Obviously nothing like the extreme fascism of the Nazis, but there's quite a look, there's quite a permanent,

there's quite a sense of force and ferocity and there's an implied guilt trip and threat.

What happens if you don't? Who are you? You know, and why do you want me? You know, it's speaking to me individually, as Goebbels said, "It must speak to the individual, personified always." So once we move to some of the ideas of today with social media is that in the age of mass replication, the power of mass replication, discerning fact and fiction, discerning what is propaganda and what isn't, is no longer, I would suggest so much from top down and a bunch of really clever ideologues and you know, very clever artist or whoever, propagandistic working on their own and only got a few media to go to work through, newspapers, posters, radio. Now we have TV, some of it commercial, some not.

And now we have obviously the internet, not quite as much Orwell's "Big Brother" or "Nineteen Eighty-Four" or the old posters of Lenin and so on. The question is still the same. How do we control truth, free speech and information? Goebbels's whole section in his diaries at different times about those words, "free speech", "information" and "truth". And I want to suggest that it's not so much a central authority anymore, that it necessarily comes from. The ideas may come from a central authority, but the tool of propaganda is the social media. The ultimate tool of democracy, of democratic aspiration is the internet, is social media.

That the central authority may have the ideas, but it relies on social media to get it out to the masses and the millions. It's got to go through that route, you know, possibly including TV, some of the mainstream TVs or not. It's far more slippery than merely a top-down couple of ideas and couple of media to use. So in the information age and a very interesting social media theorist from Yale University argues that the idea is to destroy, use social media to destroy the idea of a single truth. Use social media to destroy the idea of a single truth. Because with social media internet, you can have a thousand truths, a thousand understandings of reality. I use vaccines as one example. Many others.

There are so many different ways you can give a narrative about something which is supposedly reality or truth, a vaccine, a virus, whatever, the horror of the numbers. On the same day that Boris Johnson was in Brussels recently to discuss with the contemporary EU Commission President, I watched the news and there was more time spent on the menu that they ate. And whether the fish was intentionally, because it was about fishing and fisheries, et cetera, that they were trying to negotiate or not the menu than it was of the 547 people who had died because of coronavirus that day. Then I watched Chris Cuomo just by chance on CNN. And what he was talking about was all the stuff happening obviously, and very important of Supreme courts, the courts, et cetera.

And then he said later he said, "Why was I talking about that when more people have died today than died in 911?" I'm just saying I observe these things. The mass media takes over, it's commercially beneficial. Perhaps it's more exciting to watch it, perhaps it's more exciting if we really understand human nature. Is it more exciting to know who's in power, who isn't? What's happening? What was the menu Boris Johnson had with Ursula, you know, in Brussels, you

know, aside from hearing the numbers every day. Stalin, "A million deaths is a statistic, one death is a tragedy," who knows? But all of this says to me, What is the fascination in all of this being given to us as the ultimate truth? And what it is for me to understand it is the goal today of propagandistic characters who propagate this stuff using conspiracy theories, using misleading spin, using, you know, a corruption and disruption of the internet and social media to give out a thousand different alternative truths to the one real truth.

The aim is to undercut the very idea of truth and distract the audience. The phrase of Brexit, "take back control" and putting it in Goebbels' word, as simple as possible, "Sovereignty versus maybe financial prosperity." Of course it's going to go sovereignty and nationalism. Nobody wants to hear about the other. Go back to Goebbels, it's nationalism versus economics. Always nationalism. Russian nationalism or German whatever, not international money, economy only, et cetera. Distract the audience through disrupting and destroying the idea of truth. This is where the notion of the cliched academic idea of the post-truth generation that we are living in. That's what it really means. It means you can have a hundred truths, not one.

And we can all choose what's our truth. And if one takes hold that happens to resonate with the majority of the millions, that'll become the truth. Whether it's faith and not science, whether it's the vaccine is going to cause harm, rather don't have it, whatever it is. And in far more pernicious ways, in many other ways, whether it's mask or no mask, to mask or not to mask in the 21st century. And I look at how propaganda has taken from Goebbels, has taken from Bernays in our own times, I think we can see it so powerfully. It's the use of information in the information age, of course, ironically, and how that can manipulate what the singular idea of a singular truth. Truth, information, and ultimately free speech.

