

The Architects of
Total Quality Management
General Systems Theory
and
Marxist *Theory-Praxis*

Vol. 1-4

A Series of Research Papers

by

Judy McLemore

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- VOL. 1 THE ASPEN INSTITUTE AND MARXIST *PRAXIS*
- VOL. 2 NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH AND THE
UNIVERSITY IN EXILE/GRADUATE FACULTY
- VOL. 3 CRITICAL THEORY MARXISM DIALECTICAL METHOD
AND TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT
- VOL. 4 THE MARXIST THEORY & PRACTICE BEHIND TOTAL
QUALITY MANAGEMENT

Judy McLemore began researching educational issues such as sex education in the 1980's. Her research continued through the 1990's with Outcome Based Education, Goals 2000 which led to Total Quality Management, General Systems Theory, Transformational Marxism, Tavistock, and the National Training Laboratories. She has studied and reviewed thousands of books, training laboratories materials, periodicals, and videos. She received the Eagle Award from Eagle Forum, has done numerous radio talk shows and her articles have been published in various periodicals.

Judy and her husband Doug have two children and two grandchildren.



THE ASPEN
INSTITUTE
and
MARXIST *PRAXIS*

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 1

THE ASPEN
INSTITUTE and
MARXIST *PRAXIS*

by
Judy McLemore

Vol. 1
(Second Edition)

©2002

Institution for Authority Research Dean Gotcher
Herndon, KS 67739

www.authorityresearch.com

THE ASPEN INSTITUTE and MARXIST PRACTICE

by
Judy McLemore

*This is one of a series of papers on the roots of Total Quality Management and its philosophy, General Systems Theory. As a whole, these papers show in the Planners own words, that contrary to TQM's seemingly benign appearance, it is part of a long-range plan to control and remake, not only the citizens of the U. S., but the world. Most important, these papers attempt to reveal the Marxist **Praxis/putting theory into practice** (brainwashing process) that has and is being used to accomplish this task. Due to the complexity of the subject matter, each paper is only one piece of the puzzle. Each paper in turn adds to and/or builds upon, interconnects, and helps clarify the others. The key individuals of the Aspen Institute didn't just pop up with its creation. Their efforts go back far beyond Aspen and continue into the future. Due to space, only an occasional note is made of these efforts [the networking of Thomas Mann, for instance], although some are picked up in other papers in this series.*

As we plunge headlong into the dark abyss of world government, various individuals and groups propose different theories as to just who and/or what groups are leading this death (of freedom) march—Foundations, the Council on Foreign Relations, Skull & Bones, the New Age Movement/Occult, the Trilateral Commission, National Training Laboratories, Tavistock Institute, Club of Rome, United Nations, the so-called environmental movement, International corporations, our government, etc. Suffice it to say that the totalitarian mindset of those individuals who make up the various groups that would enslave the masses, whether that mindset is Elitist, Communist, Humanist or Fascist, varies little. All are hardened atheists and their single-minded mission in life is the total control of universal man and his environment in order to, among other things, remake him in their atheistic likeness. This paper reveals, from the outside looking in, the **Hegelian dialectic in action/practice**.

The Aspen Institute, located in Aspen, Colorado, was founded by individuals with just such a mindset. Foundational to the Institute is the dialectical process, the god of the intellectual life of Germany. The damage done to this country and its people by this Institute is totally beyond calculation. Its beginnings resulted from a meeting, using a Goethe Bicentennial Celebration as a front, of Marxist-Hegelians from around the world (Hyman [Aspen](#) 9). The following is a glimpse of its early history as told by one of its own, Sidney Hyman.

In 1948, Robert M. Hutchins, Guiseppe Antonio Borgese, Arnold Bergstrasser and Walter Paul Paepcke organized a worldwide convocation to commemorate the bicentenary of the birth of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (3, 249). The stated motive for this celebration was to ensure that the “**intellectual life** of Germany, which the Nazis had ruined,” (Hitler had taken over the brainwashing centers and used them for his own ends.) would be “revived and restored” in the “community of Western thought” (Hyman [Aspen](#) 21; Fermi 9).

Guiseppe Antonio Borgese (1882-1952), the “son-in-law of Thomas Mann” (Hyman 3), had emigrated to the U.S. from Mussolini's Italy in 1931. He joined the faculty of the University of Chicago (where Hutchins was president) in the mid-1930's and in order to

“launch his political ideas,” he founded and consequently was editor of Common Cause—the monthly magazine of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution (19; Fermi 116). His “scholarly pursuits” included “Italian thought and action,” and the “interplay of German culture” with “that of Italy” (Hyman 10). Hutchins and Borgese “had worked closely” together “arranging contacts between the University of Chicago and the Goethe University in Frankfurt,” Germany (13). After V-I Day, Borgese and Bergstrasser initiated a program in which “University of Chicago professors were urged to accept teaching assignments at the Goethe University... in order to help revive German Intellectual life” (9), that is, learn Marxist *praxis* (how to apply the Hegelian dialectic in practice). After retiring from the University of Chicago where he stayed for 12 years, Borgese moved back to Italy in 1948 and died there in 1952 (Fermi 116).

Thomas Mann (1875-1955) was a member of the board of directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation which planned the Goethe Celebration (Hyman Aspen 44). Mann’s youngest daughter Elisabeth had met Borgese at Mann’s home in Princeton and married him a year later. She was twenty-one and he was fifty-seven, seven years older than Mann himself (456). Elisabeth assisted Mann in his “literary and political ventures,” and would be an asset to Borgese as well. The Mann family had left Germany in 1931 and after staying 5 years in Switzerland, emigrated in 1937 to the U. S. where Mann obtained the position of lecturer at Princeton. He co-founded the Emergency Rescue Committee to bring likeminded comrades to America (Fermi 85,262-263,265). Mann, a poet and novelist whose work was based on “fact and fiction” as well as homosexual “fantasy and reality,” was a “bisexual” pedophile with a lustful passion for “boys and young men” which lasted apparently until his death at the age of 80. The father of six children, he was cold and detached as well as abusive. He was sexually attracted to his own son Klaus who would later commit suicide. Mann would refuse to cancel his lecture tour to attend his funeral. Later, his grandson Frido as well and daughter Michael, mother of Frido, would also commit suicide. Daughter Erika was convinced that Frido would “grow into a homosexual” because of “the way her father treated him.” Frido married Christine Heisenberg, the daughter of the scientist responsible for General Systems Theory’s uncertainty principle. Although Mann had married the daughter of a very wealthy and prominent Jewish family in his late twenties, he was “less in love with her than with her background” and hoped that the marriage would further his “work.” Mann traveled extensively both in Germany and the U.S. giving “readings” of his novels and lecturing on such topics as “Goethe and Democracy” and “The Position of Sigmund Freud in Modern Cultural History” which he described as a “wide-ranging dissertation on the problem of revolution, with academic intentions” (Hayman 194-195, 200, 250-251, 276, 323, 376, 494, 527, 554, 556, 573, 582, 588, 603, 619). Mann burned the bulk of his diaries and stipulated that the remainder not be published until 20 years after his death. These diaries form the basis of Thomas Mann.

Among those who influenced Mann was Goethe, Nietzsche—to whom Adolf Hitler himself commissioned a shrine which consequently opened in 1938 (Lively & Abrams 71)—Schiller, Oswald Spengler, and Wagner, another Hitler hero to whom Mann had a “lifelong passion.” Throughout his life, his friends and contacts were many and varied. He gave lectures at the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. He had private sittings with the Pope and Queen Juliana of the Netherlands and the Budapest Minister of Culture. He dined with George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, who was a “Fabian” socialist who had visited

Lenin in Moscow in the winter of 1920-21 where he advised him that for socialism to succeed it was “necessary to **reorganize** not only the material side of life but also the *psychology of the whole people*.” Wells advocated the **Fabians’** “evolutionary collectivism” whereby the “existing capitalistic system” is “transformed into a collective one” by a “definite system of education for all society” (Trotsky 172, 180), and **Max Horkheimer** of the Frankfurt School¹ who had been a student/peer of **Max Weber** (Gunnell 154). Mann worked closely with another Frankfurt School member and U.S. emigrant, **Theodor Adorno**, who was his “mentor” concerning the effectiveness of “atonal music” in producing “cultural decadence.” He was a personal friend of **Sigmund Freud** as well. It was Freud who prompted Mann to write “The Tables of the Law” in order to “demythify and demystify biblical material” (Hayman 149, 316-317, 487, 495-496, 608).

It was through his friendship with Josef von Lukacs of Budapest that Mann became associated with his son, Georg Lukacs, another Frankfurt School member (Georg dropped the von). Josef was a “wealthy Jewish capitalist,” and son Georg “was introduced to many prominent European intellectuals, including [Max] Weber,” in his father’s house. In 1912, Georg had become “part of Weber’s circle as well as involved with the ideas of [**Stefan**] **George.**” **Weber** envisioned an “organic cultural order informed [controlled] by an academic elite.” By 1915, Georg was “dedicated to radical renewal through cultural **critique**” (Gunnell 158-159). Georg had “joined the Hungarian Communist Party in 1918” and after “taking part in the uprising of 1919” (of which Antonio Gramsci also participated), he escaped to **Vienna** where Mann “intervened to save him from being extradited out of Austria” to Hungary. It was here that Mann personally got to know Georg although Mann’s work had “determined the essential features” of Georg’s early writings (Gunnell 257, 332-333). Mann developed a “deepening friendship” with Ernst Bertram who, after the war was “classified by the denazification court as a ‘lesser offender,’” whose “lover was Ernst Glocknes, a member of the *male group* that surrounded **Stefan George.**” Mann attended “poetry readings” at the apartment of Ludwig Derleth, another “member” of the **Stefan George Circle**, of which he based a character in one of his novels (554, 197-198, 252-253).

Incidentally, Stefan George, one of the most popular poets in Germany at the time, was among the German “intellectuals” who popularized “Nietzschean fascism” in Germany. He, like Mann, was a pedophile and a “guiding example” to the “Community of the Special,” an organization of German “pederasts” (men who “engage in or desires to engage in sex with boys around the age of puberty”) who argued that “Christian asceticism was responsible for the demise of homosexual relations,” therefore they sought a “complete transformation of Germany from a Judeo-Christian society to a Greco-Uranian one.” When Hitler was elected Chancellor of Germany in 1933, he “appointed George as President of the Nazi Academy of Letters” which he turned down (Lively & Abrams iii, 19-22, 26, 70).

During and after World War II, Mann had become such a promoter for anything and everything pertaining to Soviet Russia, he was denounced by California Congressman

¹ The Communist founded Frankfurt School/Institute for Social Research was the center of Transformational Marxism. Its members integrated Freud's "psychoanalysis and Hegelianized Marxism" and put dialectical theory into practice. After Hitler came to power, they fled the country and eventually made their new home at Columbia University where they immediately set about implementing (and training others to implement) this brainwashing process in America. (Read Martin Jay's [The Dialectical Imagination: A History Of The Frankfurt School And The Institute Of Social Research. 1923-1950.](#))

Donald Jackson as “one of the world’s foremost apologists for Stalin and Company” (Gunnell 585). Mann thought the idea of a “**world order** that is nothing but anti-Communist” was “worse” than one that was “Communist,” and his “antipathy to American anti-communism predisposed him to look charitably on Soviet expansionism” (563, 569). After the Soviets took over East Berlin, the “East German government wanted him to accept the Stalin Peace Prize and the National Prize, both of which he had to refuse, but he *resented having to do so.*” [Queen Juliana wanted to award him the cross of the order of Orange-Nassaw as well] (609). Moreover, Mann’s lesbian daughter Erika and homosexual son Klaus were both “denounced in a Munich paper as ‘leading agents of Stalin in the USA’” (349, 362, 555). Brother Heinrich was awarded the German National Prize for Art and Literature and invited to become president of the German Academy of the Arts in East Berlin which would “solve his financial problems by putting him in the power of a regime controlled by Moscow” (557). Heinrich died a natural death just before leaving America for East Berlin to accept this post.

Although Mann was afraid to accept the Stalin Prize, he did accept the “Weimar Goethe Prize,” which the East Germans offered him along with the “freedom of the city” (562). This was 1949, the year of the Aspen Institute’s birth. Combining a West Berlin lecture tour with his 3-day East Berlin visit to accept the Goethe Prize, daughter Erika noted that both East and West Germany “showered him with ‘godlike honors’” (565). In 1916, Mann had insisted that the “intellectual must never take *direct* political action” but by 1923, he “saw it as his duty to move into that dimension” (347). His entire adult life is a testament to that.

Arnold Bergstrasser’s [1896-1964] “formal training was in the social and political sciences,” but when he emigrated from Germany in 1937, he taught cultural sociology, history and German literature at Claremont College in California. In 1944, he was “called to the University of Chicago to teach in the Army Specialized Training Program for soldiers who were to be sent to Germany to become members of the military government.” When this mission was accomplished, he accepted an offer to stay in the German department at the University. Here Bergstrasser, “enlisting the collaboration of German-born colleagues in other departments” succeeded in “raising the level of German culture [Marxist *praxis*] in the community.” Among his “achievements” was the Goethe Festival at Aspen. He returned to Germany in 1951 “to pick up the threads of his interrupted career.” Having asserted that “reconciling political and ideological differences between American and German-born colleagues had not always been easy,” back in Germany Bergstrasser helped “plan and promote” the John F. Kennedy Institute of the Free University in Berlin, an institute “engaged in the study of all aspects of American culture.” He would promote this institute “until his death” (Fermi 102-103, 390). According to fellow Heidelberg émigré Hannah Arendt, before leaving Germany Bergstrasser “had successfully accommodated himself to the [Hitler] regime,” until it was “shown that he had a whole string of Jewish ancestors.” It was Bergstrasser, says Arendt, that was “the real moving force behind this [Goethe Celebration] program” (Kohler & Saner 136).

In 1929, Robert Hutchins had come to the University of Chicago from Yale Law School where he had “embraced legal realism.” By the mid-1930’s, he had turned against the “philosophical heritage” of John Dewey and turned toward a “neoclassical Aristotelian/Thomist natural law philosophy.” He recruited Mortimer Adler and his “emphasis” on the “great books” from Columbia to Chicago in 1930, as well as others who

“joined the attack on scientism and the related version of liberalism.” Hutchins argued in his manifesto, The Higher Learning in America, that “metaphysics must do for the modern university what theology had done in the Middle Ages—provide an ordering principle and an ‘intelligible basis for the study of man in his relations with other men’“ (Gunnell 132).

Hutchins spent 19 years as president of the University of Chicago [he resigned the presidency in 1947 and became chancellor] attempting to “restructure American higher education” (Hyman Aspen 3). [He became vice-president of the newly formed Ford Foundation in 1950 with Aspen Institute trustee, Clarence Faust, who was “at the forefront of foundation work in support of education” (97-98)]. As head of the University, his “educational purpose” was to achieve “a unifying synthesis about man and his world” (21). He believed that the best formal education for students was “preparatory for a lifetime of **adult learning**” (17). Hutchins sought to “make the University of Chicago the place to *initiate* and test the *revolutionary changes* he felt were imperative” (15). As a result of his efforts, he “appeared to be ‘Blasphemous the First’ to some members of his own faculty and to most American educators in the 1930’s and 1940’s” (14). Hutchins’ reforms sound disgustingly familiar, for instance, viewing the “learning process as a lifelong enterprise; producing students capable of discussing ‘common problems,’ etc.” In Hutchins’ view, the “immediate objective” of education was to “make the student not learned, but capable of learning,” while the “larger objective” was to provide society with citizens who could “communicate” (16). [Hutchins’ believed “communication” was a “precondition for a world order” (20)]. The “strong resistance” he met led him to say that “every advance in education is made over the dead bodies of 10,000 resisting professors,” later rephrasing the thought by saying that ‘it is harder to change a curriculum than it is to move a cemetery.’ Professor Mortimer Adler was Hutchins’ “principal co-worker” and “collaborator” in this effort as well as on many other “different and difficult projects” (15). (Their ideas on education reform would be taken up by the Aspen Institute.) One of these projects was the teaching of a two-year “**Great Books**” course at the University to a “select group” of undergraduates. [The “Ideas” in the Great Books were presented in “dialectical form.” (Hyman, Benton 494).] Those students who underwent the full two years of this brainwashing process “took away” what...

often became the invisible hand that shaped the order of valued, judgments, and personal commitments in their mature years. Among the students who were seminar participants in the last half of the 1930’s, what has just been said was true of Mrs. Katherine Graham, now the publishers of the Washington Post. It was true of Charles Percy, now the United States senator from Illinois. It was also true of Robert O. Anderson... (Hyman, Aspen 17-18)

Hutchins also joined with Adler in teaching “The Fat Man’s Seminar” which was “based on the Great Books.” This course, based on **Marxist Praxis**/putting dialectical theory into practice/action, targeted University “trustees” and “Chicago business leaders” (18). He was also the chairman of the **Committee to Frame a World Constitution**, on which he worked closed with Borgese (13). In a public statement preceding its 1948 draft publication, Hutchins explained the “precondition for a world order:”

...One good world requires more than the sacrifice of ancient prejudices (traditional beliefs, values, etc.). It requires the formulation and adoption of common principles and ideas [**consensus**]. It requires that this be done on a **world-wide** basis...communication lies at the foundation of any durable community. By communication, I do not refer to the means of communication, but to a common understanding of what is communicated... (20)

Hutchins had been an undergraduate at **Oberlin College**² for two years before dropping out during World War I to join the army and was subsequently stationed in Italy. He later boasted: “I memorized long passages [of the first volume of the Witkowski edition of Goethe’s Faust] while on guard duty, reciting the language of the *enemy* while in the midst of my sleeping compatriots” (14, 112).

Walter Paul Paepcke, an “admiring student of Goethe and of the German tradition” (Hyman, Aspen 26), was founder and CEO of the Container Corporation of America. He insisted that the Goethe celebration be held at Aspen, Colorado where he owned a good deal of land and real estate. His wife Elizabeth was the sister of **Paul Nitze**, who would later become an Aspen Institute participant and trustee and “successively head of the State Department’s Policy Planning Board, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, and Secretary of the Navy” (35). Paepcke and wife had been “regular participants” at The Fat Man’s Seminar (18).

In order to fund the celebration, a Goethe Bicentennial Foundation was created as a nonprofit corporation. Among the “criteria” used to recruit “officers and directors” for the foundation was the stipulation that those chosen “must reflect the many facets of Goethe’s own life” (43). As described by Hyman, Goethe had a “faith in man’s *divine* ability to live” a “**communal life.**” He offered “creative diversity” and in the place of walls raised to “isolate one mind from the next, he offered an open road to *communion* among human beings.” Goethe made...

all facets of his life a harmony of mind and body, of imagination and precept, of power and responsibility, his philosophy of life synthesized the natural sciences and humanistic studies. Undogmatic, religious in essence...he looked to that humanistic heritage and the sciences for the metaphors which illuminate the underlying unity of everything. “All things,” said he...“weave themselves into a **whole.**”

Since Goethe placed his faith in the spirit of man, his first concern was with the means of...releasing that spirit...

To Goethe, the basis of the human community was communication...What he wanted, said he, was “the union of groups of good mental standards which hitherto had little contact with each other, the recognition of one common purpose, the conviction of the necessity to keep informed about the current course of world events, in the real (what is) and the ideal (what ought to be) sense.” It was not necessary for

² Oberlin College became the home of Hungarian émigré Oscar Jaszi after he immigrated to America in 1923. Here Jaszi, together with Karl Geiser, largely constituted the political science department. In Hungary, he had “founded and led the radical Society for Social Sciences—an association patterned after the Fabians and devoted to social and political reform.” He was later associated, along with Frankfurt School member **Georg Lukacs**, with the Hungarian Free School for the Social Sciences which targeted the working class for **re-education**. (Gunnell 102-103)

everyone to agree with everyone else. “The question to ask,” said Goethe, “is not whether we are perfectly agreed, but whether we are proceeding from a **common** basis of **sentiment**.”³ (11-13)

More than 2,000 individuals from around the world gathered at Aspen on June 27, 1949, to discuss Goethe and his relationship to the “unity of mankind” (45). Hutchins and Borgese jointly prepared a statement (this “statement” became a “testament that would animate the Aspen Institute of the future”) (48), which was released at the start of the convocation. It read in part:

If **man** is somehow **one** and if the **world** is somehow **one**, it is not too soon to wonder what it is that unifies⁴ both man and the world. World organization will be human community or it will not be at all. And the great society...will not become the human community until it finds the common spirit that is man... (81)

In his speech on the closing day of the convocation, Hutchins’ remarks echoed the thread running through the conference. He concluded by saying:

There is no reason why...we cannot use the incredible means of communication...to promote the unity of mankind...

In one good Goethean world the means of communication...would be used...to exchange students, professors, ideas and books and to develop a supranational community founded on the humanity of the whole human race. The essence of the Civilization of the Dialogue is communication. The Civilization of the Dialogue presupposes mutual respect and understanding; it does not presuppose agreement...In Wilhelm Meister, there is a speech which, it seems to me, is appropriately addressed to this assembly on this great occasion: “Since we came together so miraculously...let us together become active in a noble manner!... Let us make a league for this...” (86)

Hyman, a participant at the convocation, explains:

In Hutchins’ terms, the Goethe bicentennial was...a marked success in “**adult education**.” Men and women from diverse walks of life had come together not only to listen to what eminent scholars had to say, but also to communicate with them and with each other about a great range of common concerns. It was something he had long struggled to bring about in the context of a great university...Could it be recreated and kept alive in some form once the convocation was over? (88)

Indeed it could! The task ahead was not “gaining more knowledge and more goods” but taking existing knowledge and goods to “do the right thing with them.” This perspective

³ [sentiment—opinion colored by emotion; an appeal to the emotions; combination of feelings and opinions] in other words **CONSENSUS**.

⁴ For Hegel, as for these Hegelian Aspenites, the world evolved into an **organic whole** via **putting the dialectical process into practice**.

would become the basis of the Aspen Institute (87). After the Goethe convocation, Paepcke took the lead in organizing what would become the **Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies**. This would be a place where eventually everyone from Supreme Court judges and congressmen and senators to CEOs and international political figures would come to participate in the “Executive Seminars” based on Marxist *Praxis*. Some came to facilitate while others were targeted victims. Paepcke sought advice on this endeavor from an old pro, Spanish philosopher **Jose Ortega y Gasset**, a convocation participant and later trustee of the Institute. Ortega proposed the creation at Aspen of a “Hochschule” for advanced studies, a “High School” of sorts for the “Humanities,” a humanities concerned with “specifically human facts” and “most principally—current human problems.” Its “**educational mission**” would be to promote a “**total synthesis of human life**” and to make “a single discipline” of the “physical and biological sciences and the humanities.” This “synthesis” would be “achieved” “on the basis of a library with very few but **masterly chosen** volumes. The “physical” environment of Aspen was designed to produce just enough “comforts” so that the “human individual, free from material hindrances, can...allow his inner self to live intensely and *give himself fully to thinking, imagining, loving, and feeling*.” Any conveniences that did not produce this “effect” were considered “excess” because they would cause man to give himself “over to comforts instead of himself” (93-94).

The “first and second educational principles of the new school should be Spartanism and elegance.” Spartanism included “continuity of effort” and “endurance.” “Elegance,” explained Ortega, “**must penetrate, influence a man’s entire life**, from his gestures and ways of talking...to the most intimate side of his moral and intellectual **actions**.” The “normal curriculum” would include public lectures which would bring together five or six intellectuals who were “equal mentally” and whose “**opposed views**” were “held at the same level,” that is, given the same weight whether they were Marxist, Capitalist, or whatever. The theme of such courses, lectures, and colloquies “must be extremely vivid, deeply human (to elicit emotional responses), and should offer a great incentive to the general public even if **they must be treated with a thorough-going scientific rigor**.” These “intellectuals” would serve as “**models**” to participants. The “idea,” said Ortega, is to...

create in the Aspen summer a “world.” A “world” however, is not a fortuitous gathering of individuals. It is a living together informed by **unity**...Such unity, however, will not crystallize unless there is a permanent **instrument of general collective life in Aspen**. (95)

A passage that served as a “directional signal” to the Institute was: “The domain assigned to human *reason*⁵ is that of *work and action*” (84). Primary to the Institute’s “purpose” was helping man “rediscover” the “spiritual truths which will enable men to control science and all its machinery” (98). The founders were motivated by their desire to “**bridge the gap between the ideal and the real**” (viii). Their work at Aspen would be in “spotting emerging *problems*, in examining them from different perspectives, and in formulating *alternative responses* to them” (6). Hyman explains that the...

⁵ “Reason...was the critical tribunal on which Critical Theory was primarily based.” (Jay 61)

Institute takes its unity from an idea and a commitment shared by the participants in its inner life, regardless of the city, nation, or continent where they otherwise make their home. The idea is, that any salient problem of contemporary human existence now shares a common frontier or merges with every other salient problem, and that any solutions framed for a particular problem must take into account its linkages to the rest. The commitment is to all the meanings packed into the strategic word “humanistic”—to search for ways in which “man,” in Martin Buber’s phrase, “can reach for the divine, not by reaching above the human, but by striving **to become...**” (7)

Consequently, the Institute’s “conferences and workshops” focused on “problems of contemporary life” that were “transnational, transregional, and transsocietal” (6). Many of the Institute’s trustees had been “prominently associated” with the Goethe convocation, either as officers and directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation or as featured speakers. The rest came from “education, business and government” (97-98).

So on the initiative of Paepcke, a “version” of “The Fat Man’s Seminar in the Great Books” was developed by the Institute to be offered in the summer at Aspen (96). To help launch this 1950 “trial run,” Mortimer Adler “recruited,” among others, the help of Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Menninger (who would later bring social scientists from **Tavistock** to his clinic in Topeka, Kansas), Clare Booth Luce (wife of Henry Luce, Jr.), Clarence Faust (who had been “among the leaders of the Great Books Movement at the University of Chicago, but was now at the forefront of *foundation work in support of education*”), and Robert Hutchins (then the vice-president of the newly formed **Ford Foundation**) (97-98).

Yale’s Skull & Bones member, Henry Luce, Jr.,⁶ the creator of the Time, Inc. publishing empire and a friend of Hutchins, had been a member of the American Policy Commission. This Commission had been formed at the University of Chicago by mutual friends, **William Benton**⁷ (a Senator from Illinois (148) and “master of communication” who Hutchins recruited to be vice-president of the University of Chicago (18)) and Paul Hoffman⁸ and was the “forerunner of the Hoffman-Benton-led **Committee for Economic Development**” (100).

⁶ Luce’s membership in Skull & Bones, as well as former president George Bush—who introduced America to the phrase, “New World Order”—was disclosed in a documentary on Secret Societies on T.V.’s A&E, 11-22-98. A video tape of this program may be obtained by calling 1-800-423-1212.

⁷ Hutchins, Benton, Luce as well as Ralph Ingersoll had been classmates and friends at Yale (Hutchins entering as a junior from Oberlin). Ralph Ingersoll, who would later be a “central figure for a while in the publishing empire of Henry Luce, Jr.,” was the “creator and publisher of the short-lived newspaper PM.” Taking a leave of absence from Luce Publishing, Ingersoll turned to Benton in 1939 to help him get PM started and off the ground. For his work, Benton was given one thousand shares of stock in PM. Benton, then vice-president of the University of Chicago, later went to work for PM under a “half-time agreement with the university” (Hyman Benton 68,219-221). PM was a “close American cousin to the Parisian Stalinist daily Ce Soir and “high-level” Soviet agents “including **Louis Dolivet**, could be found hovering near PM throughout its existence” (Koch 190). See “The New School for Social Research,” another paper in this series, for more information on Louis Dolivet.

⁸ Paul Hoffman, the first administrator of the Marshall Plan who succeeded General William Donovan as the “leading spirit” of the **Committee for a United Europe**, tapped Benton to “help formulate the committee’s policies for promoting the economic and political integration of Europe.” The committee financed studies (“guided by specific recommendations made principally by **Jean Monnet**, and Robert Schumann and Paul-Henri Spaak”) that helped “layout the economic grounds” for what later became the European Common Market, the forerunner of today’s European Economic Union. (Hyman, Benton 509-510)

During this trial run of The Fat Man’s Seminar, Luce sat in on one of these brainwashing sessions of which his wife, Clare Booth, was a facilitator. Later that night at the home of Paepcke, he suggested that it was the “unwashed American businessman” [those who supported free enterprise rather than monopoly capitalism/communism] that should be targeted “to share and experience directly” what he had seen occur that night. “He is the man you want,” explained Luce, “because he is the man who needs you the most” (101). In other words, it was the brain of the traditional businessman that needed washing the most. This idea “led to a swirl of excited talk” that...

recognized that the postwar **Committee for Economic Development** was doing important work in getting businessmen to devote time, effort, energy, and money to the task of clarifying their own minds and those of their fellow citizens about the major alternatives of national economic policy...But the need was for something that went beyond the limits of economics—or even beyond the Fat Man’s Seminar in the Great Books...**The need was for business leaders to sit at the same table with leaders in the world of letters, theology, government, labor, and science to discuss a broad range of problems of contemporary society and Western civilization**... (101)

Luce’s desire to wash the brain of the American businessman resulted in the Institute’s “Executive Seminar,” which targeted “established or potential heads of corporations.” Hence, The Fat Man’s Seminar became the Executive Seminar, the brainwashing dialectical “rock” upon which Aspen was “built” (220) and has remained the “cornerstone of the Aspen Institute from 1951 to the present” (102).

THE EXECUTIVE SEMINAR—A LESSON IN BRAINWASHING [i.e. the Dialectical Process in Action/*Praxis*]

Philosophy of praxis is both a euphemism for Marxism and an autonomous term used by (Antonio) Gramsci to define what he saw to be a central characteristic of the philosophy of Marxism, the inseparable link it establishes between **theory and practice, thought and action**. (Gramsci xiii)

The “creator and mainspring” of the Executive Seminars was Mortimer Adler (Hyman Aspen 134). In the “cadre of seminar leaders Adler recruited were some of the *most experienced* and gifted teachers [change agents/facilitators] in the nation” (130). The Executive Seminars consisted of a “sequence of sessions spread over twelve days” where **groups**, who had been assigned to read before-hand carefully chosen “selections” from carefully chosen books, would meet for “discussions” and “argument.” These selections contained a “sweep of tough thinking about social, economic, and political problems,” and were “from the Bible, from Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, and Thucydides,” as well as “selections from the Federalist papers, from *Karl Marx*, from *Sigmund Freud*.” All “dealt with ideas such as **equality, liberty, justice, and property**—ideas of central importance to an understanding of ‘democracy’ and ‘capitalism’ as well as of *their opposites*, ‘totalitarianism’ and ‘communism.’” The selections were designed to “widen the arc of perceptions about the

same four fundamental ideas” and...

to avoid the bogus clarity where only one side of a case is seen, the readings for a given day would include conflicting views about major issues. **Seminar participants would then be asked to formulate the terms of the conflict, to state where they stood** with respect to the rival sides, **and to defend their positions under challenge**.

Although the premise of the readings and discussions assumed that the truth was in principle discoverable—else, why bother to seek it by means of an argument?—**the seminars would teach no dogmas but would encourage the participants to examine all dogmas, starting with their own**. Further, the Executive Seminar would not provide businessmen with pat answers to the practical problems they faced... (106-107)

Obviously, it was “not the aim of the Aspen Executive Seminars to make a better treasurer out of a treasurer, or a better credit manager out of a credit manager, or to show how an advertising vice-president can be more effective in promoting a product” (107). As Luce had suggested and what the *process* was designed and proven to do was to wash or rid the brain of the individual of his/her traditional beliefs, convictions, and values. Not unlike the industrialist who collaborated with Hitler, many of the businessmen recruited for Aspen came initially because “they hoped to sell something” to Paepcke and his Container Corporation but instead, were “subjected to a treatment” that would eventually change their very worldview. From all accounts, very few failed to succumb to the “unsettling impact” (218) of these seminars. One discerning and therefore irate participant, a banker, drew a “fellow participant” aside: “This whole program is nothing more than a New Deal or **Communist plot to undermine the free enterprise system**. Look at the stuff we’ve been asked to read, and just listen to the outrageous things being said in the discussions!” raged the banker. Unfortunately, the banker had unknowingly expressed his views to the enemy, a fellow who had been involved in the “Great Books movement” (108-109).

Businessmen as well as “moderators” and “special guests” from non-business backgrounds who were “exposed to the early Executive Seminars, developed a lasting attachment to the Institute” (111). As a result of this “leader education,” a “spirit of fraternity sprang up” among those who attended (150). **Between 1951 and 1964, more than “400 corporations” had participated and “more than 2,000 alumni of the Executive Seminars held places of leadership in business, labor, government, the professions, the universities, and the arts and sciences.”** In the years ahead, the Institute continually held “refresher” seminars for the alumni at Aspen, Washington, New York and various other major cities around the country (176). These alumni would play a major role in the Institute’s plans to deceive the masses.

Paepcke also created a summer musical festival (and school as well as Health Center) at Aspen which “acted as a magnet which drew to the Institute’s Executive Seminars figures of the first rank in the realms of commerce and industry, government and the professions, the arts and sciences” (130). He “drew heavily on his personal profits from his Aspen companies to cover the deficits of the Institute” (121). This paid off! Between...

1954 and 1955, Paepcke could look across the country and derive satisfaction from

the flattering way in which the external form of the Aspen Executive Seminar was being imitated in one place and another... (130)

Initially, “adversary” figures in the ranks of “labor” were brought in to the Executive Seminars to interact with the businessmen. Then the “black community,” and by the end of the sixties radical “student leaders were brought into the seminars to challenge the values of the business executives” (117-118). By 1975, almost half the participants targeted were judges, political leaders, scholars, writers, artists, etc. Hyman boasts that 25 years after the Executive Seminars began, participants...

in the Executive Seminars have tended to show the same pattern of responses, regardless of the year when they came to Aspen or the people who flanked them. In the opening sessions, for example, some businessmen tended to be restrained, wary, noncommittal, afraid to speak in an unfamiliar vocabulary lest they stammer and appear ridiculous in the eyes of their peers. Others tended to be unbuttoned, voluble, confident, seemingly certain when they spoke, the gods in heaven would be edified. But as the days passed, both types found it increasingly difficult to adhere to their initial stance. The first could not evade questions when they were asked to explain themselves. The second could not speak and go unchallenged. **Members of either group could be badly shaken, wounded in their pride of intellect, embarrassed by the exposure of their limited perceptions**, angry on that account...Most seminars, however, reached a moment where the crisis of self-esteem was passed and **men began to speak their minds freely**... (118-119)

In 1957, at Paepcke’s urging, Robert O. Anderson took over as president of the Institute because Paepcke’s Container Corporation was “about to embark on an overseas expansion program in advance of the impending official birth of the *European Common Market*.” Anderson was “among other things, the chairman of the board of the Atlantic Richfield Oil Company, the foremost rancher in New Mexico, the owner of assorted mining and manufacturing companies, a former president of the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank, a director of the Chase National Bank, a director of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, president of the Lovelace Clinic...a trustee of the University of Chicago, a trustee of the California Institute of Technology” and “a figure of central importance to the Aspen Institute and its network of affiliated institutions” (125). The post of “chairman” of the Institute’s board of trustees was created for Paepcke, who remained involved in the Institute until his death three years later (138-139). The fees charged for participation in the Executive seminars “never covered the operating cost” (176), so Anderson, like Paepcke before, would use his personal wealth to fund the Institute. By 1971, the “base of support” for Aspen had been widened “most notably by contributions of foundations and corporations.” By 1975, the Institute had received “substantial” project and program grants from the likes of the **City of Berlin, the German Marshall Fund, the National Endowment for the Humanities, Carnegie Foundation, Ford Foundation, Henry Luce, Andrew Mellon, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Family Fund, Russell Sage, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Edna McConnell Clark, Commonwealth Fund, Danforth, Spencer Fund, North Star, Charles Kettering and Lilly Endowment, among others. Corporate contributions were made by**

ABC, CBS, NBC, IBM, Thomas J. Watson—head of IBM (see IBM/Watson below), Sperry Rand, Weyerhaeuser, A.T.& T., Chase Manhattan Bank, Exxon, First National Bank of Chicago, Ford Motor Company, Coca Cola, Sears Roebuck, Smith Barney, General Mills, Motorola, Container Corporation of America, Goodyear, Bristol Myers and Borg Warner, to name a few (375-376).

As mentioned earlier, Anderson was a product of the University of Chicago's Great Books movement and "one of its *missionaries* in the business community" (146). When he became president of Aspen, the Executive Seminars were given even more prominence by being "put on a year-round basis." Anderson was determined that the Institute remain a forum where individuals, organized into groups,

could cross disciplines in an *open* manner and *speak their minds freely*. It must remain a place whose *institutional neutrality* would permit it to consider any topic however "controversial" and *to bring to bear on it a great diversity of view-points, however heretical*. It must help **define the questions of public policy** worth asking, must help **clarify** the range and implications of **alternative answers to them**, but the conclusions drawn by individuals who shared the work of *clarification* must in every case *be their own*. (145-146)

How's that for facilitating individual "commitment" and "ownership" of these totalitarian's predetermined goals and objectives?

Anderson and Company determined that the Institute needed to "expand its *field of action* beyond the framework of the Executive Seminars." Since their inception, the seminars had brought in "major representatives of the American Scientific Community" to "enter into *face-to-face discussions*" with business leaders but this "was not enough." It didn't permit a "sustained examination" of the "breach" between the "humanities" and the "sciences" and thus the Institute's goal of "synthesizing into a single culture" the two "rival cultures" (151). To this end, the Institute initiated a series of one-week seminars from 1961-1965 on "science and society" funded by the *National Science Foundation*, that brought together "humanists, scientists, business leaders, university executives, labor leaders, clergymen, editors, and key governmental officials in both the civil and military order." Included were movers and shakers from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Army research, and the Department of Defense, to International Planned Parenthood Association, and the U. S. Department of Education (153). The Institute **framed** the "central question" put to these "American leaders" and the "continuity among some of the participants in the successive seminars, augmented by *cadres* of new participants" permitted the "question" to be asked at "regular intervals," thus "leading to progressive *clarification* of the subject matter under *discussion*" (154). As a result, "the Aspen initiative helped stimulate many regional seminars in universities and among private organizations" on the "relationship between science and government" and the "interplay between the sciences and the humanities."

In addition, the...

discussions spreading outward from Aspen helped prepare the **ground for the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) as a matching piece to the National Science Foundation. Two men who played major but**

different roles in the birth of the NEH—Barnaby C. Kenney, president of Brown University, and Thomas Watson, president of the *International Business Machines Corporation*—had long been intimately associated with the activities of the Aspen Institute (154).

If you will recall, it was the *International Business Machines Corporation's (IBM)* “Director of International Education” who later “conceived” of The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education which contained the Business Roundtable’s “agenda for educational *change*.” This “agenda,” written by the RAND Corporation’s “Senior Social Scientist” Paul T. Hill and David Hornbeck, provided the “blueprint” for the nation’s Outcome-Based Education restructuring movement. At the time, IBM’s Chairman of the Board, John Akers, was also chairman of The Business Roundtable Education Task Force (Hill and Hornbeck, Acknowledgements and Introduction).

At the same time, it was decided that the Institute needed a “division” of theoretical physics, molecular biology and theological studies with the Institute “oversee[ing]” their “activities.” It is indicated, but not explicitly stated, that the idea behind this was to bring like-minded “scientists” together to produce theories or “speculative constructs” (which build on, support, and give creditability to each) of which the Institute needed to support its revolution while at the same time, giving these “scientists” an “insurance policy” against any true scientific critique (Hyman Aspen 155-157, 215). It is so-called new theories in physics and findings in biology that are used to justify the new pantheistic worldview of General Systems Theory—the philosophy of Total Quality Management.

The influence the Institute and its cadres has had on America is unbelievable. For example, in order to “extend” its “humanistic studies,” the Institute targeted Hollywood. The goal was for the Institute to become the “meeting ground on which the fragmented and competitive parts of Hollywood and its environs in the industry might compare values, exchange ideas, and ultimately improve their work” because at that time, typical movies still projected the “dreams of an industrial society by industrial means” (traditional American beliefs and values) and in the Institute’s view, this needed to be “seriously challenged.” The first Annual Aspen Film Conference was organized in 1963. The idea was to provide a “**common meeting ground**” for the industry and “the ideas and criticisms of interested outsiders” in order for “the movie industry to subject itself to **searching self-examination**.” The keynote speaker, Lionel Trilling, spoke of the day “when films would be made that would have validities and powers equivalent to those to which we respond in...fictional narrative and stage drama,” i.e. emotionally. He noted that “new and intense efforts” were being made to “overcome the financial controls which have limited the artists of film in their *right to say what they think ought to be said, to show what they think ought to be shown*” and furthermore, the “cultural circumstances which kept the film in economic chains—namely, the efforts by financial interests to *satisfy the tastes and preferences of large egalitarian populations—were undergoing a change*.” Trilling’s remarks were initially met with “naked animosity,” but by “earnestly discussing” Trilling’s “thesis,” the industry’s “attitudes began to change” (Hyman Aspen 163-165).

Later, “young film makers” were targeted to add to the mix. Typically, the “matters discussed at the Aspen Film Conferences later became the themes for debates carried on elsewhere in private forums or through the public media.” In addition, the papers/material

prepared for the conferences “was soon put to use as teaching aids in colleges” (166). Still later, the film “with its rapidly advancing technology as in television” became the “subject of sustained inquires by the Aspen Institute’s major program on Communication and Society” (167).

The Institute targeted business schools. The Institute co-sponsored, with the Committee on Educational Development’s Subcommittee on Education, a special conference on “economic education” for three successive years. The conferences began with criticism of the existing economic education provided by the nation’s business schools which “lagged far behind the pace of changes both in the business world and in the subject of economics itself” (167). Aspen’s economics education saw man as not only governed by his own economic interests but by his “convictions, his nostalgia, his will, and his passions.” Furthermore, his “interests” aren’t confined to profits but include the “desire for a sense of personal worth, for attention, for variety, for leisure, for independence, for security, for friendship, for social utility, for knowledge.” In fact, the “concept of interest” is not confined to the bounds of a single person but moves outward until its “underlying social philosophy must take into account not only the facts of utility but those of **justice**.” The “careful economic theorist,” therefore, is aware that “marketplace competition, in the psychological meaning, is a non-economic interest,” that “applied economics in business life” must take account of “errors and motives such as prejudice, curiosity, and the various forms of human interplay which do not conform to the pattern of economic rationality” and that the “essential factor of *wants*—their propriety and how they *are met through a system of distributive justice*—cannot be assessed with the tools of economic analysis alone. They can be *assessed* only with the help of other disciplines such as *philosophy, history, political science, ethics, sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology, and statistics*” (168).

Moreover, the old school curriculum seldom reflected advances made in economics through the “perfection of mathematical tools,” or the developments in “new fields which could be applied to the problems of organized economic complexity.” Students in the old schools continued to be taught economics in “ways which left them ill prepared to cope with the realities of an American business world that was being swept by winds of *swift social, political, cultural, and technological change*.” Aspen cohort, Daniel Bell, “with his great gift for illumination” saw that the salient features of this rapidly changing world “*pointed to the coming of ‘the post-industrial society*. “, In fact, this thesis of Bell’s was put into practice by way of the dialectical process.

One of its features—the economic sector—showed a change from a goods-producing to a service economy [how better to cripple America?]. The second—occupational distribution—showed a growing preeminence of the professional and technical class [according to Tavistock’s John Sutherland, professional refers to social scientists and technical individuals (change agents) who put social scientist’s theories into practice.]

The third—the axis on which social wheels go round—showed the growing centrality of theoretical knowledge as the source of innovation and of policy formulation for society (putting theory/plans into practice).

The fourth—future orientation or forecasting—showed an increasing dependence on the control of technology and on technological assessment. The fifth feature which

absorbed all the others—**decision-making**—showed the creation of a new intellectual technology (ability to implement and facilitate the dialectical process) as a method for identifying and executing strategies for rational (predetermined and limited) choice among variables. (169)

Bell's thesis had "obvious implications for the academic training of future businessmen" and "as his thesis became known," the Institute and CED brought together the...

deans of twenty-five leading schools of business in America, along with representatives of industry, the **foundations**, and the business press. Nothing like the encounter had ever occurred before in the history of American business and education... Was it possible to **reconstruct the curriculum** of business schools so that their graduates would be armed with the tools of perception, research, analysis, and decision equal to the demands of a social, political, cultural, and economic world in flux? (169-170)

For some of the business schools, the Aspen conference merely "reinforced" a move that was already under way to "bend" their business curriculum "more on the side of **theory**," [resulting in business graduates putting Aspen's theories into practice.] In other cases, individuals who had been brought up on the old education and "ascribed to it the success they had attained in the business world" were barriers to this change. However,

a vocal segment of American youth would soon make the whole structure and ethos of the American business community and the business schools with it—the object of polemical attacks. At the same time **the 'post-industrial revolution'...continued to unfold in ways which increasingly cast into bold relief the decisive role of 'intellectual technology' in social change, not only in the United States but around the world, not only with respect to the conduct of business but in all other realms of human activity.** (170)

After Joseph E. Slater became the president of the Aspen Institute, the Institute would respond to the challenge of [implementing] the 'post-industrial revolution' in many ways. For example, it would join with the International Congress for Cultural Freedom in sponsoring in Aspen an international conference on 'The Role of the Intellectual.' It would mount a series of special conferences on 'The Educated Person.' It would bring the challenge to the center of some of its '**thought leading to action**' programs and especially to its program on Science, Technology, and Humanism. (170)

In 1963, Alvin C. Eurich, who heretofore had been a member of the Institute's board of advisors, and "an unfailing source of constructive, far-seeing counsel," replaced Anderson as president, with Anderson becoming chairman of the board of trustees. Eurich had been "successively the executive vice-president of Stanford University, the acting president of Stanford, chairman of the *Stanford Research Institute*, and the first president of the State University of New York." He then became "vice-president and director of the Fund for the

Advancement of Education, and from 1958 to 1963 served as the executive director of the Ford Foundation's Educational Program." In addition, he was also a "member of the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of President Truman's Commission on Higher Education, of President Kennedy's Task Force on Education," and a "consultant" to the public affairs program of NASA, the Surgeon General, and the Peace Corps. He was also on the board of directors of Prentice-Hall Publishing (173). The Aspen Institute, suggests Hyman, perhaps appealed to Eurich as "an instrument more readily adaptable to innovative experiments in **adult education—with an international dimension to it**" (174). While at Aspen, Eurich also created the Academy for Educational Development in New York City (216). If you recall, so-called "adult education" was the baby of Kurt Lewin and the National Training Laboratories and was based on the principles of brainwashing. Later, its "theoretical principles" were applied to TQM with Deming's blessings (Scholtes Forward).

Beginning in the early sixties, the Institute began increasing their special conferences and in 1965 decided to "classify groups of particular problems" under a "common name." In turn, conferences, seminars and workshops on each group of problems would be held on a continuous basis extending for several years. Between meetings, "research and exploration" would be done and a "nucleus of continuing participants" would "convey to others what had been learned or *clarified* in earlier sessions. The new round of *inquiry* could then start at a higher rung of *perception*. Beyond that fact, all the participants—whether they later framed legislative proposals, testified before Congressional committees, wrote books, made broadcasts, issued reports, served on advisory committees, or engaged in other *activities*—*would be armed to bridge the gap between thought and action*" (212).

Also in 1965, John G. Powers, a trustee of the Institute and former president of Prentice-Hall where Eurich was a fellow board member, wanted to "introduce American businessmen to Far Eastern culture." Supported by Eurich and aided by Phillips Talbot, Powers organized a seminar in which business executives were "introduced to aspects of Oriental culture," as expressed in "philosophy" and "religion," among other things. In a public statement, Eurich said that the seminar was a "natural outgrowth of the Institute's organic humanistic concerns." He explained that if man is to understand the direction in which he is drifting and...

conceive clearer goals for himself, he cannot remain confined by the blindness of Western thinking. No one nation, no one culture, no one language, no one civilization can claim any longer to possess universal truth...

There must be a meeting and a marriage of the major cultures of the world, a fruitful interaction in which the best of each nation's insights and values can be available to all men (211).

The Executive Seminars on Far Eastern Thought were repeated for several years on an experimental basis (211). Then a two year absence ensued, but thereafter, Far Eastern thought would become "institutionalized" in the Executive Seminars (263). And in 1966, the Institute added a Scholars-in-Residence program for "scholars in the humanities and social sciences" (216).

In 1967, William E. Stevenson, who had since 1952 filled many different roles at the

Institute including moderator and trustee, took over the presidency. He had graduated at Princeton (law), went to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar and “secured his legal training at *Inner Temple, London*.” In 1946, he gave up his law practice to become president of **Oberlin College** where he stayed for the next 14 years. Hutchins, who had been an undergraduate at Oberlin prior to WWI, was one of Stevenson’s “circle of friends,” and in fact, he saw in Hutchins “the greatest figure in the twentieth-century history of American education” (111-113). As a note of interest, it was the political science department at **Oberlin College** where **Hungarian Oscar Jaszi** found a home after his emigration to America in 1923. In fact, Jaszi, along with Karl Geiser, another Hungarian émigré, constituted this entire department. Jaszi became “closely involved” with **Charles Merriam** for the first decade, on whom he depended for “aid in publication as well as financial support, while Merriam employed him in his comparative civic education project.” In Hungary, Jaszi had founded and led in 1900 the “‘radical’ Society for Social Sciences—an association patterned after the Fabians and devoted to social and political reform.” Later, he and **Georg Lukacs** was associated with the “Free School for the Social Sciences” which “was dedicated to educating the working class” and using “positivist social science as a critical instrument of political liberalization.” Rather than “revolutionary Marxism,” they advocated “parliamentary politics, education, and state planning,” that is, transformational Marxism/Critical Theory (Gunnell 102-104).

Stevenson had taken the presidency only as a temporary measure and in 1969, Joseph E. Slater replaced Stevenson. He and Anderson immediately began their “collaboration” in “refounding” the Institute (Hyman Aspen 230). The “central purpose” of Slater’s life had been “to create a network of institutions and people who can generate and transmit tremors that will ultimately ‘**change things**’ in an orderly way” (229). A mere glance of his accomplishments will testify to that fact.

Slater was an instructor in economics at Berkeley when Pearl Harbor was bombed. He joined the Navy, was commissioned ensign and after cutting through “walls of living red tape,” landed in a London office. Here he worked on “plans for post-war Europe” then joined Robert Murphy’s staff in Versailles. At Versailles, where everyone else was an “amateur,” Slater was one of those Hegelians who “could imprint their thoughts on the shape of the plan.” He helped “design the *structure* for the Disarmament and Armed Forces Secretariat of the Allied Control Authority” (230). Later in Germany, he “participated in the ‘sealing’ of all the German ministries” and helped supervise the “dismantling of the German Army” (Slater was only in his early twenties at this time) (230-231).