For me, these are the difficult things and they're fascinatingly complicated things to try and grapple with him, understanding how propaganda has moved on from a hundred years ago, but how it still has some of the core principles, they emerge from it. Plato spoke about the problem of free speech in the democracy. How on earth do you regulate? How on earth do you have it? So it goes way back to your facet. You know, the interesting debate Plato has with himself or others. Ultimately we have a marketplace. We have a marketplace of ideas, a marketplace of truths, a marketplace of realities for one reality. It's the destruction of one reality. It's the destruction of truth, it's a destruction of all these questions up for grabs, up for purchase.

It's like going shopping in a supermarket. We can buy this version of truth or this version of reality, not that one as opposed to, and we've got, you know, 50, 23 options as opposed to just two or three main ideas, jostling for power or jostling to harness our unconscious in our way of seeing truth and understanding the absorption of total overkill of information. Blur the line between information and truth and free speech. And we can blur the line between reality and unreality. And we can push propaganda of whatever kind we want and use the mass dissemination of internet and the mass media. Muddy the waters and we can find a way to swim through if we can find that one propagandistic idea, which is going to hook more people than many others.

And it comes from Goebbels, nationalism, stereotype, emotion, unconscious, Bernays, not scientific intellectual reasoning from Goebbels and the others. Finally, as one propagandist, who I won't name said, "Just flood the information, age with, destroy it, and then come in with your idea." That's propaganda for our times. Okay, thank you very much. I'm sorry that we had these couple of glitches.

- [Judi] David, can you see the Q and A at the bottom of the screen?

- Just one second. Just trying to get it up there. Just want to get rid of this. Okay. Q and A. Yep. Yep, got it. Okay, thank you. I can see from Vivian first, is that right?

- [Judi] Yes, if you could read them out and then answer them, that'd be great.

Q&A and Comments:

Q: "As to how, I hope you'll take a look at Trumpism and how lies and authoritarianism operates from Goebbels's mouth too."

A: Vivian, I respect and thank you so much. It's fascinating, but I hesitant to get into particular ideas on contemp politics happening right this very minute, perhaps better in a one-to-one.

Q: Then from anonymous, "Did the Nazis at the time based some of their propaganda and anti-Semitism on the US caste system and racist thinking, as Isabel Wilkerson, author of 'Caste' suggests in a recent book?"

A: Very interesting. I don't know the answer. It's very interesting. I know that she has suggested it. I know the Nazis, Goebbels certainly looked primarily at the British approach to propaganda and I know that obviously the German, Speer and others looked at more the American approach to manufacturing and business and scientific developments.

Okay, from Sorelle, "Isn't the book 'Jud Süß' also an inversion of Lion Feuchtwanger's, yep, 'Stories about the life of Joseph Süss Oppenheimer.' What does mean?" Yeah, yeah, the eternal Jew. Okay, thank you. Thank you very much, Olga. I've just seen your note there. Okay, thank you. "A lie gets halfway around the world before the truth has its trousers on." I know there are so many brilliant quotes from Churchill.

Thank you so much Alan. It's a brilliant, I love that one from Churchill. He brings wit and and sanity into it all. Thank you. Brilliant. Lovely quote. Why on the same rules, naked lies accepted always also apply to getting the truth halfway around. That's the challenge. You know, T.S. Eliot wrote, you know, "Humankind cannot bear too much of reality." Maybe sometimes it's easier to mass propagate illusion.

Q: "Is there such a thing as free speech today, especially with the media censoring, deciding what to put on?"

A: Yeah. And also thank you very much, Monica. It's a great question. I think also with the media today, when this commercial media, profit is the aim, and what I've read about some of the independent commercial media, 'cause profit is the aim, what's important, but even in popular in mainstream, non-commercial with the ratings. And that's why obviously some leaders are obsessed with rate. The more the ratings, the more advertising and the more commercial profit.