Between 1945 and 1948, Slater “helped plan and establish the Economic and Financial Directorates of the Four Power Allied Control Authority in Berlin, and the Bi-Zonal Economic Council for Germany.” The “quality” of his “staff work” was noticed by *General William H. Draper* (who was a “master of the craft”) (241), so Draper made Slater an executive aide and U. S. secretary to the Economic Directorate. Slater “found in Draper one of his mentors in the immediate postwar years and one of his collaborators in later ventures” (231).

Slater spent 1948 and 1949 in Washington where he helped create the “United Nations Affairs Division of the U. S. Department of State’s Political and Security Planning Staff.” In 1949, individuals “who knew of his work in Berlin” were “instrumental in bringing him to

Bonn when **John J. McCloy**⁹ was appointed U. S. High Commissioner for Germany.” McCloy was another “master of the craft” (241), that is, a facilitator/implementor of the dialectical process/Marxist *Praxis*. On behalf of McCloy, Slater wrote the U. S. “position paper” regarding the “*structure* of Allied Control.” He also “organized the office of the Secretary General of the Allied High Commission, and served as the secretary general in it—meaning that he dealt with *all aspects* of German life, not merely those of an economic and financial nature” (Hyman Aspen 232).

In 1952, Slater went to Paris and helped organize and launch the “Office of the Executive Secretary of the U. S. Representatives in Europe,” of which he also served as secretary general, with Draper in “over-all charge.” This institution consisted of the “U. S. Departments of State, Defense, and Treasury to NATO and to the Organization of *European Economic Co-operation*” and because Draper was in “over-all charge, it was not only the largest United States office overseas, but the only operation where the total United States mission was developed into a single, unified organization and *not into a series of separate units reflecting organizational positions of each constituent governmental department*” (Hyman Aspen 232). Slater formed a number of “friendships” during these years and those

⁹ **John J. McCloy** was a former student of **Felix Frankfurter** and one of his point men and “trouble-shooter in the war Department” (Murphy 10).

McCloy was the president of the **World Bank** from 1947 to 1949 as well as Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank in 1960. He was the United States Military Governor and later High Commissioner for Germany from 1949 to 1952. In 1950, Dwight Eisenhower founded The American Assembly, a so-called non-partisan educational institution that facilitated “wide consideration of public issues,” at Columbia University where he was president and where the Frankfurt School had reorganized. After becoming President of the United States, Eisenhower appointed a “Commission on National Goals” to “set up a series of goals in various areas of national activity” and to develop an outline of “coordinated national policies and programs” apparently in pursuit of those goals. Eisenhower requested that the Commission be administered by The American Assembly. Private financing and fiscal management of the Commission were provided by the Assembly with funding from the “Carnegie Corporation,” the “Ford Foundation,” the “Rockefeller Foundation,” the “Alfred P. Sloan Foundation,” and “U. S. Steel Foundation,” among others. The members of the Commission included former and then current University presidents, corporate heads, the president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe from 1953 until 1956, George Meany of the AFL-CIO, James R. Killian, Jr. of MIT who was Special Assistant to the President from 1957-1959, Judge Learned Hand, James B. Conant, president of Harvard from 1933-1953, then ambassador to Germany from 1955-1957. The Commission in turn chose 14 other individuals to come up with recommendations for the Commission’s consideration. **John J. McCloy** was chosen to come up with the “Foreign Economic Policy and Objectives.” (Those whom McCloy chose in turn to help him included then president of the **Committee for Economic Development**, the director of Standard Oil who was a former U. S. executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development). The Report of the Commission and its recommendations weren’t expected to “command unanimous acceptance,” but rather, to “evoke active discussion” which they deemed the “path to a national **consensus**” under the so-called “democratic **process**” (Goals for Americans Preface, xi, xii, 330).

Louis Sohn, a Polish émigré and author of “World Peace Through World Law,” was a law professor and lecturer on “world organization” at Harvard. He was a “consultant and legal advisor to agencies of the United Nations,” and “a member of a committee of scientists and political scientists” advising John McCloy when McCloy later became President Kennedy’s co-coordinator of United States disarmament activities (Fermi 130-131).

After World War II Frankfurt officials sought to “entice” the Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School back to its home in Germany. With the “encouragement” of “American occupation officials” including “High Commissioner John J. McCloy,” the “city [Frankfurt, Germany] was able to make an offer that [Max] Horkheimer found impossible to reject.” Moreover, McCloy “sponsored” special legislation “signed into law” by then President Truman that granted Horkheimer a “continuation of his American citizenship despite his return” to Germany. In addition, “McCloy Funds” supplied half the necessary total for the re-establishment” of the Institute to its place of origin (Jay, 282-285).

friends “would eventually emerge as leaders of the first rank in their respective countries; some he would later bring under the roof of the scientific and cultural institutions he would help establish, and some he would draw into the Aspen Institute as members of the board of trustees” (232-233).

In 1953, Slater became the chief economist for the Creole Petroleum Company (parent company was Standard Oil of New Jersey) in Venezuela. Here he organized and launched the Creole Foundation with grants of over \$3 million per year. Slater formulated a “long-range plan of action” and concentrated these funds on a “select number of programs, embracing well-defined sets of *interacting trans-societal* problems.” This work would provide the “governing precedent” for his later work (234).

In 1957, “McCloy became the president of the **Ford Foundation** and sought Slater out to determine if he was interested in resuming their old association in a new context.” Indeed he did. Slater resigned from Creole and “joined the Ford Foundation in New York as the deputy director of its program in *international affairs*” (234). Philip Coombs, Shepard Stone and Walseman Neilson were already at Ford when Slater arrived. Coombs was “active in the field of international education” and would later become the Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs in the early Kennedy Administration and Slater would serve as his Deputy (235). In 1963, UNESCO—which had been co-founded by Aspen’s William Benton—would establish the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris for “study, research and training.” This would be a part of UNESCO’s plan to provide “direct assistance” to “Member states” in the “planning of educational development,” that is “economic and **social development**” of the masses worldwide. The “Director” of IIEP was Philip Coombs and it “was created with the initial assistance of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Ford Foundation,” while the government of France “provided its headquarters” (Educational Planning in the USSR, UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, Foreword).

The IIEP study and research program started early in 1964 and “from the outset,” it was decided that what was needed, and in fact a “necessity,” was to examine and make “known the wealth of definite experience already acquired” by countries that were the “first to undertake the establishment of plans for the development of their educational systems and especially those in which that effort was a part of their general economic and social planning” which was “especially the case with the Soviet Union.” Hence, “during meetings in Moscow” between Philip Coombs and an IIEP staff member with the “leading authorities of the [Soviet] State Committee for Cultural Relations and the National Commission of the USSR for UNESCO,” it was decided that IIEP would organize an “international study mission.” Thus, an IIEP “mission of international experts” prepared a “case study” which was “devoted to the Soviet experience in planning its educational system” (Foreword). The case study was published in 1968 and entitled Educational Planning in the USSR. It is basically a blueprint of today’s restructuring efforts in American schools!

Shepard Stone, who was Slater’s immediate supervisor at Ford, would subsequently become the president of the Association For Cultural Freedom and in 1973 he would join Aspen’s board of trustees where he would help organize **Aspen Institute Berlin**, the European affiliate of its parent in the U. S. Stone would also serve as its first director. On a “purely personal basis,” Neilson would later “undertake special task for Slater, would keep him abreast of developments in the world arena—including those *rooted* in the proliferation

of *multinational corporations*—and would eventually help formulate the terms for an Aspen program in *international affairs*. In addition, he would provide Slater with fresh insights on the internal changes within the ‘nonprofit world’ and how these were bound to affect the *interplay between that world and the world of government*.” (Hyman Aspen 235).

In 1959, Slater took a leave of absence from Ford to serve as secretary of President Eisenhower’s Commission on Foreign Assistance—a commission to reappraise all aspects of the U. S. foreign aid program (235-236). [Note how these individuals move back and forth from government to foundations and later, to corporations.] This Commission was known as the Draper Committee, after its chairman William Draper, an old comrade of Slater’s. McCloy also served on this committee. Here Slater meet Amos Jordon, a brigadier general who would become “the chairman of the Political Science Department at West Point as well as serve as the executive officer of Aspen from 1972-1974. In connection with Slater’s work on the Commission, he served as the deputy manager, under Douglas Dillion, of the Development Loan Fund, then the major arm of the U. S. foreign assistance program (236).

Upon completion of the Commission’s work, Slater returned to Ford and in 1960 took another leave of absence to serve as deputy to Philip Coombs, who had been appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs in the State Department. Here, Slater “soon swept through the place with the energy of a Kansas twister.” He created eleven “Standing Working Groups” that covered “all conceivable aspects of education and cultural exchanges—*plus a few that were inconceivable*.” When he had reached the “limits” of what he could get by with in the State Department, he returned to Ford (236-237).

Long-range planning, begun in World War II, was the key for Slater and company’s eventual take-over of America. Not unlike all Marxists geared for the eventual take-over of a country, every move this group made from the time it opened its doors (and even that was part of their plans) had a distant goal in mind. Seemingly disconnected programs and policies advocated by Aspen were simply laying the groundwork for their planned future objectives. Consequently, back at Ford, Slater “drew on what he had already formulated for the Creole Foundation, for the Draper Committee, for the Development Loan Fund, and for the Educational and Cultural Division of the State Department” and drew up a “ten-year-plan of action” concerning the “policies and programs the foundation was to pursue in the decade 1962-72.” He then was made the director of Ford’s *International Affairs Program*. Taking this new assignment “together with his previous work in 1957-59” under Shepard Stone, Slater...

played a major role in establishing such institutions as the following: Institute for Strategic Studies (London); the Overseas Development Institute (London); the International Program of the CED; the Latin American Affairs Program of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (universities in Europe and Japan); the International Comparative Music Institute (Berlin); the **United Nations Institute for Training and Research**; the China and Atlantic Programs of the **Council on Foreign Relations**; the Italian Council on Foreign Relations; the Southeast Asian Training and Research Center at Kyoto University; the China Institutes of the Universities of Leeds, Hamburg, Munich, and Berlin; the Korea Center for Asian and International Studies; and the School of Oriental and African Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs. (237-238)

In taking on the presidency of Aspen in '69, Slater had already been at the Institute since 1967 as a scholar-in-residence. While at Ford, Slater had been thinking about creating an institution "as an extension of his three-way interests in international communications, foreign affairs, and educational exchanges" but he needed a place away from his New York office where he could draw up a "document which would clearly state the nature, *structure*, and purpose of the new institution he had in mind." He discussed this with Eurich, then president of Aspen whom Slater had known since Eurich's days at the Ford Foundation, and Eurich invited him to Aspen "as a scholar-in-residence to work on his project" (238). This institution materialized as the *International Broadcast Institute* based jointly in Rome and London (239).

While a scholar-in-residence, Slater gave a lecture entitled "Biology and Humanism." Anyone familiar with General Systems Theory will catch the drift. The two points of this lecture "central to all others" was that the world was "caught up in a *biological* revolution as great as any in *physics*, and the revolution involved 'men, not things.'" Therefore, it was imperative "to force the nature of that revolution into the light" and weigh its "profound implications for man and society." The second point was that the "best way to open lines of communication between the United States and Communist China" was "by joint bio-medical efforts, since *human needs transcended differences in political, economic, social, and cultural ideologies*." At dinner after the lecture, Jerome Hardy, publisher of *Life* magazine and a trustee of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, offered Slater the presidency of Salk because it "was at odds with itself, and lacked leadership." Slater initially refused but a few months later after he had launched the Broadcast Institute (January of 1968), he accepted and took over as both chairman and president of Salk "while continuing his working relationship with the Ford Foundation" (239-240). He immediately recruited McCloy to fill the role of chairman, as well as other "friends from the past" to serve on the board of trustees. This included Sir Allan Bullock, vice-chancellor of Oxford University and both a Fellow and trustee at Aspen, whom Slater had known since his Berlin days (240).

Slater proceeded to formulate an "eight year program of action, two under the ten-year plan he had previously formulated for the Ford Foundation." In February, he brought in John Hunt as executive vice-president for operations. Hunt had graduated from Harvard, done his post-graduate studies at both *Sorbonne and the University of Iowa*, and been on the faculty of an "experimental preparatory school" for 5 years before beginning a "new career" in the "complex world of international organizations, with their cadres of temperamental *soloists*." His "initial entry point was as the assistant to the executive director of the Paris-based *Congress for Cultural Freedom*." Later known as the *International Association for Cultural Freedom*, this group included "writers, scholars, scientists and public figures from various parts of the world" and its "many-sided *programs are carried out by affiliated groups throughout the world*." Hunt had moved up to the post of director in 1958, with Shepard Stone as president, and remained so until 1967 (241).

At Salk, Hunt's "insights into human character and motivation" enabled him to "decode" what Slater said he wanted done. In order to provide Salk with an "instrument for systematic inquiry" into the "social and human implications" of scientific advances in *molecular biology*, Slater, with Hunt's executive support, created the *Council on Biology in Human Affairs*. Later, to enlarge the "frame of inquiry," Slater created the Stockholm-based

International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Studies—“a web of organizations whose *multidisciplinary* interests provided the infrastructure for a ‘free floating university.’” At the same time, Slater linked “neurological studies under way” at Aspen with the “early learning processes” in children (of which he had a long-standing interest) because he determined that “if pre-school learning for children was soundly conceived from a *biological* and *psychological* standpoint, the effect would be to reduce the scale of later needs to subject the children to ‘remedial learning’” (242).

Slater later resigned the presidency of Salk “but retained a link with it as a trustee and Special Fellow.” (Salk and its credibility would later be used by Slater, among other ways, when he targeted the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives in the process of weaving the affairs of Aspen into a “single humanistic whole” (385, 345). Hunt resigned as well and later accepted a position with the oldest foundation in France, the Royaumont Institute. The...

primary mission of Royaumont was to encourage progressive movements in the human sciences, but the directors had come to be dissatisfied with the way the mission was being executed. They asked Hunt to assume responsibility for managing the international program of the institute. And so he did. In co-operation with friends from the Salk Institute, he organized and then became the executive vice-president of the **Royaumont Center for the Science of Man**. The center...was dedicated to...**bringing the life sciences such as the new biology into a working relationship with human sciences such as anthropology and psychology...** (246) [emphasis added]

Hunt eventually would be “brought into the family of the Aspen Institute” starting in 1973 and “full time” by 1974 (247).

Immediately after Slater became president of Aspen, a celebration was held to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of its founding. Robert Hutchins was the featured guest and recipient of a \$10,000 Aspen Award in the Humanities (through a bequest from Anderson) (249). In his speech, “which ran parallel with the views of Anderson and Slater” (251), Hutchins noted that the “*post-industrial society he envisioned* could be ‘one in which men set seriously to work to straighten out their relations with one another and in which they sought, not material goods, but moral, intellectual, or what might be called cultural goods.’ Such a society could be a **learning society**...In such a society the role of educational institutions world be ‘to provide what is notably missing from them today, and that is the interaction of minds.’” Hutchins complained that universities had no “unifying principle,” were “not independent,” nor engaged in “*thought and criticism*,” but rather were a mere reflection of their traditional communities. These universities needed to become “centers of independent thought and criticism.” Explained Hutchins:

It seems fairly clear that the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial age will involve severe dislocation...The way to fortify ourselves is, therefore, to establish wherever we can colleges of liberal arts and those centers of independent thought and **criticism** for which I would prefer to reserve the name of university. If [these] can become incandescent, if they can be points of light, then culture and

civilization can be preserved and expanded as they have been by small groups during dark days of the past. (250-251)

After Slater assumed the presidency of Aspen, at the “center of everything that was to follow in the history of the Aspen Institute was the relationship between Anderson and Slater.” This relationship consisted in the ability of both men to use money and power to carry out their personal agendas. Both men were well experienced in using “oil” money [Anderson used his own and Slater used someone else’s as well as “governmental resources and private philanthropy”] and the accompanying power that money brings. This is only an example of how communism, whether revolutionary or transformational, is financed by wealthy so-called capitalists. Furthermore...

both men shared a keen interest in communication and education. Slater, for example, had tried to bring the communications community and the educational community together in order to promote “early learning.” He had initiated the creation of many overseas educational institutions and had brought into being the International Broadcast Institute. He was concerned with the whole field of public broadcasting, and had worked on a Ford Foundation¹⁰ project in 1962 which contemplated the creation of a “fourth network” to **demonstrate over a period of time what sustained quality broadcasting [propaganda for conditioning the masses] could achieve.** Anderson was equally interested in all such matters, being, among other things, a director of the Columbia Broadcasting Company. Finally, Slater had been daily at grips with issues of science, technology, humanism and economics—in all the posts he had held since the end of World War II. Many of the same issues had been of vital concern to Anderson in his capacity as president of the Lovelace Clinic and as a trustee of the California Institute (of Technology). (247)

MARXIST PRACTICE

(putting theory/thought/ideas into practice/applied)

One...advantage of the Marxist approach to history...is its fusion of theory and practice, contemplation and intervention, observation and interposition. This is perhaps the proudest boast of Marxism in general...Marxism is intended to provide more than an understanding of history. It is intended to serve as a guide for making history.

...The unity of theory and practice—of knowledge and action...recognizes that thought and action are inseparably bonded in the experience of life itself...

...Of course, such a unification also imports enormous perils into the making of history, perils monstrously evident in the way “Marxist” theory has been used

¹⁰ Sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld, who came to America in 1933 from Austria “under Rockefeller auspices,” headed the “Rockefeller-sponsored Princeton Radio Project” which was “devoted to the study of the effects of radio on American society.” They already had extensive know-how from propaganda use in Germany, what they wanted was complete control and application. (Gunnell 183-184)

to justify cruel and inhumane actions...Yet the idea of a unity of theory and practice is a laudable one, however much that idea may have been abused in actuality... (Heilbroner 80-81)

As one of his first moves as president of Aspen, Slater drew up a **Five-year Action Program** (1969-74) for the Institute that would carry forward the planned “**thought leading to action**” programs which “were to receive financial support from Anderson personally” (Hyman Aspen 251). In December of 1969, the plan was unanimously approved by the Institute’s board of trustees (253). The “**Action program** clearly indicated that the Institute meant to focus on explosive issues of **social change**.” In addition, it “consisted of a long list of *needs and developments*” that affected the “human condition,” and an inventory of subjects for Aspen seminars which were “trans-national and trans-societal in nature, and which also had profound humanistic implications.” Therefore, a statement on “public posture” was included in the Action Program:

The Aspen Institute must not allow the potential reaction of the **general public** or of any vocal segment of broad or local interest **to be of cardinal influence** in the carrying out of its programs. At the same time, it cannot discharge its proper role upon the basis of criteria that informed members of the public do not readily understand.

The Institute should pursue such a course that its broad objectives and operations will be generally comprehended and supported so that elements of its program will be largely accepted even when they are not universally approved. The Institute must retain its non-partisan character nationally and internationally. It should rely on the quality of its activities [praxis/dialectic in action] and its **expanding convinced alumni for the support and understanding which it requires**. (254)

A combination of the “changes and needs” would hereafter be the focus of Aspen. The Institute...

must reaffirm its commitment to humanistic studies, to the body of knowledge which included history, literature, the arts, *religion*, and philosophy; *to the social and cultural applications of science*; to the individual in *relationship* to himself, to his fellow man, and to his environment (collective/group); **to the endless pursuit of freedom from outmoded dogma (Christian beliefs and values), freedom to go beyond convention, freedom of the imagination and the will, freedom from...materialism, ‘freedom also to be in conflict with oneself’** (254-255).

In other words, the dialectic process in action will be applied to the group to destroy the existing faith and beliefs of individuals by way of cognitive dissonance/inner conflict. Furthermore, this same “commitment” requires that the Institute “light up the means by which individuals and groups could discharge their personal responsibilities in the common tasks of improving the **quality** of human life...”

The “**humanities**,” explained Slater in the **Action Program**, “must seek a more vigorous role” in forming the “*social, moral, and aesthetic values* of our culture.” This would “require

closer mutual understanding and cooperation between those concerned with the humanities, our social and political leaders, and...**men of science to examine how these forces can work together** to help resolve human dilemmas and the...urgent problems facing mankind,” or in other words, how to gather leaders into groups so that they can be facilitated into a predetermined agenda. “On these accounts,” the Action Program stressed that the “continuing involvement of ‘men of affairs’ in the Executive Seminars would ‘remain the central activity of the Institute’ and would have the first claim on its attention.” Moreover, since the “*perceptive industrial and business leaders*” wanted to “*play a large and direct role*” in the *solutions* to social problems, the Executive Seminars “would help them understand the fundamental issues involved in the work of social change” (255). In addition, the Action Program emphasized the need to reinstate (it had been suspended for two years) the Far Eastern Seminar and “its future activities should be planned and assisted by a panel of the nation’s most knowledgeable experts on Asian thoughts.” Also the Japan Seminar was to become a regular part of the Institute’s program and the “works by Chinese, Indian, and Japanese authors should be included in the readings of the regular or core Executive Seminar” (256). And since the “activities” of the Institute’s Center for Theoretical Physics had proven that “summer study groups for periods of three weeks to three months could be both effective and comparatively inexpensive,” the same...

arrangement should be adapted to the work of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. It should form summer study groups—whether ad hoc or for a series type of conference—that would examine critical problems of humanistic concern whose solutions required collaboration between representatives of business, government, civil, and academic life. In matters bearing on the **relationship between science and society**, such study groups could be coordinated with or cosponsored by...the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Science, the National Academy of Engineering, the Aspen Center for Physics, or the Salk Institute’s Council on Biology in Human Affairs. The Institute should also...host an annual meeting of the leading communicators in the country (read: Aspen Alumni)—particularly from radio and television—in order to evaluate the media and develop both general and specific recommendations for the improvement of program quality (conditioning of the masses) in broadcasting (256-257).

The “**thought leading to action**” programs embedded in the **Action program** were: (1) **Communications and Society**; (2) **Environment and the Quality of Life**; (3) **Education for a Changing Society**; (4) **Science, Technology, and Humanism**; (5) **Justice, Society and the Individual**; and (6) **International Affairs** [Later, Pluralism and the Commonwealth was added]. It was determined that in the future, the Institute should confine itself to these activities “rather than compile a paper record of business on many fronts solely for ‘public relations’ purposes” (257). It was agreed that Slater would make the foundations “collaborators in formulating and executing particular projects. He would also promote various forms of collaboration with other institutions in the United States and overseas.” In this way, “co-operating institutions could maximize...their resources by avoiding duplication of efforts and by bringing their own ideas to bear on the design of a *common task*—although they might subsequently concentrate on a particular aspect of that design” (258). Some of the

“efforts envisioned in the Five-Year Action Program materialized ahead of schedule, some on schedule, and some are now (1975) moving from a state of ‘becoming’ to a state of ‘being,’” boasts Hyman.

Communications and Society

Robert Anderson, as director of the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), arranged for the annual CBS conferences to be held at the Institute. This allowed a “change of name as well as *venue*” and in May of 1970 the annual “Aspen Broadcasters’ Conference came into being.” At the Institute, all “elements of the broadcasting industry (the “heads of commercial networks, producers, directors, writers, advertisers, as well as people involved in public broadcasting”) could be periodically brought into *intense face-to-face encounters with leaders of thought and action outside the broadcasting industry.*” In this new arrangement, Aspen determines the “theme” of the conferences, (for example, “American Self-Renewal in an Interdependent World,” “Values and Scarcity”) and “provides the participants from outside the industry.”

...Speakers and other participants provided by the Aspen Institute present or dispute the facts germane to a theme, define the questions posed by the facts, and present or challenge alternative lines of public policy bearing on the social realities under consideration. But it is for the industry to decide how it will deal with the questions of choice that come to the front...The Aspen Institute, on its part, takes seriously its self-assumed responsibility for regularly exposing the leaders of the industry to...diverse sources of informed opinion about public-policy issues that do in fact call for acts of choice. (265-266).

This was only the beginning of what was to come. It was determined that “**communications**” represented an “enterprise even more fundamental than formal education” to an “**open society**” (302). As far back as 1931, Hutchins “saw in the news media of radio broadcasting and talking motion pictures *instruments for mass education*, not just for mass entertainment” (18). The goal of Aspen was to gain control of public communications in order to use it as a “humanistic force” (322) to do everything from change the attitudes and behavior of the masses and rewrite history to determining what “news” would be presented, and thus, what news would not be presented. The *Communications and Society Program* was headed by Douglass Cater, an old friend of Aspen’s who had participated in the Institute’s “1966 conference on education,” had been a “participant in the Executive Seminars,” and more recently a “scholar-in-residence” (280). He had been a “special assistant” to President Lyndon Johnson and as such, had “concentrated on the President’s programs in the fields of *education and health*; not the least of the things he did was to shepherd through the Congress the act which created the *Public Broadcasting Corporation*” (281). Cater was also the author of The Fourth Branch of Government, in which he had...

observed how the image of government, projected by the media, was being accepted as reality, not only by the lay public but by those involved in government itself. He

further observed that the vast power communications media have to *shape* government policies and leaders...was the power **to select which of the words spoken and which of the events that occurred in Washington during the day were to be projected for mankind to see. It was also the power to ignore—and words and events which failed to get projected might as well not have occurred** (280-281). [Emphasis added]

An “intimate collaborator” of Cater’s was Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool of the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology** (MIT) (333). Pool, an “Aspen Communications Fellow” and “regular participant” in the program (300) was a “specialist in **communications and public opinion**” (287).

Individuals chosen for Cater’s “advisory council” were those who “could be counted on to bring many perspectives to bear on policy issues in communications.” These individuals included Slater and Edward Barrett (former dean of the School of Journalism at Columbia University) and Sig Mickelson (former president of CBS News), both “part of his [Slater’s] network of friends,” as well as comrades Elie Abel (the existing dean of the School of Journalism at Columbia University), Louis Cowan (professor, Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, president of the *Broadcast Institute of North America*, and former president of the CBS Television Network), Peter Goldmark (former president of CBS Laboratories and current president of Goldmark Communications), the already mentioned propaganda specialist Ithiel de Sola Pool of **MIT**, James Killian (a director of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, former chairman of the *Carnegie* Commission on Educational Television, and the former **president of MIT**), Harry Ashmore (president of the *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*), Charles Benton (president of Films, Inc.), Kermit Gordon (president of the Brookings Institution), and De Vier Pierson (a Washington attorney who had served in the White House under Johnson) (280, 286).

The Aspen program on Communication and Society “directly contributed to the formulation of public policies in ways which take into account the *humanistic and social components* of communications questions” (301-302). Aspen would target public television as well as pay cable (323-328); team up with the (then) new **MIT Communications Policy Research Program**; and create a “continuing seminar in Washington” to that end (333-334). By the mid-seventies, the program had “drawn into its orbit over *five hundred leaders* in the communications field and thus expanded the community of those vitally concerned with *humanistic and social claims on communications*” (300). In addition, the creation of the Aspen Community Fellows program brought in “regular participants” such as Bill Moyers, William Harris of **MIT**, William Rivers of Stanford, Daniel Schorr, Henry Geller (former General Counsel for the FCC), and representatives from the Chicago Sun-Times and Washington Post. Individuals from the likes of Fortune Magazine, The Public Interest, Ohio University, Princeton, and the University of Colorado “actively contributed to the work of the program” as well (300-301). The “social or humanistic demands on communications technology were never far removed from the thoughts of Douglass Cater” (335). Therefore, the Program’s activities “have been heavily directed to **social invention**” (338).

Environment and the Quality of Life

Under this program, an environmental “crisis” was created out of thin air to be used as the future “organizing force” for the planned New World Order. In “preparing the ground” for this “crisis,” a “series of summer institutes” on the environment was held at Aspen (starting in June, 1962), co-sponsored by the National Science Foundation and Colorado College. These institutes “aimed at a ‘multiplier’ principle in education” and thus were “expressly designed for high school teachers.” Consequently, the teachers who participated “became the nuclei for similar programs” organized at the “state and local levels.” The “cumulative impact these efforts had on school children starting in the early 1960’s may have helped prepare the ground for the leap in the intensity of the interest young people showed by the end of the decade in ecological and environmental matters” (161162).

At the same time, an “interdisciplinary conference” was held at the Institute in 1962 on “Climate in the 11th and 16th Centuries.” This conference was co-sponsored by, among others, the National Academy of Science and “prefigured the Institute’s future role in promoting an *informed* national and *international* approach to environmental issues.” In the “year-long” research work performed “in anticipation” of the conference, comrades in different countries had collected “data” by “all modes” of so-called “scientific *detective work*.” This was brought to the conference and “laid out on the floor of the Institute’s seminar room for study and *argument*” and resulted in “transforming the nature of climate research” (159-160).

Even while still at the Ford Foundation, Slater had determined that the “old-line conservation organizations tended to focus only on single aspects of the environment and even then from a perspective that seldom went beyond a particular region in the United States.” To rectify this, Slater wanted to **create a new international environmental institution** similar to the *Institute for Strategic Studies* which he had been “instrumental in creating in London with Ford Foundation support.” This group was a “service” organization which “periodically provided interested parties with a world-wide overview of security issues and their underlying facts.” It was headed by Alistair Buchan, a journalist who had “distinguished himself as a Washington correspondent for the London Observer” and was no doubt very adept at propaganda. The new global environmental institution Slater had in mind would be a “counterpart service institute” to the Institute for Strategic Studies and its role would be to “conduct an international overview of environmental issues, to identify problems and their linkages, to mobilize and present in lucid form sets of facts on which an informed national and international debate on policy issues could go forward” (252).

Anderson agreed to fund the “first step toward the new international institution Slater had in mind.” The first step, of course, was to conduct a “survey” to see where everyone stood on the issue. The “conservationist” chosen to do the survey “either misunderstood the assignment or could not discharge it other than *conventional* ways” so his final report “was of no use” as a “building block” for the institution Slater had in mind. It “could only provide the basis for a ‘**consciousness-heightening**’ event known as **Earth Day**, financed by Anderson.” Slater “would not settle for so ephemeral a result” so he picked his brain for just the right “talent” to redo the survey and decided on Thomas J. Wilson Jr., who was experienced in “policy analysis and formulation” (252-253). Wilson, among other things, had been a “special advisor” to Skull & Bones member “W. Averell Harriman during the Marshall Plan.” In the United States diplomatic service he “held the rank of minister and was a member or advisor to numerous United States delegations to the United Nations and other

international organizations such as NATO.” When Slater telephoned him in late 1969 about doing the survey, he was “back in the State Department serving as senior planning advisor to the Office of Counsellor.” He readily accepted the offer and said he could start in early February (253).

In doing the survey, Wilson observed “the general tendency to conceive of environmental issues in terms limited to the technical and legal aspects of air and water pollution control and, as a related matter, to see the implications of these issues only within the narrow boundaries of a single community, state, or region. The first tendency raised the *danger that the social and humanistic dimensions would be neglected*; the second pointed to an equally serious *neglect of the **internationally unifying force** implicit in the concept of Spaceship Earth*” (267). [Emphasis added]

Wilson’s study was published in book form under the title of International Environment Action: A Global Survey. When he initially gave Slater the manuscript, he explained that Aspen should leave the “specifically technical aspects of environmental problems” to the scientists and

should concentrate on its social fall-out—on the long-term [unprovable] implications environmental issues had for the individual, society, value systems, and the institutions of decision-making. It should do this, moreover, not in any parochial context, but in a global context, taking into account the unitary nature of the biosphere and its interactions with a man-made environment. (267)

The first chapter of Wilson’s survey was published in a pamphlet in the summer of 1970 and “widely distributed among government officials and *opinion leaders* and was excerpted for publication in newspapers, magazines, and books.” In it, Wilson argued that the “*structure and quality* of our institutions” would be a “critical variable in the success or failure of society to cope with emergent issues of the human environment, issues which are *inseparable* from fundamental decisions on **how society is to be managed for what purposes.**” Wrote Wilson:

The crisis has more to do with economic-political-social change than with more and better sewage treatment and smoke abatement...It is a crisis not just for the environment but for traditions and institutions as well. (267-268)

From August 29 to September 3 of 1970, an international conference was held at Aspen entitled, “Technology: Social Goals and Cultural Options,” to discuss the “social and ethical” aspects of the matter. It was co-sponsored by the *International Association for Cultural Freedom* and brought “scientists, economists, historians, philosophers, journalists” from around the world. New York Times’ James Reston (a participant) later reported in his column that his “fellow conferees were agreed on the *goals* of human society and on the fact that ‘the human family was approaching an historic crisis which **will require fundamental revisions in the organization of society.**’” but the “means” to achieve this reorganization “was a babble of disagreement” (268).

In spite of all this posturing, Aspen already had their long-range plan in hand which included the means to reorganize society. The conference was merely part of that plan. It

“reinforced the case for the creation of an *international institute on environmental issues*” [as envisioned by Slater] and “Wilson’s advocacy of a world-wide response to the crisis of the environment,” and most important, it “put the Institute into an advanced position where it could help prepare the conceptual basis for the **United Nations Conference on the Human Environment set for Stockholm** in June, 1972.” This UN conference had been officially approved by the UN General Assembly in 1968. The proposal had been submitted by Sverker Ostrom, the Swedish ambassador to the UN “with whom Slater had *quietly* worked.” Heretofore, the UN “had given little thought to environmental problems” (269).

Maurice Strong, “another of the friends of Slater,” was “recruited from his position as head of Canada’s International Development Research Center” to become secretary-general of the UN conference. One of Strong’s “first moves was to recruit Thomas Wilson as a personal consultant” because institutional problems of “environmental control” were complex. This because...

International controls would entail intergovernmental agreements. Different nations differed in their environmental priorities. The need to provide broad national representation in the agencies of the world community **would introduce** eccentric or obstructionist elements into their administrative structure. Above all, international environmental management would tend to impinge upon traditional concepts of **national sovereignty.**” (270)

These transformational Marxists realized that what they were seeking would require some piece-meal efforts; therefore, the UN conference could adopt an “action program” for “post-Stockholm follow-through work, the responsibilities for which should be vested either in existing institutions or in *new ones* to be formed.” To “adapt, alter, or design international or intergovernmental agencies for the purposes indicated would require *sustained probing and imaginative mental efforts.*” To get at the “sources of unconventional thinking” required for this subversion, Strong “reached above the heads of official national or international bodies and into private organizations, including the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.” Strong justified his actions to UN officials thus:

...I have been convinced for years that governments and international agencies must break down the old frontiers between “public” and “private” agencies and reach out to engage the leading talents of the **nongovernmental world** if such problems are to be resolved or even managed in a tolerable fashion.

As things stand now, large reservoirs of existing knowledge and experience lying in the private domain are not being brought to bear in a systematic way on problems of the human environment. The gap between these resources and the political process of policy formulation and decision-making must be bridged with a system of cooperative working arrangements.

...Public administrators...need the stimulation of steady exposure to innovative concepts, ideas and perceptions that are generated on the leading edges of intellectual endeavor. Above all, perhaps, the leaders of public institutions need to be reminded, over and over again, that their ultimate purpose is to help bring about a more humane International Society... (271-272)

These “large reservoirs of existing knowledge” turned out to be a pre-determined agenda waiting to be carried out. With Anderson furnishing the “seed money,” Slater’s International Institute for Environmental Affairs (IIEA) was launched [Strong “was kept informed of every turn in the shaping of IIEA” (277)] and subsequently chosen by Strong and Wilson to help “prepare the grounds” for the UN conference (278). It “was understood that the **Aspen program in the environmental field would be carried out through the IIEA**” (273).

Slater chose Jack Raymond, former foreign correspondent for The New York Times, to be president of IIEA. Slater had known Raymond from his days in “Berlin,” and had renewed that friendship from time to time. Raymond had been the “bureau chief for the Times in Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and Romania, and was then posted to the Washington bureau of the Times, with the Pentagon as his beat.” When tapped by Slater, Raymond headed a “large public relations firm” based in New York (273). In 1973, IIEA headquarters would be moved to London under the head of Barbara Ward (*Lady Jackson, who insisted that the IIEA “meld the issues of development with those of the environment,” thus it was then renamed the International Institute for Environment and Development*) (296).

But in the meantime, Wilson was chosen to “serve as the IIEA vice-president for programs, to head its Washington office and to direct the *international* workshops to be held in Aspen on all aspects of the environment which affect the quality of life.” Wilson “not only knew who and what made the wheels go round in Washington and in international organizations, but was the *kind of writer who could take a seemingly dry subject and convert it into an explosion of dry gunpowder*. Soon there issued from him a succession of articles, speeches, and testamentary material for appearances before Congressional committees...” (272-274). The...

sum of what Wilson contended and refined entered into the ongoing purpose of the Aspen program on Environment and Quality of Life. The purpose was to help bring to the surface the social implications of environment-related conflict, to help search for points of convergence and harmony among goals, values, and priorities, and to pose in unmistakably clear terms the choices to be made among alternative lines of action... (276-277)

Aspen and the IIEA shared “a number of trustees” (273), while Aspen’s Anderson and Roy Jenkins, a “leader of the **British Labor party**,” [which was communist] were co-chairman. There were five vice-chairmen serving under them—“one for each of the five *regions* in the world.” Another twenty individuals made up a “general board of directors.” The “dominant figures” which made up the “Advisory Council” were **Robert S. McNamara**, then president of the *World Bank* and **Maurice Strong** who had “rendered important help in finding and recruiting *qualified* individuals for the governance of the IIEA” (277).

The “conceptual framework” for the UN conference was “laid out first in a draft manuscript” written by hand-picked comrades Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson) of Great Britain and Rene Dubos. The IIEA formed a committee of “corresponding consultants” who reviewed and criticized the draft by correspondence (the Delphi technique), and were

designated a measure of “co-authorship” for the final result. The “World Bank and the Ford Foundation provided the financial support” (278).

Once the UN conference was over “things were in readiness in Aspen itself for a follow-through” and IIEA and Aspen immediately and jointly, “rolled into the second Aspen international environmental workshop,” and this one focused on adding “energy” to the environmental “crisis.” The “initial interest in energy was based on the *assumption* that when the subject emerged as a public policy issue...it would become apparent that the environmental problem was vastly more complex than air and water pollution and solid waste disposal” (293). This seven-week workshop resulted in the development of a “world overview” of “global energy problems.” The “object was to place the energy issue in the relevant context of environmental and international affairs, to probe the implications for institutional *adaptations*, and to recommend the first steps for *political action* that would be valid regardless of disputes about supply-demand data and technological prospects in the energy field” (293).

Wilson wrote a paper on the materials and ideas considered by this international group of wanna-be dictators. His “main accent was on the need to *adapt and reform existing institutional structures...*” (294). In the spring of 1973, yet another “international” workshop was held in New York, co-sponsored by Aspen and the *Institute on Man and Science*, which added “population problems” to the crisis. Typically, UN agency officials and NGO’s were among the participants. Still another one was held in the following summer on the “relationship of population growth to food supplies.” The plans and “action-oriented ideas” that resulted from these workshops became the agenda for the already planned UN World Population Conference in Bucharest in August of 1974 and the UN World Food Conference in Rome the following November (288, 292, 296-297).

As a result of the UN conference in Stockholm, the Aspen inspired **United Nations Environment Program** (UNEP) was launched by the General Assembly and was directed by Maurice Strong (290, 292). Aspen and the **UNEP** held yet another conference (with participants from 14 countries) to, among other things, determine how to “avert social and political disasters in the decades ahead” and to determine the “outer limits” to the “carrying capacity of Planet Earth” with respect to matters such as “population load,” “contemporary stress,” and the “management” of “social problems.” This conference resulted in a set of recommendations for “priorities” for “**UNEP**-endorsed studies and **activities**” (297-298). U. S. participants included Rene Dubos and Carroll Wilson of the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**. Furthermore, at the Stockholm conference the **International Chamber of Commerce** “formally pledged support for the UN program on the environment and organized an Environmental Problems Project of its own to *work in ongoing co-operation with the United Nations Environment Program*” (290).

Incidentally, Carroll Wilson was one of the leaders in the Club of Rome [founded in 1968] which Aurelio Peccei, an Italian industrial manager, headed. Peccei, Rene Dubos, Barbara Ward and Gunnar Myrdal were chosen by the Aspen group to be a part of the Distinguished Lecture Series at the Stockholm Conference. This Lecture Series, co-sponsored by IIEA and the International Population Institute, was literally imposed on the UN General Assembly by Maurice Strong (290-292). It was the Club of Rome and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who jointly produced a report in 1972, “The Limits to Growth,” with an agenda similar to Aspen’s. Two years later, Club of Rome member Ervin

Laszlo—who, according to W. Edwards Deming, developed the philosophy of **Total Quality Management**—wrote a how-to book, A Strategy For The Future: The Systems Approach to World Order. [This is covered in another paper in this series.]

The “work performed in support of the Stockholm Conference by IIEA, by the Aspen workshop, and by its participants in other roles, offered a striking **case history** of how **nongovernmental organizations** [the new soviets] can contribute to the public policy-making process,” explains Hyman. It would be safe to say that what the UN has done in the last 25 years or more likely, since its inception, has been solely dictated by Aspen and its cohorts. Today, we are seeing, but only beginning to actually experience the nightmare of all this “long-range planning” become reality.

Early 1972 marked the beginning of Aspen’s attempt to weave all their affairs into a “**single humanistic whole**” (343) by a “**sustained, self-aware search for ways to inject the full force of the term ‘humanistic’ in everything the Institute was currently doing or hoped to do.**” A statement of Slater’s reflects this goal:

Few institutions in our society today deal with the humanities as disciplines. Even fewer seek actively to bring humanistic values and knowledge to bear on...domestic and international problems which face American society and...all modern technological societies. Among available resources for dealing humanistically with social crisis resulting from technological development and rapid social change, the Aspen Institute has a special role—not only in its concern for engaging leaders in humanistically oriented dialogue but also in the **special relevance** of many of its programs to the crisis of change. (343)

In the Spring of 1972 the Aspen Institute formed an “arrangement” with the “**Educational Testing Service** and its affiliate, the **Institute for Educational Development**” to provide “solutions to the problems of education and learning systems being posed by the scope and pace of change in all aspects of contemporary life.” Within a year, they had jointly developed “three clearly defined projects” that “could be mounted without further delay.” One of the projects was in “the field of early child learning.” The second project “involved the relationship among education, work and the quality of life,” and the third was on “the future state of higher education.” Once these projects were in progress, “*new concepts could be formulated leading to new lines of activity in response to newly perceived needs.*” This tactic is the fascist/transformational Marxist concept of and key to taking over a society’s institutions so-called democratically without allowing that society to know where that takeover is going or even that it is being taken over, and is the key to Total Quality Management as well. Slater wanted to begin immediately, while the Education Testing Service and its affiliate needed to spend some time in “formulating an ‘operational philosophy’ before moving ahead” primarily due to their “institutional constituencies.” After some debate, in September of 1973 the Education Testing Service assumed responsibility for the project “in the field of early child learning” which was “ready for field work” and Aspen “pressed ahead with the programs on **education, work, and the quality of life,** and with the one on the future of state higher education.” They then “formally” dissolved their “arrangement” but agreed that “informal contacts and mutual consultation would continue” (340-341).

In preparation for this grab at “wholeness,” in July 1972, Aspen and the *International Association for Cultural Freedom* co-sponsored an international conference, chaired by Sir Alan Bullock, on “**The Intellectual and Power: His Role and Responsibility.**” A “high proportion” of the 33 participants were Aspen board members although nearly half were from foreign countries. The board itself, “an international body of men and women who were not letterhead figures, but were *personally and directly engaged* in the substantive work of the Institute,” exemplified the future role of the intellectual and use of his power. In a “former day,” the “intellectual” had played the role of the “outsider” and as such, was the “permanent critic” of the “process of production and administration” and the “general culture of society.” But the current reality of the “post-industrial society” called for the intellectual to accept and perform a different “function,” that of change agent/practitioner. Of course, the “post-industrial society” theorist Daniel Bell was a participant (347).

The “new role demanded by the intellectual” was perhaps an attempt to prevent a possible Hitler/German re-run because “it would be all the more disastrous if the intellectuals, as in the case of the German intellectuals during the time of the Weimar Republic, adhered to a bystander’s role, yet continued to raise the expectations and the demands of what society and government can be asked to provide its constituent members.” Consequently and henceforth, the “new role” of the intellectual would include “political activist” or change agent, a moving “in and out of different points of the spectrum at different times.” As an “advisor to men of political power,” he could generate “a normative consensus concerning *what should or should not be done in the political realm.*” This new role of the intellectual would require patience because it could take years before “his ideas gained wide acceptance and were *put into effect*” (347-349). In the “summer of 1973, yet another Aspen conference was held on “The Role of the Intellectual.” It was here that Anderson and Slater made the “decision to establish **Aspen Institute Berlin**” (248).

Target Politicians. What “followed” from Aspen’s decision to use the “full force” of the term humanistic to bring about “wholeness” was the “new form” in which Slater “pursued his long-standing concern over the social, political, and cultural implications of the advances being made in *molecular biology.*” This new form consisted of Aspen organized “tutorials” for members of the U. S. Senate and the House of Representatives, under the guise of “bring[ing] them abreast of the revolution in the biomedical sciences, and its implications for man and for future legislation.” Slater lined up “molecular biologists” from Salk for the initial briefing which resulted in an invitation to Aspen to “organize further briefings on Capitol Hill—perhaps several a year—so that lawmakers could be kept abreast of developments in biomedical research and of their ‘*profound ethical and legislative implications*’” (344-345). While Slater was at Salk, it “had been brought home to him that the more man understood about the molecular mechanism¹¹ of life, the closer he moved to the *role of a trustee of his own evolution.*” That’s totalitarian poppycock used by Ervin Laszlo for the ability to control society. Moreover, Slater learned that “the more man added to the body of knowledge about the *functioning of the human mind, the greater would be the implications for his liberation or servitude*” (344), and without doubt, it was servitude that Slater had in mind.

¹¹ See *Feedback Thought in Social Science and Systems Theory* by George Richardson, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

Target Existing Institutions. Another means to “weave things into a single humanistic whole” was to establish the Executive Seminars “in local communities and regions around the country.” Slater tapped his old friend, John Hunt of the **Royaumont Center for the Science of Man**, to work with the **National Endowment for the Humanities** on a “feasibility study” to this end (345). At the onset, the study apparently revealed that few institutions were interested in “co-operating with a regionalized Aspen Program.” It was later determined that “flawed approaches” were being made and moreover “under *existing administrative arrangements* the Institute could not control the quality of any regionalized programs” offered in its name. Aspen decided to suspend the feasibility study but it “was understood that the grant would be reactivated when the manner of the approach to other institutions had been *rethought and new provisions were made for quality control.*” (346).

Target Women. It should be obvious by now that whatever issue, policy, committee, group, organization etc. the Institute associated itself with, it soon controlled. These people were able to move into any institution or organization at will and take over with little difficulty and use it and its people for their personal agenda. In effect, this “party” would have made Antonio Gramsci proud! At any rate, this “wholeness” take-over included a long-term scheme to “emancipate the subject of sex role” from the “limited circle of intellectuals who had heretofore concentrated on it.” With a grant from the Rockefeller Fund, Libby A. Cater (one of the wives of Slater’s “associates at the Institute”) kicked off this scheme by organizing a week long Aspen conference that “was meant to synthesize existing knowledge about the dynamics of sex differences in society, to formulate new lines of inquiry into the realities of the case, and to set the agenda for a large-scale conference” that was to follow. The participants in this agenda-setting conference were individuals “who had *thought systematically about the implications of changes in these roles in every enclave of American society*” and “representatives from major institutions affected by those changes.” One-third of the thirty participants were “men.” In preparation for future plans, this group decided that a “substantial number” of “qualified professional women” would be brought into the Executive Seminars by way of “fellowships” and would “participate as full-fledged members of the *year-round work* of the Institute’s “**thought leading to action programs**” (350-351).

Target Artists. As evidenced in the Garden of Eden, in the name of good the “serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety,” and so it was with Aspen in everything it did. This quest for wholeness included a “long-range Aspen Arts program.” This because Slater realized from the beginning that “the *identifying term ‘humanistic’ would be deeply flawed unless it had an Arts Program along with its other activities.*” This “two prong” program included the “direct involvement of artists in the Institute’s activities straight across the board from the Executive Seminars to the ‘**thought leading to action**’ programs.” The second prong was to promote so-called “musical education” beginning in “pre-school years” and “extending to all levels of education” and even “society” at large. This effort called for an international workshop which brought artists together with “leaders in education, communications, and the foundations.” This included Sir Alan Bullock, Asa Briggs of Oxford, Thorsen Husen (a “Swedish educator who knows as much about educational developments in the United States and Japan *as in Europe*”), Daniel Schorr, Lloyd Morrisett, Douglass Cater, and “Frank Keppel of the Aspen Program on Education for a Changing Society.” The...

object of the workshop was to formulate the issues of ‘musical literacy’ in various

countries, to identify the obstacles in the way, and to formulate ways and means for overcoming them. As in other aspects of the search for ‘wholeness,’ the workshop gained in clarity and focus from the **intense face-to-face discussions among diverse individuals who brought their special fund of knowledge to bear on a common interest.** (351-352)

The “larger examples of the movement to weave **all things into a single humanistic whole**” concerns the remaining “**thought leading to action**” programs “envisioned in Slater’s 1969 plan”—**Science, Technology and Humanism; Justice, Society, and the Individual; International Affairs; and Education for a Changing Society.** By mid-1974, the other two programs were “fully operational” and although a “great deal of work had gone forward” on the remaining four, it was at this time that they were “formally inaugurated with the appointment of their respective directors.” By summer of 1975, a “‘critical mass’ has been achieved with respect to all of them” (353).

Science, Technology, and Humanism

Walter Orr Roberts, who had headed the Climate research project (covered above) for Aspen, was chosen as director of the *Science, Technology, and Humanism* “thought leading to action” program. These issues represented a “personal challenge of the highest urgency and significance” to Roberts. This because “throughout the world” more and more people were voicing their “hostility” to an “old vision—stemming from Francis Bacon” (353-354). Bacon’s dream was to discover all of nature’s laws and apply them to society then “the world will be merely the raw material of whatever utopia man may decide to make” (Durant 134). The basis for this hostility included the belief that “scientific and humanistic thought are diametrically opposed *in spirit*” and that science and technology had become “autonomous ends in themselves” and were “directly responsible for conditions where the world is becoming uninhabitable” (Hyman Aspen 354).