So it pays them to, okay, so this conspiracy theory or false idea comes in about vaccines or whatever, masks, and then it pays them to dwell on that more than on the human lives that have been catastrophically lost. And in some of the individuals who've died. It pays to talk about the cacophony of noise around it rather than the harsh truth of what's happening.

Q: The word propaganda from Martin, "The word propaganda has negative connotations, lies. Is that always true? Can it be used in a positive way?"

A: Fantastic question, Martin. I agree entirely, if some of these ideas, and I love the question because if some of these ideas could be used in a positive way, it could absolutely counter it. And my hope in trying to understand these pernicious and ferocious and horrific of using propaganda, these ideas can ironically be used the other way around to counter it and give more positive messages. In the way I was trying to suggest that one can use some of Leni Riefenstahl's techniques in filmmaking. It is, you know, most of Olympic filmmaking and sports filmmaking is still based on that film of hers, Olympia. It can be used in a positive way, in a much more interesting way.

Q: Absolutely. Andrew, thank you. "Why would you compare communications by legitimately elected democratic governments to propaganda by all autocrats dictators and hate mongers?"

A: Thank you. Because I think propaganda is a function of necessity. And as Martin's question was great, one can use it in a propaganda in a negative or positive way. During apartheid, the word "swart gevaar", the red under the bed, McCarthy era, the red under the bed, the slogan named, you know, all of it fits into what I've been trying to say, the stereotype, the slogan, the simplicity, the image, et cetera, the swart gevaar "black danger", under apartheid, you know, or the threat of communism under apartheid.

Those two ideas put together and that's what apartheid's really fighting or McCarthy, the same thing, how you can generate the McCarthy era, how you can generate mass hysteria through prop again. But how you can counter it in the post-apartheid era in the Mandela period was extraordinary because I think some of those ideas did counter it so powerfully and in such a positive way of what it means to really live in a negotiation, what it means to have a governmental national unity. What it means to believe negotiation is the way not on conflict, what it means to have a democratic non-racial society.

I mean, I think whether consciously or not, certain of the slogans pushed in that period, and I can only speak because of knowing that period fairly well. That period was extraordinarily, perhaps idealistically and you know, naively, but it was inspiring in such a positive way to counter the darkness of the propaganda of before. So one can, you know, but they're also democratically elected leaders that I would say, Andrew, you know, or what about Hungary? Poland, elsewhere, democratically elected. Poland, now, you know, they want to stop women having the right for abortion in the 21st century.

A woman has no right of say over her body. I can't agree. You know, so that's democratically elected governor in part of the EU, Hungary, you know, what's happening there with immigrants. And so one can still see Hitler, never forget was democratically elected. They can move one way or the other, I would say, Mbeki in South Africa was democratically elected, but he and his people were partly responsible for nearly, you know, 5 million South Africans dying of HIV because he said it was a western disease.

He said, "Don't take antiretrovirals." He refused free antiretrovirals from the Americans. Why? And certain propagandistic ideas were pushed and as a result, not simplistically as a result, but it was part of the framing and ruling the narrative that so many people just never used a condom, never used a mask. Never used a condom. Why? For me, he's democratically elected. So I think can be used by both. Not necessarily they become fascists in the end, but maybe partly.

Q: Thank you from Catherine. "Perhaps fake news, conspiracy theories on the internet are reactions to 40 years of suppression of free speech in the form of political correctness."

A: That's a fantastic question, Katherine. Political correctness is Rowan Atkinson is to Bean or a black hat as you know, and John Cleese, fantastic speeches they've given on satire requires insult and a lack of political correctness. And I'm all for it because maybe I'm too maverick, I dunno. But the extremity that political correctness has gone to for me personally, is a threat because it ultimately as Goebbels says, "It sows the seeds of its own destruction." Free speech gives the seeds of its own destruction in democracy. It can be taken so far that an alternative narrative which can police the mind comes in. And I think some political correctness certainly does that in my opinion. Thank you Catherine. It's a great question.