In Roberts’ opinion, very serious consequences could follow if this hostile view led to “scientific and technological arrest” in various societies. For the solution to the world’s cardinal problems...must include major scientific and technological components. He does not argue that the future should be entrusted **solely** to the care of the scientific and technological community. His argument is that...humanistic purposes will not be advanced by the rejection of science and technology, no more than science and technology can assure human self-fulfillment without the integration of humanistic social purposes into their practices... In today’s world, therefore, no nation-state and no region can ignore **the imperative need to use the powers of science and technology in ways in which the controlling perception will be humanistic in cast.** (354-355)

The “purpose” of this program was to “mobilize *humanists, leaders of public action, business leaders, and members of the **scientific and engineering** community for joint concentration on a *series* of concrete and conceptual problems which have a direct bearing on the humanistic uses of science,” a wedding or synthesis of Marxist/Hegelian idealists and*

Marxist dialectical materialists, if you will. Both groups wanted to control and remake man, only they differed somewhat on means and ends. Specific projects in this connection would “entail co-operative efforts with other programs of the Aspen Institute or with other interested organizations” (355). The purpose of one of these projects was to...

seek ways and means to **bridge the gap between scientific and humanistic thought**, as well as the gulf between both of them **and the public decision-making process**. The specific questions posed in this connection are of the following order. What are the underlying similarities and differences between the fundamental operative values involved in the **theory and practice** of the physical and life sciences and the humanities? What are their common philosophical roots? Does the...assumption of social responsibility impede the creative instincts of practitioners in these fields?...How do laymen in different societies view the mysteries of science...? What values are indigenous to science...and what values are lacking? What is the difference between factual and value judgments? The questions...interlock with those that impinge on the work of all the other Aspen programs. (356-357)

Another project of Robert’s group was to...

study the implications of the **application of new technologies to the education of men and women of diverse cultures**. It will inquire into the kind of **education that is suited to a post-industrial and post-traditional society**...But can and should a common education ideal be formulated for the latter part of the twentieth century in such a way that the development of an educated person—at home in the realm of technology—becomes an accepted individual and social goal around which educational philosophy may once again cohere? There are obvious cross-linkages between the inquiries into this question and the Aspen program on Education for a Changing Society. (356)

...The essence of communism is social justice—the elimination of poverty, the elimination of suffering, the elimination of all differences that erect walls between people. The essence of communism is the global village in which everyone benefits equally within an interdependent and socially conscious world. The essence of communism is rearing of children by the vii/age. Even Hitler’s version, which he called “National Socialism,” was intended to deliver great and lasting benefits to the masses, once a few million redundant people were, well, eliminated (Vazsonyi¹² 57-58).

...[We] need to face the fact that the Rule of Law and the Search for Social justice cannot exist side-by-side because social justice requires those who possess’ more of anything have it taken away from them. The Rule of Law will not permit that...First, they take away opportunity. Next they take away possessions. In the end, they have to take away life itself. (59)

...all those who believe that socialism has merit...but communism is abhorrent

¹² Hungarian-born Vazsonyi was a victim of both Communism and its variant, Fascism.

and out of the question, are fooling themselves. It is all one package because all of it is predicated on the same way of thinking. One either signs on to the package or one does not. Partial consent is an illusion. (66)

...The Search for Social Justice...is the current Americanized version of the Franco-Germanic line—The Idea—of which communism is the end state. Unlike communism, “social justice” sounds wonderfully warm, humane, even lofty. Since social justice is pure demagoguery with no foundation in reality, it is flexible enough to enhance and camouflage anyone’s personal agenda. (67-68)

Justice, Society and the Individual: The “issues of justice and law” had been “raised and discussed in all the core Executive Seminars, and in various workshops or special conferences held in Aspen or elsewhere.” In fact, Anderson stressed the “centrality” of these issues to the very “nature of contemporary society and the life of individuals in it” (Hyman Aspen 357). Indeed, the “whole of moral and political philosophy was involved in an adequate treatment of the problem of **justice**” (359). Even before the **Action Program** on “*Justice, Society, and the Individual*” was formally inaugurated, much work had already been done in this connection, and funded by “yearly grants” from the Joseph Hazen Foundation. Joseph Hazen was a former legal counsel to the Warner brothers “in development of their motion picture interests.” He was also a producer and had “prospered in oil ventures” (357). After participating in some Executive Seminars in 1970, Hazen had decided that “**judges were the very people who could benefit the most from exposure to the Aspen Executive Seminar.**” He later recalled...

It seemed to me...that most political, social and economic questions in the United States tend to come before the courts in the form of legal questions. If so, then how our controversies about **justice** and injustice were resolved would **depend** on large measure on the **perceptions and values of our federal judiciary. The decisions by circuit court judges and courts of appeal judges would permeate the whole of our society.** (358)

To bring judges into the Executive Seminars would mean that they would be...

intimately exposed to a cross-section of people from all walks of life...They would not be deferred to in the Executive Seminars. They would challenge and be challenged in turn, would be compelled to explain themselves, might be prodded to embark on new avenues of inquiry, study, and reflection. “Why is it,” Hazen asked, “that many great books have been written by prisoners [bloody revolutionaries?], and not one by a guard or warden?” **It was his way of suggesting that judges, too, were in urgent need of education and re-education.** (358)

Hazen had talked his scheme over with Slater, volunteering to pay for “fellowships” so that “judges of the Circuit and District Courts could come to Aspen to participate in the Executive Seminars” and he accepted on an experimental basis.

The first five who came out were enthusiastic about the experience. Word spread

through the federal judiciary. The **Chief Justice**¹³ of the United States encouraged **what had begun**, and Hazen arranged to continue his grant of fellowships to federal judges so that a **sizable percentage of all who comprise the national membership of the Circuit and District Courts may eventually participate in the Executive Seminars.** (359)

The program on “**Justice, Society and the Individual**” would take into account:

considerations that are antecedent to the **theory of justice** and on which it is dependent—considerations such as...the social character of man, and questions about human equality. In addition, there would be the need to consider a number of notions internal to the idea of justice itself, such as those of **theory of justice**—including questions about the necessity, **authority**, and limits of government; questions about the several kinds of liberty in political society and about the relation of freedom to authority, law, and government; questions about the resolution of conflicts concerning political, economic, and social equality. In addition, there would be the need to consider...notions internal to the idea of justice itself, such as those of right, duty, obligation, claim, and status. There was also the fact that theories of justice differ and perhaps conflict, depending on how they formulate the criteria of the just and the unjust in terms of...equality and inequality of individuals and of the ways in which they should be treated; and those concerned with what is lawful and unlawful, constitutional and unconstitutional, and, in the broadest of views, **right and wrong.** (359-360)

In a planning meeting on the program in New York in 1973 with participants including Mortimer Adler, William Groman, Charles Frankel of Columbia University, *Chief Judge Irving Kaufman of the Second Circuit Court*, and John Nields (a former Wall Street lawyer turned professor at Sarah Lawrence), a disagreement arose. Some participants insisted that the program “begin with specific action-oriented projects,” while others insisted that “before any action-oriented projects could be mounted, the lineaments of a ‘just society’ must be clarified first.” In the end, a “compromise draft plan” was produced (360).

Dean Robert B. McKay of the New York University School of Law was recruited to head the new program. McKay had been “deeply involved with problems related to equal educational opportunity,” with “legislative districting,” the “criminal justice system,” the “administration of justice,” and “legal education.” He was vice-chairman of National News Council and vice president of the Legal Aid Society. He had served as chairman of the New York State Special Commission on Attica, the Mayor’s Rent Control Committee, and the New York City Board of Corrections (360-361).

McKay studied the plan and remarked that he was being “entrusted with a unique vehicle for the examination of almost any aspect of the contemporary world, using the lens of justice to consider whether proper standards of liberty, equality, and fairness have been applied.” His first order of the day was to “define and delimit” the scope of “inquiries to be pursued by the program;” to catalogue all existing institutions, programs, and organizations

¹³ Warren Burger, a member of the “Aspen Institute International Board of Trustees.” (318)

“concerned with the **infusion of justice into the social structure**” and in this connection to “identify major social problems that require analysis in terms of the implications for justice as they arise in the context of a search for ends and means.” On the other hand while all this was being set in place, McKay proceeded in four different areas with “programs that would find their internal unity in the idea of justice and the rule of law.” This involved (1) “action-oriented activities” concerning the “right of access to equal opportunity;” (2) “punishment and responsibility” with a view toward “catalytic action that can convert into actual policies an existing *consensus* about what needs to be done to *reform the whole of the American correction system*;” (3) “training for professional responsibility” with a view toward “clarifying the system of licensing in the professions, along with questions of morality and justice which arise in the practice of the professions;” and (4) “law training for nonlawyers” (361).

Moreover, McKay was anointed “general counsel” for Aspen “straight across the board” because “issues of justice crop up at every turn in the work of the Institute.” For example, in the Environment and the Quality of Life program, “critical issues of **justice** are posed by the need to balance the rival claims of environmental protection, the rights of private property, and the need for industrial development,” as well as “Who...should get what, when, and how” concerning “scarce” resources. In the Communications and Society program, issues of justice crop up in matters such as “the right of privacy,” the “right of access to the media,” “‘fair comment’ by the media,” “shield laws to protect reporters” and so on. Then “there are the questions of justice which are indivisible with the concerns of the program on International Affairs. **How can one foster the development of a world community held together by a network of common laws and common concepts of justice?** How can such a community provide itself with better means for the resolution of disputes?” McKay’s role also included “scanning,” that is, “highlighting the interconnections among the particular questions of **justice** that arise at diverse points in the work of the Institute,” and bringing “new sources of *perception* and judgment to bear on the search for *solutions* to the questions noted” (362-363).

Concerning the “**International Affairs**” Action Program, Aspen was international in scope from day one and with the already existing “co-operative arrangement” between Aspen and the “Asian Society,” the Institute in 1969 had “swiftly **expanded its explicit partnerships with non-profit organizations having aims parallel to its own**” many of which were “international in nature.” In the private sector, these included the “International Council for Educational Development” and the “Overseas Development Council.” In the public sector, as indicated above, they included the “United Nations Environment Program, whose director, Maurice Strong, is a trustee of the Aspen Institute” and the “World Bank, whose president, Robert McNamara, is also an Institute trustee.” In 1970, Aspen had created a “Statesman-Humanist Award.” The “first recipient was Jean Monnet, the ‘father’ of the **European Common Market**,” who “formed a partnership” with Felix Frankfurter when he came to the U. S. after the fall of France (Murphy 213). The second recipient was Willy Brandt. In 1973...

Aspen Institute Berlin was established as an integral part of the Aspen Institute, and began to function in the spring of 1974 with the active backing of the Berlin Senate. Aspen Institute Berlin will address major humanistic problems confronting societies

and individuals everywhere—problems worked on by all the Institute programs.

The Institute had effectively carried out a large number of continuing international activities, including an annual arms control workshop, a series of task groups leading to Karl Kaiser's widely used book on U. S.-European relations, an annual meeting of top leaders of the United Nations, and sessions on the international dimensions of the major issues with which the Institute had been concerned. (Hyman Aspen 364)

In choosing a director for the International Affairs program, Slater's "search for the person he wanted had the complexity and high seriousness of a quest for a new Grand Lama of Tibet." Harland Cleveland, a globalist and New Ager, was chosen to head the program. Like MIT and the Club of Rome, Cleveland believed that "systems thinking" could "help mankind enhance control of its destiny," and computer "**simulations**" could enable "**groups**" to make "decisions in the more mindful knowledge of alternative futures" (366). In this connection, Cleveland explained that the "central aim" of the International Affairs program would be "*to develop concepts, ideas, and action proposals for adapting old transnational institutes and inventing new ones.*" They would begin by "building outward from the Aspen's Institute's **existing web of contacts around the world—to create a continuously functioning multinational network of analytical minds whose collective product is ideas about international action.**" A first step would be "*an international consultation leading to the draft of a general strategy for 'next steps'—during perhaps the next ten years—in the mutation of international institutions, 'public' and private.*" (367).

At the same time, a "two-year work program" from the fall of 1974 to the summer of 1976 would explore four areas in "**how the world can be managed for mankind.**" These four areas would include:

(1) "**International Management of Conflict**"—Major workshops would be "organized in Aspen, in regions of the United States, at **Aspen Institute Berlin**, at a proposed Aspen-Hawaii and Aspen-Japan, and at other locations" convenient "to Latin American, African, and Asian *participants.*" The object of the workshops would "be to consider procedures for the identification, prevention, and the resolution of conflict; to limit conventional and strategic arms; to revive international peace-keeping—'consortium of the concerned'; to establish a Golden Rule of *active* and timely international consultation; to practice 'preventive diplomacy'—as in the case of the conflicts about resources." (367)

(2) "**Management of Global Technologies**"—Which "will have linkages with the Aspen program on The Environment and the Quality of Life, and on Science, Technology, and Humanism." It would entail a "search for ways in which the ambivalent **technologies of destruction or development**, of pollution or prosperity, of **coercion or consent can be organized** to work *for* rather than *against* individual human beings." (367-368)

(3) "**International Management of Money and Commerce**"—This "consists of efforts to formulate suggested standards of behavior for multinational enterprises (with suggestions for action by governments covering both incentives and inhibitions

on the development of international business); and to explore to what extent, if any, such private standards and national-government actions should be translated into international agreements and institutions.” (368)

(4) “**International Management of Development**”—This will “focus on the new basis of the relationship between *rich and poor nations*. The *coming* struggles over resources...will require ways of thinking and institutional arrangements which *get beyond* the postwar concepts of national development planning *aimed at economic growth* and supported by aid-as-charity...in the years just ahead, *minimum human needs* threaten dramatically to outdistance the world’s capacity to supply them—at least under present assumptions and arrangements. This aspect of the Aspen program in International Affairs may be seen as a continuing international inquiry into the ethics, **justice**, and politics of development and the distribution of resources to serve human needs. It thus lends strength to, and draws strength from, the Aspen program on **Justice, Society, and the Individual**.” (368) [This idea of worldwide redistribution of wealth is advocated by the MIT/Club of Rome plan as well.]

The program on Education for a Changing Society formally “mounted an action-oriented program” in 1974. Of course, Aspen “since its inception had been a form of education for a changing society.” The delay in mounting an all-out national and international program “was symmetrical” with the delay in mounting the Justice, Society, and the Individual program:

Specifically, education, like justice, cuts into and across a wide range of subject matters—ethics, politics, and economics; art and science; change and progress, virtue and truth, knowledge and opinion; desire, will, sense, memory, mind, and habit; family and state; man, nature, and **God**. Indeed, virtually everything at the focus of the Institute’s own attention was shot through with educational aspects. (368-369)

Francis Keppel, former dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, was tapped to head the program. Keppel’s relationship with Aspen had begun much earlier as a participant in the 1966 conference: “The Relationship of Colleges and Universities to Government.” To digress a bit and recap this conference’s origins: As a result of Anderson’s desire to “classify groups of particular problems under a common identifying name” where “each group could be the subject of continuing conferences” extending a number of years, therefore “arming” the participants “**to bridge the gap between thought and action,**” Eurich had formulated an Aspen program called “Man in 1980.” This resulted in conferences in 1965-66 on Population Problems, Planning for Higher Education, *Educational Development Below the College Level*, and Moral and Ethical Values. The 1966 conferences attempted to “deal *more firmly* with the issues” that had been “raised in exploratory discussions of the preceding year.” At the time of the conference, Keppel was then the “United States Commissioner for Education” under the Johnson Administration and “subsequently the Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.” [Douglass Cater, then a “special assistant” to President Johnson, also attended] (212-216)

In developing the Education for a Changing Society program, Keppel based the

“programmatic content” on two “assumptions”:

...The first is that **the impetus for change in educational institutions** ranging from pre-school through the university is more likely to **derive from changes** in the wider society—such as **judicial and political decisions involving the rights of children, civil rights, and equity financing**—than from pedagogic initiatives within the institutions themselves. Hence to meet the problems of social change lying ahead, education will need allies, resources and directional signals from other sectors of society that are now concerned with matters such as taxation, housing, urban development, industrial and governmental training, scientific research, pension programs, program for senior citizens, and so on.

The second major assumption is that the present definition of education is in need of substantial change. Keppel...shares a view central to Douglass Cater’s Aspen program, that the revolution in communications has had a massive impact on human learning; television [by design] in particular has affected the way children learn about society and the way adults learn about public affairs and the arts. In the case of his own program, **Keppel’s working definition of education includes all lifelong learning of an institutionalized character directed toward the goal of human fulfillment and social benefit.**” (369-370) [Emphasis added]

Based on these two “assumptions,” Keppel’s program began by “identifying” the nature and “force” of societal factors that would “impinge” on “the lives of individuals and of educational institutions.” For instance, how would “**changing individual and societal goals and expectations**” affect education? How would the need to “upgrade the capacity of the citizenry to grasp the scientific and technological aspects of political issues in a range from environmental balance to arms control” [via propaganda] affect education? What promise do the “values” that are “developing” from the “new insistence on equal opportunity and education rights” hold? What issues do “changes in demographic patterns, *in resources and the allocation of funds, in the nature of occupations and the demand for educated manpower*” raise for “learning” and for “educational institutions” (370)?

In addition, Keppel’s program would focus on the “**internal or external factors that would enable—or prod—educational institutions actually to adapt themselves to the needs of a changing society.**” For example, what kind of “selection policies and institutional innovations are necessary” to ease the “cross-tensions between the rising rival demands for equal educational opportunities and for quality in education?” What “roles” should be “played by governmental authorities, by educational administrators, and by leaders of unions and associations” in order to “remedy” the “governance of educational systems,” and what “*criteria for consultation and collaboration*” needed to be formulated for these groups (370)?

The Education for a Changing Society program would make the “interplay” between the “internal and external” aspects of “early learning at one end of the educational scale and **lifelong learning** at the other end” the “factors that will enable educational institutions actually to **adapt to the needs of a changing society.**” As pertains to early learning, it would study the “effects of extensive day care *on family relationships, personality development, and social interaction,*” with the objective of formulating “criteria for those governmental

policies which directly or indirectly impinge” on, for example, policies related to “day care centers,” “welfare and employment,” and “**labor-management contracts and other industrial practices.**” This program would...

look at something more than special educational programs for the illiterate, the handicapped, the unemployed without skills, and the skilled but displaced professionals. It will also study the grounds for dissatisfaction with present working conditions, along with the nature of the demand for career changes in middle years; and still further, on-the-job advancement opportunities for women and minorities, or their access to professional careers...the Aspen program will explore the impact on education of issues such as vested and portable pensions; the potential for American education of workers’ “sabbaticals” as part of labor and government contracts; “sandwich courses” for employees; and tax policies to encourage private sector investment in employees’ educational development. (371)

“If it seems sensible to take seriously the idea of **lifelong learning,**” said Keppel, “**change will be required not only in schools and colleges, but in existing policies and practices in the private and public sector.**” He divided his program into two phases, a “preparatory” phase (1975-77) used to “formulate educational policies that can be proposed for adoption by the Congress and the federal administration, by state and local governments, and by private institutions.” The “object of the second, extending from 1977 to the 1990’s will be to help prepare the ground for the actual **adaptation of education to the needs of a changing society.**” [It is this phase that is now being implemented.] As part of the preparation for the actual implementation of their school restructuring, a plan was devised...

starting right now, to make promising young figures in government, scholarship, and educational institutions active collaborators in shaping the Aspen program which Keppel heads. There are...difficulties in forecasting years in advance who in particular will hold leadership posts in the 1980’s and beyond. Yet it is possible to identify the type of person between the ages of twenty-five and forty who might play such a role and who can be prepared in advance to fill it. A long lead time for advance preparation is necessary since the task ahead, enormous in itself, is complicated by the fact that all too many **forces** in society have a vested interest in bending their weight to the end that educational institutions will stand still—though the wide society around them is in [planned] **oceanic flux.** (371-372)

Pluralism and the Commonwealth was a “thought leading to action” program launched in 1975. Although it was not part of Slater’s 1969 5-year plan, it was a “logical extension of the Institute’s commitment to *a pluralistic society, hospitable to democratic and humanistic values.*” It also was a “response” to a need to balance two “countervailing imperatives” which...

confronted democratic societies the world over—without regard to differences in how they organized the economic functions of productions and distribution. **First, a democratic people,** acting through their instruments of government must respond

collectively to common challenges if they are to achieve **common goals**.

Second...there must be multiple centers for social invention independent of formal organs of government. That in turn implies the presence and survival of a wide range of...institutions comprising the “non-profit” sector of communal life. (372-373) [Emphasis added]

Waldemar A. Nielsen [mentioned above], was chosen for director of this program. It’s “purpose” would be to “assess in different societies the *changing roles and responsibility of the private and public sectors*, and to formulate responses to new problems, new dangers [opposition], and new opportunities *rising from these changing roles*.” He noted that in the United States and elsewhere in the world, the “diverse centers of thought and action which are the instruments of pluralism...are fighting for survival in the face of developments that have brought them under siege.” Therefore, in stating the “conceptual basis” for his program, Nielsen explained that...

a variety of centers of thought and diverse sources of initiative...are an important assurance of creativity, adaptability, and orderly progress in every sphere of human existence...multiple centers of action, coupled with an active sense of private responsibility for the general welfare, make for a...more open, and less callous society... (373)

By 1975, Aspen had moved its headquarters to New York while the headquarters of the directors of the “thought leading to action” programs were based in Washington D.C., Boulder, Colorado, New York City, Boston, Princeton, New Jersey and Palo Alto, California (6). The facilities at Aspen continued to be used for the Executive Seminars and “intensive summer workshops where the year-around preparatory efforts pursued elsewhere come to a head,” while an “international extension of all its full range of ventures is now operating in Europe at Aspen Institute Berlin.” In addition, a number of Aspen’s programs were “being conducted in collaboration with a network of other national and international institutions” (376-377). The order of the day for Aspen’s programs and activities was for “joint planning of activities directed toward a commonly agreed goal” and the resultant tasks “to be carried out collectively by all or many of the different programs.” Slater wrote in the 1975 “President’s Letter:”

...With a common purpose and approach, the Aspen Institute can more effectively bring to bear its unique characteristics on the central problems of today. Among these unique characteristics are the active participation of Institute Trustees and Fellows in the full range of Institute Activities, leadership that combines intellectual and managerial achievement with...social activism, and an international network of individuals and institutions motivated by a commitment to thought, instructive action and the...**extension of humanistic values**. Also characteristic of the Institute are its approach to problems based on an analysis of the situation as a whole, its orientation toward the development of policy alternatives, its consideration for the human past and present and its commitment to the future, its emphasis on humanistic values as an essential guide to decision-making and its systematic efforts to achieve

impact on public debate and policy-making with a view to developing national goals in its various areas of concern.

As we start a new stage, our efforts must be...to realize more effectively our total commitment so that **we may be faithful to our calling of humanism and reflective thought leading to constructive action.** (377-378) [Emphasis added]

In concluding his book, Hyman explains that the “governing attitude” which “informs the inner life of the Institute” has a “negative and a positive side.” On the negative side of this attitude, they are “unaware” of the ordinance “Conquer but spare.” When they are in a majority, they insist that the “majority has a clear title of right to take all.” When in a minority, they “insist that the majority has no right to anything except at the sufferance of the minority.” The positive side of this attitude understands that the “data of the political process” are the “wants and needs” of “real” people who “must be addressed in the language of choice, which is the language of ‘if.’ If we do this, the possible consequences might be thus and so; but if we do that, the possible consequences might be the other way around.” Real people “must be galvanized into acts of choice” and “share” in the “decisions affecting their destiny.” The positive side understands that the “problems of success can be as difficult as the problems of failure” and the “**object of politics is justice** and not the exercise of power merely for the sake of dominion itself” (379-380). Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, history has proven again and again that the negative side always wins out.

Keep in mind that this was only a glimpse of Aspen from its inception in 1948 until 1975 and is therefore limited to that period and not beyond. Today, Aspen is still going strong and holds its Executive Seminars as before. It has now become part of the establishment. Elected representatives make yearly treks to Aspen for “orientation.” In assessing Aspen’s effectiveness from its inception to 1975, Hyman explains that “Mental and moral sensibilities...work their effects slowly and quietly” with no “trumpets to announce either the onset of a new mental and moral order or the decay [read: destruction] of a pre-existing one.” However, Aspen has/is playing a major role in “reshaping of the mental and moral life of an epoch” (8), the results of which we are now suffering. More important is the eternal souls who lost their faith at Aspen.

Appendix

Below is a partial list of individuals who were affiliated with the Aspen Institute, of which many played major roles in preparing America for what we're seeing today. Some of the names the reader may recognize.

Dean Acheson (former Secretary of State)—“helped shape the Aspen Institute” and “Special Participant” (Hyman Aspen 190). Acheson was a “mend” of communist spy Alger Hiss and the law partner of his brother, Donald (Isaacson and Thomas 466-467). Prior to Hiss’s exposure as a spy, Acheson had “worked [with] and counseled” him and a “silver tray on Acheson’s desk bore Hiss’s signature, alongside those of other members of the ‘Nine-Thirty Club—or Prayer Meeting’” [meetings held in 1946 by Acheson and attended by Hiss and the others]. Acheson “had secretly helped Hiss prepare his defense before the House Un-American Activities Committee” before his later trial and conviction. At a press conference on the day Hiss was sentenced, Acheson stated: “I should like to make clear that whatever the outcome of any appeal which Mr. Hiss or his lawyers might take in this case I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss” (490-491). This arrogance reveals the extent of control Acheson and comrades had in this country during this time. Today, the control is even more complete, but it’s hidden now as it was then, at least to the public.

It was Supreme Court Justice (1916) Louis Brandeis, one of the leaders of “Progressivism” and Felix Frankfurter, then professor at Harvard Law school and Brandeis’ personally “paid political lobbyist and lieutenant,” who were responsible for Acheson and Hiss’ government positions throughout their political careers. “Working together over a period of twenty-five years,” Brandeis and Frankfurter “placed a network of disciples (including Dean Acheson, a former law clerk of Brandeis, and Alger Hiss) in positions of influence, and labored diligently for the enactment of their desired programs.” After “his own appointment to the Court” (1939), Frankfurter continued placing a “network of disciples in various agencies and working through this network for the realization of his own goals.” These appointees, in turn, served as the “eyes and ears” of Brandeis and Frankfurter and as “point men in the effort to place more troops in the agencies.” Their work together, when seen as a whole, represents a “vast, carefully planned and orchestrated political crusade, first by Brandeis through Frankfurter, and then by Frankfurter on his own to accomplish extrajudicial political goals.” It was the **“progressive movement” of which Brandeis was a leader** that was “so dear to his heart.” So “extensive was the extrajudicial behavior of both Brandeis and Frankfurter that one is left puzzled as to how it could have remained secret for so long.” Indeed, both individuals’ “involvement remained hidden not just from the general public” but from their “closest allies and supporters” (Murphy 10-13, 20, 40, 111, 116-118).

Moreover, Robert Hutchins went to Washington in March 1950 to “talk to **Justice Felix Frankfurter**” just prior to William Benton making his “maiden speech” in the Senate.” **Frankfurter explained to Hutchins “the bitter attack being mounted against Secretary of State Dean Acheson** and the fact that no one in the Senate had yet come to Acheson’s defense.” Frankfurter “wondered why Benton in particular had not done so. Hutchins put the question to Benton, who was persuaded that he had a duty to speak out on behalf of Acheson and the State Department.” As a result, Benton’s “takeoff point” in his maiden speech to the Senate (a proposal for the Marshall Plan) was a “defense of Acheson” (Hyman Benton 428).

Later, Benton “led the Senate fight against Senator Joseph McCarthy” which ultimately led to his censuring by the Senate (511,602603).

Mortimer Adler—Adler published a book in 1991, Haves Without Have-Nots: Essays For The 21st Century On Democracy and Socialism, that was dedicated to Mikhail Gorbachev “whose perestroika opened the window to this [book’s] vision of the future in the United States, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union.” The chapters in the book “derive their substance” from “seminars or lectures” by Adler given at Aspen (xiii). Adler explains: “In my long experience of conducting Aspen seminars, in which the Communist Manifesto is read and discussed, I have always begun by saying that Marx is more right than wrong” (62). When the “six mistakes in Marxist-Leninist doctrine are corrected,” says Adler, the “positive picture that emerges” is that “communism chose the wrong **means** to establish socialism.” Rather than the abolition of private ownership replaced by state capitalism as the Soviets had done, Adler says “A society that aims at nonegalitarian socialism serves basic human **needs**...Private-property capitalism, not state capitalism, is the effective **means** for producing enough consumable wealth and providing a decent standard of living to satisfy all the reasonable wants of its members” (66). Moreover, the same reforms used to rectify poverty in welfare states must be used to “rectify the injustices suffered by have-not **nations**,” that is, to “eliminate the inequitable distribution of resources and wealth” on a worldwide scale (319). This “can be done only by the regulation of a world economy by a world government” and “what is true of poverty on a worldwide basis is similarly true of racism on a worldwide basis” (320). Adler advocates the “centralization of ultimate authority in the organs of a world government” including “police power,” with a “decentralization of the functions to be performed by its subordinate components, each exercising the measure of residual autonomy that is requisite for an effective performance of its special function” (321-322). This describes the function of the Systems hierarchy advocated by MIT, Club of Rome, etc. and Ervin Laszlo who developed the philosophy of Total Quality Management and whom Edwards Deming said to read to understand that philosophy.

Robert Amory (deputy director of the CIA)—Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (Hyman Aspen 149).

Dr. Ernest Anderson (Los Alamos Scientific Laboratories)—Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

Herbert Bayer—trustee and Aspen Institute Founding Fellow who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 199).

Louis Benezet (president, Colorado College)—Aspen trustee (148).

Leonard Bernstein—“Special Participant” who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 198).

William Benton—Benton was a man “for whom ideas took on meaning only when related to practical action.” He was an Aspen trustee and member of the “American Policy

Commission,” the forerunner of the **Committee for Economic Development** (CED) (100). (The members of the CED, headed by Hoffman and Benton, would be hand-picked by Hoffman and Benton and later accused by a *local unwashed* Chamber of Commerce of being a “left-wing, communist-infiltrated organization.”) The American Policy Commission was founded by Benton, Hoffman and **Harold Lasswell** and was based on Marxist *praxis*. Its goal was to form an “educational union” between “economic professors and corporate presidents” and “a staff of social scientists” from the University of Chicago to set forth ways to bridge the “gap between **knowledge and public policy**,” that is, theory and practice. Lasswell, then a faculty member at the University of Chicago and an “after-hours companion” to Benton, (when Benton later worked in the state department, Lasswell would be his “advisor”) had “pioneered in the study of public opinion and propaganda.” His interest had then turned to the question of “power in all its forms—political, economic, military, **social, cultural, religious**.” Consequently, he “applied to **group political behavior** a number of concepts drawn from the field of psychology and psychoanalysis.” It was Lasswell that Benton relied on to work out the “details” of the American Policy Commission. It’s interesting that in 1955, Benton would travel to the Soviet Union to “study at close range the media and management of Soviet propaganda.” Upon arrival, he diverted his attention to the “study of Soviet education,” even enrolling his 13 year old son in “Moscow School Number One.” Although American embassy officials in Moscow had never heard of such schools, there were “scores of such schools conducted in many languages where Russian boys were being trained to serve their country abroad as diplomats, scientists—or spies.” The “National Defense Education Act of 1958” basically grew out of this visit and this drive for federal aid to education was led by Benton, “Adlai Stevenson and **Anna Rosenberg**.” Moreover, Benton then went on to “tackle the larger needs of American education” through the subcommittee on education of the Advisory Council of the National Democratic Committee. Headed by Benton, the policy drafted by this group influenced the “measures President Kennedy advocated for education, measures which were to be enacted in great part during his and the Johnson administration” (Hyman Benton 194, 232-233, 267-268, 381, 513-520).

Paul Hoffman “was married to **Anna Rosenberg**, who was an “intimate friend and collaborator” of **Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt**. Born into a “half-Jewish Hungarian household,” Anna had come to the U. S. with her family as a young girl. Her firm, Anna Rosenberg Associates, “specialized in labor-management problems and public relations.” One of her clients in the thirties was Nelson Rockefeller, who she introduced to President Roosevelt and “his appointment as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs followed.” Benton had met Anna when “he himself became a consultant to Nelson Rockefeller.” It was Rockefeller and his consultants who determined “what Inter-American affairs were all about.” Out of these sessions “Nelson Rockefeller put together a program—confined by statute to the Western Hemisphere—which made him the ‘grandfather’ of many of the programs Benton himself was to extend around the world after he became assistant secretary of state for public affairs.” Said Benton of Anna, “She alone could recast our advice in political ways that would win acceptance from the President, the Congress, the Bureaucracy and the press. We would have been lost babes in the Washington woods without her.” Although Roosevelt wanted to appoint her secretary of labor or ambassador to Moscow, she refused, but in 1942 she closed the doors to her firm to accept her appointment by Roosevelt as “manpower commissioner of New York.” Here, she became close friends with General

George C. Marshall, the U. S. Army chief of staff At the beginning of the Korean War, Marshall, who was then secretary of defense, recommended to President Truman that Anna be appointed assistant secretary of defense, “the first woman ever to hold such a post” (384, 235-237).

Benton was an early “hero” to the “Jewish community” in America. Indeed, “every major Jewish organization in the United States has honored him with its highest award.” Benton, being non-Jewish, even received the rare honor of “trusteeship of Brandeis University [of Abraham Maslow fame], followed by an honorary degree from it.” (Ibid. 594) Benton’s achievements include everything from the “American founding father and patriarch of UNESCO” to playing the key role in initiating and facilitating the Senate into “censuring” Joseph McCarthy. Although Benton had initiated and facilitated McCarthy’s censure, it was a Republican Boston banker and member of the American Policy Commission, Senator Ralph Flanders, who Benton tapped to issue the “ultimate censure vote” (234, 541,602-603,607).

Francois Bourricaud (University of Paris)—A participant in Aspen’s “The Intellectuals and Power—Their Role and Responsibility” (Hyman Aspen 179).

Thornton Bradshaw (president, Atlantic Richfield)—A participant in Aspen’s “The Intellectual and Power—Their Role and Responsibility” (179).

Sylvain Bromberger (MIT)—A participant in Aspen’s continuing workshop on “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Lester Brown—A participant in Aspen’s continuing workshop on “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Heinrich Bruening (the last of Germany’s pre-Nazi leaders who came to America and joined the Harvard Faculty after Hitler came to power)—Member of the board of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation (44).

Sir Alan Bullock (former vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford)—Aspen Fellow and trustee (5).

Warren E. Burger (Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court)—member of Aspen Institute International Board of Trustees (318).

Henry Steele Commager—Frequent Scholar-in-Residence at Aspen (311).

Jack Conway (key aide to Walter Reuther, United Auto Workers; became head of the Public Employees Union)—Moderator at Aspen (116-117).

Marion Countess Doenhoff (publisher of Die Zeit)—Aspen Institute trustee who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 200).

Gaylord Freeman (president and chairman, First National Bank of Chicago)—Aspen board member who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute.” In an encouraging letter Freeman wrote to Eurich, he “vividly described the unsettling impact of the Executive Seminars on business executives—and their importance for that very reason” (190, 191, 149, 218).

Gerald Ford (Representative and later President of the U. S.)—A conference participant who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 196).

Richard Gardner (Columbia University Law School)—A participant in the continuing workshop of “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Jose Ortega Y Gasset (former professor of metaphysics at the University of Madrid)—Gasset was a Spanish philosopher and celebrated “humanist” who founded the Institute of the Humanities in Madrid in 1948. He was a participant at the initial Goethe celebration and advisor to Paepcke on the Executive Seminars and an Aspen trustee (46-47, 93, 97).

William Gomberg (Wharton School of Finance and Industry)—Aspen trustee (148).

John Herron—Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen (148).

Shirley M. Hufstедler (judge on U. S. Court of Appeals in Los Angeles)—Aspen trustee who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (148).

Robert Ingersoll (president of the Borg-Warner Corporation)—Aspen trustee and future Ambassador to Japan (148).

Lady Barbara Ward Jackson (president of the International Institute for Environment and Development in London)—A “Special Participant” who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute (190, 202).

William Janss (president of the Janss Investment Company)—Aspen trustee (149).

Barnaby C. Kenny (president of Brown University)—Moderator at Aspen (119).

Robert Kennedy (U. S. Attorney General)—A conference participant who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 194). From other sources, it appears Kennedy was considered one of Aspen’s own.

Glen A. Lloyd (chairman of the Board of Trustees at the University of Chicago and senior partner of a leading Chicago law firm)—Vice-chairman of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation and original member of the board (43, 148).

Thomas Mann (writer)—Member of the Board of Directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation (44).

Thurgood Marshall (D. S. Supreme Court)—A “Special Participant” who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 193).

George C. McGhee (president of McGhee Production Company; counselor to the U. S. Department of State and future U. S. Ambassador to Germany)—Aspen trustee (149).

Robert S. McNamara (former Secretary of Defense)—Aspen trustee and “frequent participant in various Institute programs.” He “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 203).

John F. Merriam (president of a “western utility company”)—Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen. Merriam was also chairman of the Committee on Educational Development’s Subcommittee on Education. Aspen and this group co-sponsored a “special conference” on “economic education” for three successive years. It began with a 1963 conference on the “kind” of economic education then provided by the “nation’s business schools” and obviously why it was outmoded (148, 167).

Jean Monnet—(The first recipient of the Aspen Humanistic Statesman Award, 258) Best known for his “work in bringing about the European Common Market.” Born to an aristocratic family, Monnet was a diplomat “attached to the British Purchasing Commission,” a liaison agency to the United States government which consisted of various “British diplomatic missions in Washington.” After the fall of his native France, he came to Washington in 1940. Here he formed a “partnership” with **Felix Frankfurter** and through him, “met decision-makers at the highest levels of government,” including the “president” and of course “John McCloy.” His motives in 1940, as Frankfurter’s, was to “prepare the United States for fighting the war” (Murphy 212-213).

Sir Leslie K. Munro (a New Zealander and president of the United Nations General Assembly)—Aspen trustee (Hyman Aspen 149).

Harald Pabst—Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen (148).

John G. Powers (Academy for Educational Development; former president of Prentice-Hall)—Powers “helped shape the Aspen Institute.” He had been an Aspen trustee but was then serving as a “special advisor to the Institute’s president.” It was this “Aspenite who wished to introduce American businessmen to Far Eastern Culture.” Encouraged by Alvin Eurich and aided by Phillips Talbot, Powers organized the “Executive Seminars on Far Eastern Thought” at Aspen. They were held for several years but were halted and then brought back later. Some of the problems were “springing either from forthright differences of opinion or from **emotional unease**” and “would haunt the attempts to introduce Japanese, Chinese, and Indian texts into the *regular* Executive Seminar.” Eurich said that the seminars on Far Eastern Thought was a “natural outgrowth of the Institute’s organic humanistic concerns” (190, 206).

Walter Reuther (president of the United Auto Workers Union)—Member of Aspen’s advisory board; Special Participant in the Executive Program; Aspen trustee and also “helped

shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 197).

Walter Orr Roberts (solar astronomer; director of the High Altitude Observatory—a joint venture of the University of Colorado and Harvard in Climax, Colorado; president of a commission of the International Astronomical Union; president-founder of the Corporation for Atmospheric Research- a consortium of forty-nine universities; member of the U. S. Defense Department’s Defense Science Board; member of the Special Committee of the International Geophysical Year in Barcelona (1956) and Moscow (1958); member of NASA’s Solar Physics Subcommittee of the Space Science Steering Committee; president of the **American Association for the Advancement of Science**, [AAAS])—Roberts was attracted to astronomy “mainly” because of its effects on the “**whole** of the earth below—climate, man, beasts, soil, water, crops, cultures, economics, social patterns, and political structures.” The “quality” of his “theoretical” research would eventually make him “internationally” known as the “refounding father” of solar astronomy. In effect, he was a “political scientist, **always searching for ways in which the theoretical and applied (theory and practice) sciences could promote the transnational cause of human welfare.**” As president of AAAS, Roberts would “press that search” as a member of its Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare and chairman of its Committee on the Public Understanding of Science. He would “press that search” as well as a member of the Council of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, as a member of the **Committee of Consultants for the United Nations Stockholm Conference on the Environment**, and as a “vital intellectual force” as a member of the Aspen family. Roberts’ participation with Aspen began in 1953 when James H. Smith Jr., Assistant Secretary for Air in the Eisenhower **Administration** and “enthusiast regarding the Aspen Institute,” invited him to Aspen to participate as a special guest in an Executive Seminar. By the end of the first session, moderated by Mortimer Adler, Roberts and Adler had “formed an intimate and durable friendship.” Thereafter, Roberts was a constant participant in Aspen’s Executive Seminar, either as “special guest” or “moderator,” where he “often” played the “role” of “scientific adversary to Adler’s philosophical humanism.” Such eventually led to the assertion that the “iron line of division traditionally drawn between science and the humanities was **false**” (114-116). The goal was to merge the two which resulted in the application of the laws of nature to human groups, organizations, etc., as well as merging science with religion [occult]—an apt description of General Systems Theory, the philosophy of TQM.

Daniel Schorr (Washington correspondent of CBS News)—“Frequent” participant at Aspen that also “helped shape the Aspen Institute. (190, 201).

Herbert Schlosser (president of NBC)—Participant at Aspen’s annual Broadcasters’ Workshop and also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190,208).

James H. Smith, Jr. (Assistant Secretary for Air in the Eisenhower Administration)—Aspen trustee (115, 149).

Soedjatmoko (former Indonesian Ambassador to the U. S.)—Aspen trustee and Scholar-in-Residence (192).

John V. Spachner (executive vice-president of the Container Corporation of America)—Aspen board member (149).

Maurice S. Strong—(executive director of the United Nations Environment Program)—Aspen trustee; Leader of several Institute programs and also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 205). Strong’s involvement in the New World Order (especially in education and the occult through the United Nations) is and remains so great that it would require a paper in itself

Robert L. Stearns—Member of the original board at Aspen (148).

Adlai E. Stevenson—Served as “Special Guest” in Executive Seminar and a participant in the Aspen Health Center (144-145).

Phillips Talbot—Moderated the Asian program on Far Eastern Thought (178).

Lionel Trilling (Columbia University)—Conference participant; Scholar-in-Residence who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 195).

Brian Urquhart (special assistant to the secretary-general of the **United Nations**)—Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

George H. Watkins (vice-president of the Chicago firm of Marsh and McLellan)—Aspen board member (149).

Byron White (president of the Social Science Foundation at Denver University; Deputy U. S. Attorney General; justice of the U. S. Supreme Court)—Aspen trustee (149).

Admiral Ellis Zacharias (former head of U. S. Navel Intelligence in the Pacific theater “during the post-Pearl Harbor years” of WWII)—Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

*Other individuals who participated in Aspen’s Executive Seminars during its first decade included but by no means limited to:

Charles Bohlen—then former U S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and future Ambassador of France (150).

William Brennan—U. S. Supreme Court Justice (150).

John Burchard—dean of humanities and social sciences at MIT (150).

Cass Canfield—publisher of Harper & Brothers (150). Harper & Brothers published some of Kurt Lewin’s work after his death in the late forties.

Sir Pierson Dixon—Great Britain’s Ambassador to France (150).

Lester B. Granger—executive director of the National Urban League (150).

Najeeb Halaby—head of the Federal Aeronautics Administration (150).

O. A. Knight—president of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union (150).

Bayless Manning—Yale University Law School (150).

Major General Glen Martin—deputy director of Plan in the U S. Air Force (150).

Sterling McMurrin—U S. Commissioner of Education (150).

Carey McWilliams—editor of The Nation (150).

Dr. Sammuel Miller—dean of Harvard Divinity School (150).

Jacob Potosky—general president of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (150).

C. L. Sulzberger—New York Times (150).

Leonard Woodcock—vice-president of the United Auto Workers (150).

“Major representatives of the American scientific community” (many were emigrants) of which Aspen initially brought the “business leaders” into “face-to-face discussions” in the Executive Seminars included: (151)

Hans Bethe

Harrison Brown

Enrico Fermi

Donald Hughes

George Kistiakovsky

Gerard Kuiper

Hermann Muller

Leo Szilard

WORKS CITED

- Adler, Mortimer. Haves Without Have-Nots. Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, 1991.
- Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. Simon & Schuster, Inc. 1926, 1977 Edition.
- Educational Planning in the USSR. UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1968.
- Fermi, Laura. Illustrious Immigrants. University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the Prison Notebooks. edited and translated by Geoffrey Smith and Quintin Hoare. International Publishers, 1995 Edition.
- Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Gunnell, John G. The Descent of Political Theory. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Hayman, Ronald. Thomas Mann. Bloomsbury, 1995.
- Heilbroner, Robert. Marxism: For and Against. W. W. Norton & Co., New York-London, 1980.
- Hill, Paul T. and David Hornbeck, The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education, Second Edition, 1991.
- Hyman, Sidney. The Aspen Idea. University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.
- Hyman, Sidney. The Lives of William Benton. University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Isaacson, Walter and Evan Thomas. The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made. Touchstone, 1986.
- Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination. Little, Brown and Company, 1973.
- Koch, Stephen. Double Lives: Spies And Writers In The Secret Soviet War of Ideas Against the West. Free Press, 1994.
- Kohler, Lotte and Hans Saner, editors. Correspondence: Hannah Arendt—Karl Jaspers. 1926-1969. Translated from the German by Robert and Rita Kimber. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1992.
- Lively, Scott and Kevin Abrams. The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party. Founders Publishing Corporation, 1995.

Murphy, Bruce Allen. The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection: The Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices. Anchor Press/Doubleday Company, Inc., 1983.

Scholtes, Peter (and other contributors). The TEAM Handbook: How to Use Teams to Improve Quality. Joiner Associates, Inc., 1988.

Trotsky, Leon. Lenin. Blue Ribbon Books, Inc., 1925.

Vazsonyi, Balint. America's 30 Years War: Who Is Winning? Regnery Publishing, Inc., 1998.

NEW SCHOOL FOR
SOCIAL RESEARCH
AND THE
UNIVERSITY IN
EXILE/GRADUATE
FACULTY

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 2

**NEW SCHOOL FOR
SOCIAL RESEARCH
AND THE
UNIVERSITY IN
EXILE/GRADUATE
FACULTY**

by
Judy McLemore

Vol. 2
(Second Edition)

©2002
Institution for Authority Research
Dean Gotcher
Herndon, KS 67739
www.authorityresearch.com

NEW SCHOOL FOR SOCIAL RESEARCH AND THE UNIVERSITY IN EXILE/GRADUATE FACULTY

by
Judy McLemore

“Totalitarianism and planning are inextricably connected.” (von Hayek in Jordan 278)

The **New School for Social Research** was founded in early 1919 as a small “experimental institution for **adult education**.”¹ The founders were a group of “liberals and radical democrats” associated with The New Republic among which were Herbert Croly, Charles Beard, Thorstein Veblen, John Dewey, Wesley C. Mitchell, the “English socialist” Harold Laski, the German-born anthropologist Franz Boas, social philosopher Horace M. Kallen, and Alvin Johnson. This group had “started publishing The New Republic in 1914 as a forum for the many scattered progressive groups in America.” The New School was “established in a similar spirit” and “international understanding and a **critical analysis of society** were to be the guiding principles of the curriculum.” Its “first connections with Germany” date back to “these early years.” The New School took its “orientation from the [German] secondary schools for adults, the *volkshochschulen*, that were founded there after 1918, largely **adopting their pedagogical and political goals**” (Krohn 59,60, 68; Gunnell 179).

Future Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter had “helped establish” The New Republic and was a “trustee and contributing editor” as well. Apparently there were other areas in which he contributed to the efforts of this journal because it paid him for his “traveling and incidental expenses” he incurred on its behalf. Herbert Croly, the general editor, was one of “those friends whose opinions he [Frankfurter] most respected,” as well as a good friend of Louis Brandeis. It was during this time (1914) that Brandeis used his influence to get Frankfurter on the faculty at Harvard Law school and “for the next twenty-five years, [Frankfurter] shaped the minds of generations of the nation’s most elite law students.” In 1916, when Brandeis became Supreme Court Justice, he enlisted Frankfurter as his personally “paid political lobbyist and lieutenant.” Moreover, he had Frankfurter “send him sight unseen Harvard law students—no others—to be his law clerks” until he retired from the Court in 1939. Legal issues that came before the Court were routinely discussed with Frankfurter. “Working together over a period of twenty-five years, they placed a network of disciples in positions of influence (within government), and labored diligently for the enactment of their desired programs.” (Two weeks before Brandeis retired from the Court in 1939, Frankfurter was appointed to the Court and actively continued all he had learned from Brandeis). At the same time, Frankfurter frequently wrote “unsigned editorials and articles” for The New Republic but the “true inspiration for many of these pieces was Justice Louis Brandeis.” Working through Frankfurter, Brandeis would even “outline topics for articles” and designate his “choice for the author of the work.” While being “extremely

¹ **adult education** as in Marxist Praxis/putting the dialectical process into action.

careful to conceal his connection with the journal,” Brandeis was in effect, “a member of the editorial board in absentia.” He realized that “employing Frankfurter and his many contacts in the literacy worlds to *prepare public opinion* for the acceptance of **change** by presenting the **progressive ideas** in print would only serve as a first step” in making his “reform programs” a reality. The journal’s “task,” Brandeis explained to the editors (through Frankfurter) “must be accomplished by **directing thought**, and propelling influence persistently against specific evils,” which according to him, included everything from “capitalism” to the “*character* and importance of Charles Lindberg,” one of his foes at the time (Murphy 10-11, 38-40, 89-91).

Harold Laski had spent 1916-1920 at Harvard. He and to some extent Mary Parker Follett redeemed “**pluralism** as a normative thesis” within political science in America. Pluralism was viewed as a “**critical political theory**” directed against the “conservative political theory” of the state. By the mid-1920s, the “concept of pluralism and the idiom of pluralistic theory had become common currency, while a decade earlier the concepts had been absent from the literature.” By the 1930s, pluralism “had begun to be equated with the theory of liberal democracy” (Gunnell 105-106). In England, Laski was “a member of the (Socialist) **Labour** party’s executive committee and one of its chief theoreticians” (Hyman Benton 281). In 1933, Laski helped persuade the communist founded **Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School** to establish a branch in London. He was also a board member of the Institute in Geneva where it was headquartered after leaving Germany and before moving to Columbia University. (After its move to Columbia, the Institute sponsored Laski as a guest lecturer.) The Geneva headquarters was called the **International Society for Social Research**. Max Horkheimer and his lifelong companion Friedrich Pollock were its “two” presidents and other board members included Charles Beard, Robert S. Lynd, Sidney Webb, Paul Tillich, and systems theorist Jean Piaget (Jay 30, 115, 307). As noted, Laski was a “personal friend” of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis² and Felix Frankfurter³ as well as a “long-time correspondent” to Oliver Wendell Holmes. It’s most interesting that Frankfurter chose 1933-1934 to spend a year at Oxford. From this time on, he stayed in “constant contact” with Laski and John Maynard Keynes as well as others in British academia (Murphy 43, 71, 207).

Furthermore, Berlin labor lawyer Franz Neumann, a “political and legal analysts of the **Frankfurt School**”/**Institute for Social Research**, studied the rule of law (more likely how to destroy the American rule of law) “under the guidance of Harold Laski at the London School of Economics” after leaving Germany in early 1933. At the same time, he became active in socialist “exile politics” and contributed essays to “left-wing exile publications.” After coming to America, Neumann taught at the New School for Social Research and

² It’s interesting that it was Brandeis, who “used his access to (President Woodrow) Wilson to translate his vision of the good society into concrete policies,” that had “advised Wilson in 1913 to back the Federal Reserve System.” Searching for the best possible place in his administration to place Brandeis, Wilson finally chose the supreme court. (Murphy 27-28)

³ At the Paris Peace Conference in 1919 attended by Felix Frankfurter, Laski had recommended Ella Winter, a student of his at the London School of Economics as Brandeis’ secretary. Winter would later become “one of the most trusted (Communist) party agents for the West Coast,” a “witting Soviet propaganda agent.” Even after a visit to the Soviet Union in 1930, she became “one of the most ardent and systematic defenders of the Stalinist tyranny in the United States, and remained so permanently.” (Koch. 227)

Columbia University where he “influenced a considerable number of social-science students.” Years earlier, Neumann had “chosen revolution over imperialism” and had “participated actively” in the communist uprisings that “swept across central Europe in 1918 and 1919.” As a law student in Germany, he had participated in the Social Democratic Party (social fascist) and in “organizing left-wing student groups” (Scheuerman 61-62).