Q: From anonymous, "Wonderful topic. Thank you. How do we think about the vulnerability of the collective unconscious this time of social media? Are we more at risk as a species if we are linked to the media?"

A: It's a fascinating question. Thank you, anonymous. The vulnerability of the collective unconscious. That's a lovely way of putting it in this time of social media. Yeah, but perhaps as Goebbels would say and Edward Bernays, I know that became obviously much more part of the global zeitgeist, the word unconscious, you know, from post Freud. But it's always been there.



And perhaps not in that words, and it's a great phrase, the vulnerability of the collection conscious. It can be filled with narratives of truth, narratives of how information is used to construct a narrative of truth or narrative of reality. Therefore, the from anonymous again, thank you.

Therefore propaganda remains at the mercy of evil and good." It can absolutely, thank you, from what we've been saying. Keith, "If it wasn't a Fox News or equivalent, would Trump have 70 million from social media alone?" Yeah, well, you know, you would know far more about America than me, but there's no question, you know, 70 million adherence on Twitter, however many others have throughout different parts of the world. Fox News, you know, it's all about ratings, commercial, it becomes important to follow the plot, follow the story, and more fascinating than report, sometimes the factual truths that you know, however many people have died is a number of 911 or in England, 500 people have died.

It's more important to discuss that the minister of home affairs wants to arrest, you know, immigrants or fishermen around whatever, where's it all placed in the news? What's glossed over, what isn't? Why do we get tired of one story so quickly on the other we to also, to be honest with ourselves. Thanks, Gary.

Q: "Was Goebbels executed?"

A: No, he committed suicide a few hours after Hitler. He and his wife, Magda Goebbels, they committed suicide and they killed their five children in the bunker in Berlin, in Hitler's bunker in Berlin. And they said, Magda Goebbels' word, "It was not worth living a life after the death of the Führer."

"Please say slowly the name of the German filmmaker." Thank you. Thanks. Very, very helpful. The name of the German filmmaker is Leni Riefenstahl and I can email it to if everyone would like through Judi with pleasure. So it's Leni Riefenstahl. From Karen, "Greatest threat to free expression is hypersensitivity to personal insult." That's a fantastic way of putting it, Karen. Thank you. I agree and I listened recently to Rowan Atkinson and John Cleese and Stephen Fry debating and arguing for free expression and not political correctness. Yes, hypersensitive to personal insult. Absolutely.

You can't have satire and much of artistic satire without insult and using stereotype. But to get people to laugh at themselves, not saying the art with guns and march and kill and you know, put in a fascist dictatorship. It's humour. Thank you, Karen. Andrew, "Have you heard Nazi jazz? Am I, am I?" No, I haven't. I'd love to. Thank you, Andrew. It's really interesting. Okay, Philippe, thank you very much for your kind comments Andrew, I can't read that. Philippe, I'm really not trying to, thank you for your point, but it's really not.

You understand propaganda anywhere in the world from apartheid from South Africa, from anywhere, anytime, you know, and whether it's Trump now or Orbán in Hungary or Poland,

wherever, to other countries back here as well. Whatever. You know, Boris, what interests me is how we as human beings absorb, respond, and try and understand how it's working in order to counter it or use it smartly against itself.

- [Judi] We are running out of time, so I suggest we take one more question take or you can do one more question then we'll have to sign off if you don't mind.

Q: Okay, sure. "How long after British recruitment posted did the American one appear?"

A: The American one appeared, I think it was, America entered the war slightly later. The British one was 1914. The American one, if I remember was 1916, late 1915, early 1916. I'll check. Thank you so much.

- [Judi] Thank you so much to everybody. Sorry we can't get all the questions this evening. Thank you so much. Once again, thank you to everybody and we'll see you.

- [Attendee] Should I kiss it better? All better.

- [Wendy] Thank you everybody.

- Thanks so much everybody. Thank you Judi. Thank you Wendy, and thanks everybody so much and let's lift our own positive spirit for Hanukkah and for Christmas.

- [Wendy] Thank you, David. Thank you very much. Thank you, Judi.

- [Judi] Thanks, Wendy. Bye everybody