The New Republic’s editorial offices, along with the Russell Sage and Rockefeller Foundations and the Carnegie Corporation “**comprised a vanguard of the future in which academics and other experts devised and implemented plans for managed social change.**” It was funded by the “unlimited wealth of Willard and Dorothy Straight.”⁴ Writers included John Dewey, Santayana, Royce, Charles Beard, Lewis Mumford, H. G. Wells, and other like-minded comrades (Jordan 68, 70-71).

The New Republic was apparently “owned” by Willard and Dorothy Straight. Willard worked on Wall Street and “was a partner in J. P. Morgan.” In 1937, son Michael, a “committed student communist,” would be recruited in England at Cambridge as a spy for the Soviet Union and “sent back to America for work in the capital” and consequently, he “became editor of the journal.” Within days of his arrival in Washington after his recruitment, Michael “was in the second-floor sitting room of the White House, having tea with the Roosevelts.” While Michael was editor of The New Republic, sister Beatrice Straight “would marry a man named Louis Dolivet, who in turn had been a **Comintern** agent” and was likely “still under Soviet discipline” during this time (Koch 174-175). It was this spy ring that Hede Massing, associated with the founding of the Frankfurt School in the early twenties, would be involved in. At the founding of the Frankfurt School, Hede was married to Communist editor Julian Gumperz. She later married Gerhart Eisler and then Paul Massing. When the Frankfurt School moved its headquarters to Columbia University in New York, Max Horkheimer was its director and its members included, but certainly not limited to, Otto Kirchheimer, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, Paul Massing, Felix Weil, and Karl Wittfogel. Theodor Adorno, “an eminent member” of the Institute accepted a position in Princeton with the Radio Research Project, but continued his ties with the Institute (Fermi 5). Not coincidentally, Austrian born Paul Lazarsfeld, while still teaching psychology in Vienna, had “made studies in social psychology for the United States government and for American business concerns, and after a visit in 1933, he settled here in 1937 as the director of a radio research program in Princeton” (Fermi 339-340).

Herbert Croly “was actually baptized into Comte’s religion of humanity.” He provided “intellectual leadership to reformers seeking to **remake government along managerial lines**” using “**engineering**” principles. Croly argued that “knowledge of universal laws, discovered by *scientific method*, led to rational control.” Thus, he was one of the “foremost intellectuals” who advocated “**managed social change**” (Jordan 13, 68-69).

Charles Beard spent four years at Oxford where he helped found Rusking Hall “which was devoted to the education (brainwashing) of the working class.” He entered graduate school at Columbia and was appointed a chair in politics and government in 1907. Influenced by the wealthy German-born Edwin R. A. Seligman, Beard’s work “was widely denounced as **socialist or Marxist**.” He advocated the “*application*” of an “imaginative intelligence nourished by the ‘Socratic method’” to the “social organism” which is attuned to “political

⁴ I have found, without exception, that it is the very wealthy who always fund subversion and revolution.

reality” and “grounded in **experience**” yet remote from “immediate interest.” For him, universities were the “training ground” for such “political thinkers” (Gunnell 84-85, 115).

Incidentally, because of the **Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt Schools’** “contacts” with Beard, Wesley Mitchell, Reinhold Niebuhr, Robert Lynd and such at Columbia University prior to its immigration, and in response to Max Horkheimer’s personal request in 1934, President Nicholas M. Butler immediately “offered the Institute affiliation with the university and a home in one of its buildings” (Jay 39). When Beard left Columbia he headed the *Bureau of Municipal Research*. This institution was part of a “movement to *rationalize* public administration” along the lines of scientific management/Taylorite methods and was funded in part by John D. Rockefeller and Andrew Carnegie. This “Rational **reform**” drew its intellectual “vigor” from “Lester Frank Ward and Thorstein Veblen.” It drew its “professional” vigor from “academic social science,” and its “material sources” from “**engineering** successes.” In each instance, “social changes hinges on the appropriation of apparently **scientific technique** rather than virtue, votes, or received wisdom.” These “innovators influenced later generations to continue to flee social ideology and personal metaphysics toward **scientific control** and existential certainty” always grounded “in the power of science.” The “philosophical bases of social engineering” is “**pragmatism and Veblenism,**” that is, “**Deweyan experimental pragmatism and Veblenian social engineering**” (Jordan 13, 84, 175). “From his graduate work under George S. Morris at John Hopkins, he (Dewey) had carried away a commitment to **Hegelian idealism**” (Archamdault 26).

Wesley C. Mitchell had received his “early training under John Dewey and Thorstein Veblen.” A founding member of the **Social Science Research Council** (more later) as well as the National Bureau of Economic Research, Mitchell advocated “both objective, impartial investigation and **salvation from social problems through application of scientific precepts.**” He explained; “**We desire knowledge mainly as an instrument of control.**” To this end, he developed “working relations with the *philanthropic managers*, Hebrew Hoover and Franklin D. Roosevelt,” thus “gaining access to power,” a goal of every totalitarian. History itself reveals that the ideas implemented by Hitler didn’t originate with him, he merely was the first to have the power to actually put them into practice (Jordan 147).

In 1923, the New School was reorganized under Alvin Johnson, a graduate of the School of Political Science at Columbia University. A major influence on Johnson was Edwin R. A. Seligman, a “German-trained economist” that was “influenced by both Marx and the *historical* economists,” who taught economics at Columbia. Johnson had taught at Bryn Mawr and Columbia and worked with Charles Beard on the *Political Science Quarterly*. He later left Columbia for a “series of jobs at Texas, Chicago, and Stanford before finally returning to New York to join Croly at *The New Republic*” (Gunnell 85, 179).

In 1927, Alvin Johnson was appointed by the **Social Science Research Council** to co-edit the **Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences** (ESS). The “main idea” of the ESS was not only to “integrate and strengthen social science,” but to give it “a voice on practical issues,” that is, to put theory into practice. His partner in this enterprise was his former teacher and “mentor,” Edwin Seligman. These two made “frequent trips abroad” seeking contributors to ESS and became well acquainted with European radicals and were most “impressed with those who drew their inspiration from [Max] Weber-’the most *creative* thinker of our time.’” The ESS contributors were recruited from many countries but the “largest number from a

single nation were **German**” (Gunnell 179-180).

The ESS consisted of 15 volumes with the last one published in 1935. It “took shape at the nexus of private philanthropy, **scientific social reform**, and the quest for **professional prestige**,” that is, to give creditability to its revolutionary contributors. Although Johnson was the “intellectual architect” of the project, it was actually led by Edwin Seligman. Such prominent “advocates of applied social science as Wesley Mitchell, Mary van Kleeck, and John Dewey” were on the board of directors. The ESS secretly received funding “from the LSRM (Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial) and the Rockefeller Foundation social science division” for production cost. The ESS organizers “consciously sought to influence public affairs with scientific expertise” although they “saw contradictions between reform (practice) and scholarship (theory) that later scholars would solve with **abstraction and specialized language**” (Jordan 139, 165, 167-168, 171).

Founded in 1923 and funded by **Rockefeller** monies, the **Social Science Research Council** (SSRC) supplied “**philanthropists an effective medium through which to invest their funds for the development of social science.**” The SSRC “partially centralized the distribution of funding and the coordination of research” in this area. It also served as an “**image maker**” to “improve public perception of the **investigator.**” Most important, the SSRC sought cooperation between “students of politics and the other branches of social science and also with the students of psychology, anthropology, geography, biological science, and **engineering**” in order that “the new political science may avail itself of all the results of modern thought in the attempt to work out **scientific methods of political control.**” Like Frederick W. Taylor, these “social engineers used science to negate traditional moralistic concerns with equally moralistic...objectives” (Jordan 132-133). **Of particular interest, the Social Science Research Council’s Committee on Personality Development in Youth, chaired by Dr. Ralph Tyler, would help fund the development of Bloom’s Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Book 2: Affective Domain on which today’s school restructuring is based (Krathwohl Preface).**

As a result of Johnson’s close contact with ESS contributors, he became a “leading expert on who was who in the world of *social science.*” As soon as it was known that the Nazis’ would purge the universities, “Johnson acted to recruit an entire intellectual community” for he, “more than any other American, quickly realized the need for action to prevent Hitler’s destruction of the **German intellectual tradition.**” Johnson had always admired the German university system with its “ideal of education as exemplified in the humanities.” In initially hand-picking his group, he looked for “**like-minded ‘practical idealists’ who had tried to transplant their academic insights into reality,**” that is, those experienced in putting Marxist theory into practice (Krohn Forward, 63). He began facilitating the process of immigration with the aid of Emil Lederer, “the socialist professor of economics at the University of Heidelberg” and member of the “**Keil circle**” of the **Institute of World Economics**. Lederer, an Austrian with degrees in “jurisprudence and political studies from Vienna and Munich, had been “instrumental in coordinating the work on the ESS.” He emigrated in 1932 and became the first dean of the **Graduate Faculty/University in Exile at the New School for Social Research** (Jordan 180).

Many of the “Jewish and socialist contributors to the ESS” found a home at Johnson’s newly created University in Exile. One of Johnson’s “goals” in recruiting these Marxists was to “**bring this group of intellectuals to bear on academia—and on American public**

life—and he attempted to find people who had **practical** as well as scholarly experience” (179-180).

Among the “names at the top of Johnson’s wish list,” were “Adolph Lowe, Emil Lederer, Jacob Marschak, Hans Neisser, and Karl Mannheim.” (Mannheim, Marschak and Lederer were also the “top names in the social sciences” that the University of Chicago had on their wish list). Mannheim was a Marxist who became involved with the “circle around [Oscar] Jaszi and [Georg] Lukacs in his native Hungary” in 1910, becoming a “leading member of the **Lukacs group**” around 1915. Both Lukacs and Mannheim were from Budapest and both studied in Germany. Lukacs’ group had become “a part of [Max] **Weber’s circle**” in 1912, as well as involved with the ideas of Stephan George. Thus, most of Mannheim’s work and thought reflected Weber and Lukacs. By this time, Lukacs was “dedicated to radical renewal through **cultural critique**” or Critical Theory Marxism (158-159).

In the early twenties, Mannheim had become a member of the “Kranzchen,” an intimate “discussion group” in Frankfurt that gathered around Max Horkheimer and included Paul Tillich, Leo Lowenthal, Adolph Lowe, Karl Mennicke, Friedrich Pollock, Theodore Adorno and Kurt Reizler. He also “shared office space” with the Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School before its 1933 emigration. When most of its members were forced to emigrate, the Kranzchen “continued in New York for several years” (Jay 24, 63).

Russian born Jacob Marschak was an economist educated in Russia, Germany, and England. With other Russian and Baltic-born immigrants, he “broadened and deepened the American understanding of **Soviet economic theory and practice.**” He chose Oxford rather than the New School but in 1939, he accepted Johnson’s invitation and spent several years there. He later joined the University of Chicago and the Crowles Commission of which he was director from 1943-1948. When the Commission went to Yale, Marschak followed. Several years later he went to the University of California in Los Angeles. As director of the Crowles Commission, Marschak was in charge of “broad studies to explore how mathematics could be used in the investigation of economic behavior and later showed how some of the results he obtained could be extended to **human behavior and the social sciences**” (Fermi 325,332).

Johnson didn’t initially get everyone he wanted. For example, Frankfurt School member Paul Tillich declined Johnson’s invitation and instead went to the **Union Theological Seminary** in New York, although he “stayed in close contact” and was a “regular guest” at the New School. Ernst Cassirer (a philosophy teacher of Kurt Lewin), Gustav Radbruch, and Hermann Heller also declined. Lowe and Marschak eventually joined the New School in the late thirties. Hans Neisser originally went to the **Wharton School of Finance at the University of Pennsylvania** and didn’t join the New School until 1943. Johnson was also too late in the case of Mannheim who had gone to the **University of London** with the aid of Harold Laski (Krohn 62, 64-66; Bennis 315).

The initial core of Johnson’s group was made up of economists and included Karl Brandt from Berlin; Gerhard Colm from the Institute of World Economics in Keil; Arthur Feiler of the University of Konigsberg; Eduard Heimann from the University of Hamburg; Gestalt psychologists Wertheimer, Frieda Wunderlich (authority on labor theory and social policy from the *Berufspadagogisches Institut* in Berlin), and as noted, Emil Lederer. Other members included jurist Hermann Kantorowicz, sociologists Albert Salomon and Erich von Hornbostel, Hans Speier (who had worked with Lederer and had taught at the *Hochschule fur*

Politik in Berlin), and Hans Simons (“son of the former president of the Reich Supreme Court”). Simons had been “director of the Berlin *Hochschule fur Politik*” and worked temporarily at the London School of Economics with a grant from Rockefeller. He came to the New School in 1935 as “dean of the Graduate Faculty.” From 1950 until his retirement in 1960 he served as “president of the New School.” Italian political scientist Max Ascoli, “a former student of Gaetano Salvemini,” became a member of the New School in 1933. Other new arrivals included Alfred Kahler from Keil, who had “ran a secondary school for adults in Schleswig-Holstein;” sociologist Carl Mayer “who had taught at the Frankfurt Academy of Labor;” jurist and industrial manager Fritz Lehmann who had been an assistant to Eugen Schmalenbach, the **“founder of management science in Germany.”** In 1938, Leo Strauss joined the Graduate Faculty then went to the University of Chicago in 1948. Ernst Karl Winter, former vice-mayor of Vienna and advocate of **“corporate monarchy”** in Austria, came to the New School after 1938. Kurt Riezler, former German diplomat and later administrator of the University of Frankfurt, accepted a position on the Graduate Faculty in 1938 (Krohn 65-68, 74-75).

Recall that Kurt Riezler was a close friend of Max Horkheimer and a member of the *Kranzchen* as well as helped found the Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School.. It was Riezler who, “having been asked by Husserl,” recommended Herbert Marcuse to Horkheimer and the Frankfurt School (Jay 24, 28). Others from Austria who came to the New School included Erich Hula, former assistant to “constitutional lawyer Hans Kelsen;” Felix Kaufmann, a “logical positivists” and member of the **Vienna Circle** and former Husserl student and jurist of the “Kelsen school.” Hula, together with John Herz and Hans Morgenthau, were “among the German jurist who introduced *questions of international law and comparative government into America academe;*” and Alfred Schutz who introduced “phenomenology into American thinking.” Spanish political scientist Fernando de los Rios and Italian sociologist Nino Levi were also appointed to the Faculty (Krohn 65-68, 74-75). Erich Fromm, a member of the Frankfurt School (until 1938) who developed a “materialist psychoanalysis” whose “social psychology, in this vein, rested on an **appropriation of critical theory**” and who, as a “social psychologist” fused the “thought of Marx and Freud,” taught at the New School for Social Research as well (Bronner 210-211).

Although the Graduate Faculty initially “started operating under the aegis of the New School,” it became an “autonomous institution that had its own independent administration, its own dean, a separate budget, and separate course offerings,” and the “school’s affairs were conducted by a provisional advisory committee.” Johnson had “enlisted John Dewey, Edwin R. A. Seligman, Felix Frankfurter, and Robert M. Hutchins (president of the University of Chicago)—all of them illustrious and influential **New Dealers—to serve on the committee.**” In 1935, a new constitution was adopted that gave “legal status” to this University in Exile and thus it was renamed the **Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science “under a governing committee which included John Dewey, Felix Frankfurter, Hutchins, and Oliver Wendell Holmes”** (who, like Frankfurter, would later become a Supreme Court Justice). Johnson had made it clear from the beginning that the “primary goal of the new Graduate Faculty” was to “internationalize the American social sciences” and the “school’s constitution reflected that same mission.” It stated basically that the institution’s “policies” were to be determined “solely” by its members. As opposed to émigrés hired individually by other universities and colleges, the New School group continued “to teach in

their accustomed mode” and work with “advanced students.” Moreover, “Johnson required that everyone teach one course in the **adult education** program,” which “was nothing new for them, since most of them had already worked with similar groups in Germany” (Krohn 70-71; Gunnell 179).

When the University in Exile first opened in October 1933, it had 92 students. By 1940, it had 520. Faculty members went from eighteen in early 1934 to thirty-three in 1939 but in 1940-41, the New School became the “refuge for over 170 scholars”/socialist/communist. Industrialist Hiram Halle volunteered to supply the money Johnson needed to make his Graduate Faculty a reality and for the first two years, over 80 percent of the yearly expenses were paid by Halle alone. In the next few years: “Without the financial support of **foundations** [primarily Rockefeller] and philanthropists, who sometimes gave several hundred thousand dollars at a time, the Graduate Faculty could hardly have survived and could not have embarked on its major **research projects**, especially **during and after World War II**” (Krohn 63, 71-73).

Actually, it wasn't only Alvin Johnson and the Aspen Institute who sought to have the *German intellectual tradition* transplanted to America. Stephen Duggan, a “friend” of Johnson's who was the “director of the **Institute of International Education**” in New York, organized the **Emergency Committee in Aid of German Displaced Scholars** to assist teachers. This Committee was made up of “presidents of universities and similar institutions, one of them Robert Hutchins, and eventually came to coordinate the activities of the American academic world” on behalf of their European colleagues. It began work in May of 1933 with Duggan as its director, of which he would remain until its termination in June of 1945. Edward R. Murrow was its first assistant director. Colleges or universities willing to make room for a European “could invite directly the man of its choice, either a man already in the United States or a man still in *Germany*,” or the Committee would provide a “list of names” to choose from, and the Committee would pay a renewable grant or fellowship to the hiring institution. The **Committee** was funded primarily by “**large foundations**” and “**worked in very close collaboration with** other institutions assisting foreign scholars, like the **Institute for Advanced Studies** at Princeton and **the University in Exile**” (Fermi 76-78).

Abraham Flexner, an avid admirer and “expert on German universities,” had founded the **Institute for Advanced Study** at Princeton in 1932. More specifically, he had received funding for the proposed Institute in 1930 from Louis Bamberger and his sister. Meetings were held in 1931 to “discuss the organization” of the Institute and 1932 was “devoted to the selection of the initial personnel.” Hence, in 1932, Flexner “went abroad to initiate his recruiting in Europe” and it just so happened that the “Nazi oppression began to force the intelligentsia out of Germany.” He then added a “school of humanistic studies to the institute” and for “decades the institute was a haven for scores of Europeans.” His policy was to “balance foreigners and Americans, *in order not to create resentment* among the latter.” Flexner wrote of those “foreign scholars” who were given temporary positions: “We have tried to scatter them far and wide through Canada and the United States, so that they might infuse new life into struggling institutions...” (Fermi 72-74).

After the fall of France in 1940, the **Emergency Rescue Committee** was formed. Its chairman was Frank Kingdon, and “among its national members” was “**Alvin Johnson.**” The “inspirers of the committee were intellectual émigrés who knew the European situation”

and “Thomas Mann was one of them.” Another “behind-the-scenes founder” of the Rescue Committee was Karl B. Frank, an “influential member of the **American Friends of German Freedom.**” This “Socialist organization” kept in “touch with German anti-Nazis in Europe” and in fact, the Rescue Committee was “formed on the spur of the moment at a meeting” of this group. Varian Fry was an editor on the staff of the Foreign Policy Association. He had traveled in Germany and become “acquainted with the work of the German and Austrian Socialist parties” and “out of sympathy with some of their work,” Fry had “joined the American Friends of German Freedom and became Karl Frank’s friend.” He was sent to France where he “organized and directed the underground operations” of the Rescue Committee. Thomas Mann and Hermann Kesten knew “which writers were in danger,” thus “Karl Frank gave Fry the names of Socialist labor leaders; and others furnished other lists.” Fry later stated that the success of the operations in France resulted from the “**co-operation of the State Department** and the aid of **Eleanor Roosevelt**” who “went daily to prod” emigration officials and “speed up the more difficult cases,” that is, those having problems because of their communist reputations and affiliations. Moreover, she “obtained visas for some men and women” with “little to go by but the assurance of émigrés (for instance, of “Thomas Mann”) that the person in question was all right.” Eleanor “never tired of her *self-imposed* task, nor did her efforts slacken” as long as the Rescue Committee operated in France. Before its end in 1942, Fry and his staff had “rescued almost 1,500 refugees” and his successor another 300 (Fermi 85-87, 91).

To Johnson, the New School represented an institution that was “**dedicated to the education of the educated in order to free them from dominant opinion (traditional beliefs, values, etc.),** through the work of a true galaxy of liberal professors.” The New School émigrés’ were “committed to the *life of the mind*” with a “passion.” They “drew their inspiration and intellectual sustenance” from such “predecessors” as “[Karl] Marx, Bohm-Bawerk, [Max] Weber, Simmel, Schmoller, Durkheim, Georg Jellinek,” among others. This group, “Always **mindful of the work of their predecessors, charted new directions for disciplines of economics, sociology, philosophy, psychology, and political science.**” Moreover, they brought to America a “fully developed awareness of what would *only later* be recognized as the central problems of twentieth-century civilization.” Many of the émigrés in the New School were economists but the “work of these *politically and socially minded* economists did not fit the conventional models the discipline worked with.” However, their “ideas found their way into what is now conventional economic thought.” This group consisted of “reform political economists” who’s “conceptualization of **theories** was always **derived** from prevailing empirical **realities**, enabling them to provide a *praxis* grounded in a coherent framework of **thought.**” Laying the blueprint for the Aspen Institute, they rejected the traditional view of economic man and postulated the “interconnections between economics and politics,” arguing that the “field of economics cannot be set apart from the broader social and cultural milieu of society.” Their work “**transcended the rigid dichotomy between capitalism and communism,**” which both Mussolini and Gramsci proposed to do (Krohn Forward; Gunnell 150).

The core group at the New School were primarily veterans of “political **practice,**” including the economists. While still in Germany, the New School economists “had already addressed fundamental questions concerning unemployment in relation to market forces and technical change and had developed fiscal and monetary ideas about economic and social

planning that anticipated much of what later became the **foundation of Roosevelt's New Deal.**" While John Maynard Keynes had provided some theoretical underpinnings for New Deal economic policies, these "reform" economists not only thought in short-range terms but hoped "to resolve the *long-range* problems that beset Western capitalism." Under the guidance of Johnson, the New School economists "became a kind of think tank for New Deal strivings" which "*allowed them to continue their previous work*" (Krohn Forward, 190).

Aspen Institute co-founder Giuseppe Antonio Borgese, "a student of Benedetto Croce" with a background in "political science," was also brought to America with the "help" of the New School and apparently was a faculty member there before going to the University of Chicago (130, 205). With Alvin Johnson as their spokesman, some of the "New School scholars joined a wider circle of émigré intellectuals and like-minded Americans" and took part in "Hermann Broch's and Giuseppe Borgese's plan to draw up a common manifesto that would not only spearhead the publicity battle against fascism but also encourage, in view of the Western countries' passivity, **a reexamination of these countries' democratic principles**...the aim was to produce a collectively conceived **program** for an **international order** after the defeat of fascism. After a number of conferences, the manifesto was published in the spring of 1941 under the title The City of Man: A Declaration of World Democracy. It was signed by seventeen prominent persons including Broch, Borgese, Thomas Mann, Alvin Johnson, Frank Aydeltote (director of the Institute for Advanced Studies at Princeton), Christian Gauss (dean at Princeton), Gaetano Salvemini and William Elliott from Harvard, the theologian Reinhold Niebuhr, and the writer Lewis Mumford" (138).

This document wasn't just "utopian" dreaming, it was "an important document" because "it was the product of a *far from common* intellectual and political **collaboration** between émigrés and Americans" and because "it reflected on the *future role* of the United States in World Politics." At the same time, the manifesto "made it clear" that...

America as it existed was not ready for the task, for democracy⁵ there [in America], as in the European countries, was in a severe crisis. For the time being, social realities conflicted with democratic principles—the plutocratic dominance of the dollar, the oppression of the blacks, and a far from democratic educational system were cited—hardly justified the United States' assumption of the necessary international leadership role. (139)

Soon after World War II broke out, the "studies of fascism at the New School gave way to a large project entitled 'Peace Research,' which was to develop planning for a **German and European postwar order**" (139). At about the same time, the "Washington administration now turned to the New School with massive needs for information" relevant to the war. As Alvin Johnson noted, "officials from the administration and the army came knocking at the doors, asking for information, analyses, and assessments concerning Europe." The émigrés at the New School "were probably the academic group most frequently consulted by U.S. government officials" after 1939. The **Rockefeller Foundation** "now contributed substantial sums to the Peace Project" which made it possible for the

⁵ *Socialist/Communist democracy.*

Graduate Faculty to “undertake extensive group research with sound financial backing and to build up a common research apparatus.” Moreover:

...the Rockefeller appropriations were no doubt made partially to conform to Washington’s expectations. The Board of Economic Warfare, for instance...would have liked to hire some of the scholars who had just come from France, but because of their status as “enemy aliens” it could not employ them directly, so projects were assigned to them indirectly through the Rockefeller Foundation. This **method** of financing was used not only for the studies on Nazi propaganda...**but also for projects on the institutional aspects of the armament industry, on the recruitment of the government elite in Germany, on the role of women in the work force, on resource allocations, and on wage politics, to mention only a few examples.** (140-141)

At the same time, Alvin Johnson felt that the “prime task” of the émigrés’ was to “win the peace,” therefore the central goal of research should be to “develop strategies that would provide a rational basis for future peace negotiations” and prevent another 1918 where the Allies won the war but “lost the peace” (140-141). Thus, beginning in the early 1940s, the New School began to plan an **international research institute** “to take over the tasks of the original Peace Project.” It would consist of themselves and other European scholars “waiting to be rescued in France.” This “community of intellectuals,” Johnson thought, could “outline plans for a peaceful postwar world.” **The Rockefeller Foundation** “approved of the intentions and plans as well as of the personnel” because it “had by now **worked together with the initiators of the planned institute for twenty years.**” Therefore it was “willing to help pay for salaries” but not the administrative cost because it felt that the project should be pursued at an American university. This because of “opposition” aroused when “the shaping of **future plans so crucial to American foreign policy was to be left entirely to émigré circles.**” Doris Duke, the tobacco heiress, donated \$250,000 to cover these expenses and the **Institute of World Affairs** was established in 1943. Its very name “indicated the *scope* of the envisioned program” and also “emphasized the connection with the former **Kiel Institute and the research begun there before 1933**” (141-142).

As the Institute of World Affairs saw it, the “crisis” demanded that the “economic, social, political, military, and philosophical aspects” of “solutions could not be considered separately,” nor “could the problems be geographically limited.” The new Institute would take up the work of the **Kiel Institute** that had originally **begun in the 1920s**. But because “**the studies undertaken at the Institute would be used to help determine the future postwar order**, an obvious attempt was made to place them in the context of research that had been going on over the past decades. One major reason for this was to **forestall possible attacks by the (American) public**—to which the New School had been subjected enough as it was—against this major program” (141-142). With this sleight of hand, Johnson’s plan called for the Institute of World Affairs to be “founded in imitation of the **Kiel Institute and to continue the work done by that group in the 1920s,**” and with the “arrival of [Adolph] Lowe, the most important people of the Kiel group were now assembled at the New School” (82).

The Kiel Institute had been established in 1914 and in 1926 and 1927, respectively,

Institute head Bernhard Harms offered Adolf Lowe and Gerhard Colm professorships. Before then, it consisted of only a library and a newspaper archive. Lowe had a law degree and Gerhard Colm came from sociology and with “few exceptions,” others that would eventually make up the Kiel Institute “were not trained economists.” While there, Lowe and Colm “developed a systematic science of economics with international applicability.” Those at the Kiel School “always saw economic **theory in terms of practical application** in economic and social policy.” For them, “no sharp line separated economic questions from sociological ones.” The group that eventually gathered there included Lowe, Colm, Hans Neisser, Alfred Kahler (a student of Lowe’s), Wassily Leontief (a Russian Menshevik), Jacob Marschak (a Russian Menshevik who had a degree in engineering), and Hans Staudinger (who studied under Alfred Weber and had a degree in sociology). The work of the Kiel School was “supplemented by Emil Lederer in Heidelberg” and Eduard Heimann of the University of Hamburg, who was the first to develop a “consistent theory of social policy” that was no longer based on the “idea of protecting the socially weak and insuring their welfare in complete isolation from the economic system but instead saw this protection as a powerful vehicle for transforming society.” Kiel members took an “active role” in “practical work” in labor unions, in the “ecumenical circle of religious socialists,” taught “courses in economics for adults at the university, for workers’ education clubs” and even “tutored union leaders” in the “theory of the circular flow of money.” They also started a journal in the “hope of reaching the anticapitalistic element” among the educated young.” The Kiel circle “expanded” in 1931 when Lowe went to the University of Frankfurt “**to assume the chair of Carl Grunberg,**” the “**head of the Institute of Social Research,** who had just resigned.” A “close cooperation developed especially among Lowe, his friend the theologian Paul Tillich, and the sociologist Karl Mannheim.” There were many connections between the Kiel group and “the circle around Max Horkheimer, **a friend of Lowe’s from his student days. Borkheimer had been appointed to succeed Grunberg, head of the Institute, and had been given a newly established chair** in the philosophical faculty.” Lowe looked after the Institute’s affairs” after its leading members, “anticipating a National Socialist victory,” left Germany in the fall of 1932. In the twenties, the “Paris experts of the Rockefeller Foundation” considered the “Kiel Institute the most significant research center in the field of international economics” (57).

Subsequently, Adolph Lowe was appointed research director of the newly created Institute of World Affairs. Lowe “drew on theoretical studies he and his colleagues had begun in the 1920s.” These studies “indicated that unregulated growth dynamics” and the “separation of production and employment” had caused “instability” in various countries and “international rivalries in an increasingly unstable world market.” The crucial variables in an analysis of postwar conditions was “technology and **unregulated** capital accumulation.” Therefore in the name of “international stability,” these would-be dictators determined that “full employment” could be attained “through **globally determined** and internationally coordinated economic policies.” But the shaping of this postwar world “should not be left to the diplomats,” because what was “crucial now was not so much a matter of foreign policy as of **creating a new, comprehensive economic and social order**” (142).

The New School comrades’ “strikingly new” approach in this endeavor “differed from many political émigré circles” in that they didn’t “generate *abstract* and utopian schemes (**theory**) for a future social order” without giving thought to “how they could be realized

(**practice**).” Indeed, the New School’s writings on fascism had already made clear that the “hope cherished during the Weimar period that the *working class* [proletariat] would carry the banner of democratic progress [revolution] had been abandoned *after* the events of 1933” [in which Hitler was elected chancellor of Germany]. But “rather than lapsing into resignation” as some of their friends and colleagues had done, the “New School scholars developed an outlook in which the concept of **social conformity**⁶ **became the key feature of stable societies**. It was this concept that provided the central strategic direction of their planning for international peace” (143).

Lowe’s ideas for “building a European postwar order looked not only to England for inspiration but to the **Soviet Union** as well. He and his colleagues thought a kind of **convergence of the two supranational societies essential, with Great Britain taking on more socialistic traits and bolshevism being forced to become more democratic.**” Those in Germany responsible for the war must “be punished in order to preclude the possible reemergence of the *stab-in-the-back* legend.” Under the leadership of the United States, which “would have to accept its global responsibilities as a world power, worldwide economic connections were to be established through internationally planned resource allocation and, above all, through credit operations.” Organizing this “global economic order” required “a kind of global New Deal designed to protect the world market against erratic oscillations in exchange rates, prices, credit availability—in short, in the terms of **trade.**” The “United States with its abundance of raw materials and its accumulation of world currency reserves was to provide the necessary stimuli here. In this connection ideas were put forward that were later partially realized in the **Marshall Plan.**” Goods were to be made “available on *credit* to regions destroyed by the war. **Repayments were to be made to international funds, which would in turn finance progress in other disadvantaged regions,** in particular the Third World.” The goal was a “**socially just international order**” (144-145). Sound familiar?

When war broke out, many European economists were appointed to government positions. Although large universities and colleges had some European-born economists on their faculties, the record was set by the Graduate Faculty at the New School. European economists connected with the New School included Herbert Block, Karl Brandt, Warner Brook, Gerhard Cohn, Arthur Feiler, Eduard Heimann, Julius Hirsch, Emil Lederer, Fritz Lehmann, Abba Lerner, Adolph Lowe, Jacob Marschak, Franco Modigliani, Hans Neisser, Karl Niebyl, Richard Schuller, Hans Staudinger, and Giorgio Tagliacozzo. One or more European economists were hired by the U. S. government or agencies working for the government as economic analysts, advisers, consultants, statisticians, or in some other capacity by the Office of Strategic Services, Office of War Information, Board of Economic Warfare and Foreign Economic Administration, Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Alien Property Custodian, Bureau of Latin-American Research, Social Security Research Council, Social Security Research Board, Bureau of the Census, **Federal Reserve System**, and the departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Treasury, Justice, and War. In the postwar years, European-born economists were actively involved in tax treaty negotiations with several European countries, in the Allied Commission in occupied

⁶ social conformity achieved by way of Marxist praxis/putting the dialectical process into actions resulting in the **standardization/norming** of the masses worldwide.

countries, the administration of relief through UNRRA, the Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion, the Economic Co-operation Administration, the Institute of Federal Taxes, the Maritime Commission, the International Bank of Reconstruction and Development, and the **International Monetary Fund** (Fermi 326-237).

The military Psychological Warfare Division, made up of the Office of Strategic Services⁷ which controlled most intelligence activities and the Office of War Information which was its propaganda counterpart, employed numerous European-born Marxists. These included Hans Speier (“one of the world’s leading experts in propaganda techniques”); Paul Lazarsfeld; political scientist John Herz; **Frankfurt School members Max Horkheimer, Kurt Lewin (the “founder of group dynamics” and the “Three-step” brainwashing process), Franz Neumann, Leo Lowenthal, Herbert Marcuse, and Otto Kirchheimer;** George Rohrlich; psychoanalysts Karl Deutsch; Louise Holborn; Nathan Leites; Richard Krautheimer; economist Walter Levy (chief of the petroleum section of the OSS); Giorgio Tagliacozzo; Gerhard Tintner; John Herma; Hajo Holborn; Felix Gilbert; and “many others” (322-325)⁸

Most of the research done by the Institute at this time was **“commissioned by the U. S. Administration”** but was never published “for reasons of secrecy” (Fermi 145). It appears that the roots of just about everything we’re seeing today on the international scene came out of the postwar plans of Marxists and monopoly capitalists, including the looting and redistribution of American wealth, both inside the U. S. and around the world. The sheer arrogance of these power-mongers at the time can be seen in a statement by Claus-Dieter Krohn, the author of *Intellectuals in Exile*. He explains that with the end of the New Deal, the cold war, and the McCarthy era, it was “no longer appropriate, for example, for Arnold Brecht to recommend at a conference of the State Department that America make known to the world that its fundamental opposition to the Soviet Union was based *only on* the disregard for human rights there and *did not extend to the economic system*” (Krohn 148). Today, even a communist country’s disregard for human rights poses no problem for our government as proven by its shameful economic partnership with China.

By 1950, the “Graduate Faculty had become a completely American institution of higher learning, and the émigré scholars had long since become integrated as American citizens.” Many of the “previous younger faculty had moved on to pursue careers at other institutions, and because of America’s **new role in foreign politics, internationally oriented research had long since found a secure home in American academe**” (Fermi 149).

Today, we’re seeing the University in Exile’s theories in action. We’re no longer a sovereign nation which means we’re no longer endowed with God-given rights. Our Constitution has been so redefined in preparation for this new Marxist “international order” that it no longer has any authority in reality. The time is late, but our children and grandchildren will never know freedom if we do nothing. We are condemning them and generations that follow to a world of slavery if we forsake the challenge before us for the ease and comfort of the here and now. Consider the wisdom of Daniel Webster:

Other misfortunes may be borne, or their effects overcome. If disastrous war should

⁷ precursor to the CIA—Central Intelligence Agency.

⁸ See also “The Marxist Theory and Practice Behind Total Quality Management,” another paper in this series.

sweep our commerce from the ocean, another generation may renew it; if it exhaust our treasury, future industry may replenish it...It were but a trifle even if the walls of yonder Capitol were to crumble, if its lofty pillars should fall, and its gorgeous decorations be all covered by the dust of the valley. All these might be rebuilt. But who shall reconstruct the fabric of demolished government? Who shall rear again the well-proportioned columns of constitutional liberty?...No, if these columns fall, they will be raised not again...they will be the remnants of a more glorious edifice than Greece or Rome ever saw, the edifice of constitutional American liberty.”⁹

⁹ Webster in a speech delivered in Washington, D.C. on February 22, 1832, reprinted in “Foundations of Liberty,” MacArthur Institute, East Moline, Illinois).

WORKS CITED

- Archamdault, Reginald D. Dewey on Education. Brown University, Random House, 1966.
- Bennis, Warren, Kenneth Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth Corey. The Planning of Change, edited by Warren Bennis. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, 1975 Edition.
- Bronner, Stephen Eric. Of Critical Theory and Its Theorists. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford UK & Cambridge USA, 1994.
- Fermi, Laura. Illustrious Immigrants. University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Hyman, Sidney. The Lives of William Benton. University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Gunnell, John C. The Descent of Political Theory. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950. Little, Brown and Company, 1973.
- Jordan, John. Machine-Age Ideology: Social Engineering & American Liberalism, 1911-1939. University of North Carolina Press, 1994.
- Koch, Stephen. Double Lives: Spies And Writers In The Secret Soviet War of Ideas Against the West. Free Press, 1994.
- Krathwohl, David, et al. Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Book 2: Affective Domain. Longman Inc., 1965.
- Krohn, Claus-Dieter. Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research. Campus-Verlag, 1987; University of Massachusetts Press, 1993.
- Murphy, Bruce Allen. The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection: The Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices. Anchor Press/Doubleday Company, Inc., 1983.
- Scheurman, William E. Between the Norm and the Exception: The Frankfurt School and the Rule of Law. The MIT Press, 1994.

**CRITICAL THEORY
MARXISM,
DIALECTICAL
METHOD
and
TOTAL QUALITY
MANAGEMENT**

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 3

**CRITICAL THEORY
MARXISM, DIALECTICAL
METHOD
and
TOTAL QUALITY
MANAGEMENT**

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 3
(Second Edition)

©2002
Institution for Authority Research
Dean Gotcher
Herndon, KS 67739
www.authorityresearch.com

CRITICAL THEORY MARXISM DIALECTICAL METHOD and TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

by
Judy McLemore

One...advantage of the **Marxist approach to history...is its fusion of theory and practice**, contemplation and intervention, observation and interposition. This is perhaps the proudest boast of Marxism in general. Marxism is intended to provide more than an understanding of history. It is **intended to serve as a guide for making history**.

Toward this end, the philosophic, historic, economic, and other theoretical productions of Marxism are each meant to serve a double purpose. By illuminating the past, they enlighten mankind as to its heritage: they open consciousness to wholly unsuspected aspects of social existence. Thus, they change the terms by which we accept the present, and thereby change our ability to shape the future. The **unity of theory and practice - of knowledge and action**...recognizes that thought and action are inseparably bonded in the **experience** of life itself. Thought provides the understanding of the past by which we guide our actions, action expresses the translation of thought into our engagement with the future.

Of course, such a unification also imports enormous perils into the **making of history**, perils monstrously evident in the way "Marxist" theory has been used to justify cruel and inhuman actions...**Yet the idea of a unity of theory and practice is a laudable one, however much that idea may have been abused in actuality...** (Heilbroner 80-81)

In the thirties, the Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School immigrated to America from Germany. After World War II, aided by British Hegelians at the Tavistock Institute in London, they brought **Critical Theory Marxism** to bear on America and its institutions in quest for her transformation. The origins of Total Quality Management (TQM) are found in the work of the Frankfurt School and the Tavistock Institute. In their formulation of Critical Theory, the Frankfurt School blended a revised Marxism, based on the work of the Young Hegelians with which the young Karl Marx himself was a member, and the work of Sigmund Freud. Tavistock's work was based on Georg Hegel's dialectical process and a revised Freudism.

Reason...was the critical tribunal on which **Critical Theory** was primarily based. (Jay 61)

While Marx and Engels combined Hegel's dialectic with philosophical materialism, Hegel saw it as the expression of the world spirit realizing itself in nature and in human society. He contended that the world was evolving by way of the dialectical process into an

organic whole. He gave various names to this *process* such as “Spirit,” “Idea,” “God,” and “**Reason.**” According to German émigré Herbert Marcuse, Frankfurt School member and revolutionary professor of the sixties, Hegel’s “**reason**” has the “**task of reconciling the opposites and ‘sublating’ them in a true unity**” which includes “**restoring the lost unity in the social relations of men.**” (Marcuse 43)

Marcuse writes:

...**reason** is motivated by the need to restore the totality. How can this be done? First, says Hegel, by undermining the false security that the **perceptions** and manipulations of the **understandings**¹ provide. The common-sense view is one of indifference and security, the indifference of security. Satisfaction with the given state (status quo/what is) of reality and acceptance of its fixed and stable (existing) relations make men indifferent to the as yet unrealized potentialities that are not ‘given’ with the same certainty and stability as the objects of sense. **Common sense** mistakes the accidental appearance of things for their **essence** (conflictual/contradictory elements that foster change), and persists in believing that there is an immediate identity of essence and existence. (Marcuse 44)

“Beware of **Common sense,**” explains W. Edwards Deming, the father of Total Quality Management (TQM). This because he believes the use of common sense is the major problem with traditional management. “Education and government” are in “need of *transformation to think and act in terms of a system*” (Whole, Totality). But transformation is not automatic, says Deming, it “must be learned, it must be led.” A leader must “construct a theory” which requires *knowledge* about a system and its optimization. Then the leader “develops an appropriate system for management (**practice**) of his **theory.**” TQM provides that “system of theory,” for the “**continual change** of practices for all people,” he boasts (Deming 3:6)

Marcuse continues:

The identity of essence and existence...can only result from the enduring effort of **reason to create it**. It comes about only through a conscious **putting into action of knowledge** (theory into practice), the **primary condition for which is the abandonment of common sense and mere understanding for speculative thinking**. Hegel insists that only this kind of thinking can get beyond...the prevailing state (what is) of being. **Speculative thinking compares the apparent or given form of things (what is) to the potentialities (what ought to be) of those same things...Speculative thinking conceives the intellectual and material world not as a totality of fixed and stable relations, but as a becoming, and its being as a product and a producing.**

What Hegel calls **speculative thinking** is in effect his earliest presentation of **dialectical method**. The relation between dialectical thinking (reason) and isolating

¹ the “operations of the understanding yield the usual type of thinking usual type of thinking that prevails in everyday life as well as in science” (Marcuse 44).

reflection (traditional thinking) is clearly defined. The former **criticizes** and supersedes the **fixed oppositions** created by the latter. It **undermines** the security of **common sense**...The first criterion of **reason**, then, is a distrust of matter-of-fact **authority**... (Marcuse 44)

The strategy of the Frankfurt School was the reorganization of the American people into collectives or groups and putting the dialectical process into action within these groups. The entire plan was first laid out in 1951 in the how-to book, Human Relations and Curriculum Change. This was a selection of readings by various Hegelian Marxists that in its totality, provided a guide for the destruction of any and all of America's existing traditional institutions by first destroying, group by group, each individual's Christian conscience, and thus the Ultimate **Authority** in America. It is on the work of this book that Total Quality Management is based.²

Human Relations in Curriculum Change explains that one of the "most difficult problems of modern planning" is to "**bridge the gap**" between "*what is*" and "*what ought to be*." However, it can be done with a "methodology of **problem-solving**" which is a "methodology of **deliberation**." This method of deliberation consists of the application of the dialectical method to the group, resulting in brainwashing. The problem the group believes they are organized to solve is in reality, the planner's predetermined plan for change. Thus, what the group believes is a "quest for the solution to the problem" is in reality the planners "quest for a *plan* or program of change" that will transform *what is* into *what ought to be*.

Briefly, this planning/problem-solving process might go something like the following (covertly, there is much more going on). A small committee is formed, headed by a facilitator, to do an assessment or study of the *existing* system or *what is*. This in order to elicit complaints and dissatisfactions, and later to compare *what is* to *what ought to be*, as well as to pinpoint where various individuals stand on the issue. With this knowledge in hand, they can begin work on the opposition to change. Next, individuals concerned would be organized into a soviet (collective, group, team, committee) to solve the pseudo-problems revealed by the assessment or study and then the planning begins.

The next phase would involve a facilitator manipulating the group into defining the problem as the planners see it. This would include **deliberation and dialogue** and is the key to the whole process. It concerns the "formulation of a purpose" or "goal," the "desired" end or "state of affairs." This is often referred to as "*what ought to be*" as opposed to *what is* or the *existing* state of affairs. Deliberation and dialogue "focuses upon devising action-solutions" to the problem, meaning a *plan* of action or steps to "transform *existing* conditions into conditions that are *desired*' by the planners. This, of course, necessitates the "fusion and interpenetration of outlooks" of group members. In order to accomplish this, putting the dialectical process into action is an absolute necessity. The dialectical method is based on **contradictions** or "**conflict**" facilitated between diverse individuals within a group, conflict between "competing perspectives" and "conflicting conceptions of *what should be*, conflicting standards of good or bad, conflicting value perspectives." The function of the dialectical process is to facilitate a diverse group of individuals to **consensus**, that is, into a

² See "The Marxist Theory and Practice behind Total Quality Management," another paper in this series, for documentation.

“communion of belief, feeling, purpose, and direction, or “one mind.” A group mind in flux and thus adaptable to change can be facilitated in any direction, belief, worldview, etc. the facilitator chooses. No conflict is fully resolved until all members “have come, through **deliberation**, to accept the resolution as their own” which signifies **consensus**. Once the group has thus internalized the decision/solution, they will commit to it and help in its implementation/common action because they erroneously believe they themselves made the decision.

Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils.

Speaking lies in hypocrisy; **having their conscience seared** with a hot iron... (Holy Bible, I Timothy, 4:1-2)

In order to accomplish this false perception of participation, each member is facilitated to “project publicly” or openly to the rest of the group what they personally feel the goal should be. More to the point, individual group members must state openly the goal their existing personality or “character” demands. By projecting alternative solutions, the personalities and beliefs of each member is *revealed* because individuals’ beliefs and personalities are “defined by the ideal purposes and goals with which they are identified.” **Otherwise, the “value perspectives and the characters” of members “will remain subjective, unreasonable, and unconstructed sources of dissent and non-cooperation...to the degree to which they are not brought out in the open, objectified, discussed, reconstructed, and made common...in the process of deliberation.”** To the facilitator, individual “dogmas are seen methodologically as intellectual attempts to save some privileged *position* (belief/thesis) from open collective criticism and modification.” Over time, this collective criticism/feedback from the group will destroy all individual “dogmas” (beliefs and convictions) and eventually the individual’s *conscience* itself. It is through the brainwashing process of “*inter-persuasion*” that a “common character is built” from individual group members. This because the *conflict* the facilitators are manipulating is internal, within the minds of group members. (See “*The Marxist Theory and Practice behind Total Quality Management*” which details this internal brainwashing process.)

Marcuse continues:

The form of reality that is immediately given (what is or status quo) is, then, no final reality. The system of isolated things in opposition, produced by the operations of the **understanding**, must be recognized for what it is: a bad form of reality, a realm of limitation and bondage. The realm of freedom, which is the inherent goal of **reason**, cannot be achieved, as Kant and Fichte thought, by playing off the subject against the objective world...In the final reality there can be no isolation of the free subject from the objective world; that **antagonism**³ must be resolved, together with all the others created by the **understanding**. The final reality in which the **antagonisms** are resolved Hegel terms the Absolute (the ideas and thinking of **reason**)...it is quite the reverse of the reality apprehended by common sense and

³ Defined and explained later in this paper.

understanding; it **negates common-sense reality** in every detail, so that the absolute reality has no single point of resemblance to the finite world

Whereas **common sense** and the **understanding** had perceived isolated entities (individuals) that stood opposed one to the other, reason apprehends the **identity of the opposites**. It does not produce the identity by a process of connecting and combining the opposites, **but transforms them so that they cease to exist as opposites**, although their content is preserved in a higher and more real form of being. **The process of unifying opposites touches every part of reality and comes to an end only when reason has organized the whole so that ‘every part exists only in relation to the whole. and every individual entity has meaning and significance only in its relation to the totality.**

The totality of the **concepts and cognitions of reason** alone represents the **absolute**. Reason, therefore, is fully before us only in the form of an all-embracing...system...[I]n his first philosophical writings, Hegel intentionally emphasizes the **negative function of reason: its destruction of the fixed and secure world of common sense and understanding**. The absolute is referred to as Night and nothing...Reason signifies the **absolute annihilation of the common-sense world**. For, as we have already said, the struggle against common sense is the beginning of speculative thinking, and the loss of everyday security (one’s faith in the Ultimate Authority) is the origin of philosophy. (Marcuse 45-47)

Marcuse dedicated his book Reason and Revolution to Max Horkheimer and the Institute of Social Research/Frankfurt School. Horkheimer had succeeded the Austrian Marxist Carl Grunberg in 1931⁴ as leader of the Frankfurt School in Germany. When Hitler came to power, he “was able to save his Institute as an entity, moving it first to Geneva, then to Paris, before finding a permanent home for it in facilities made available by Columbia University” (Krohn 161).

Writes Marcuse:

Hegel’s philosophy is indeed...a negative philosophy. It is originally motivated by the conviction that the given (existing) facts that appear to common sense as the positive index of truth are in reality the negation of truth, so that **truth can only be established by their destruction. The driving force of the dialectical method lies in this critical conviction...**

Hegel’s point is that the old order has to be replaced by a ‘true community’ (Allegemeinheit). Allegemeinheit means at one and the same time, first, a society in which all particular and individual interests are integrated into the whole, so that the actual **social organism** that results accords with the common interest (community), and, second, a totality in which all the different isolated concepts of knowledge are fused and integrated so that they receive their significance in their relation to the whole...The second meaning is obviously the counterpart of the first...The universality of **reason**, represented by the absolute, is the philosophical counterpart of the **social community in which all particular interests are unified into the whole.**

⁴ This date varies with different authors. One author states that it was 1927, another 1930.

(Marcuse. 27, 52)

The Hegelian dialectic considers things in their “*movements and changes, inter-relations and interactions.*” Everything is in “continual *process* of becoming and ceasing to be, in which nothing is permanent but everything changes and is eventually superseded. All things contain *contradictory* or *conflictual* sides or aspects, whose *tension* is the *driving force* of change and eventually transforms or dissolves them. *Processes* of gradual quantitative increase or decrease, at a certain stage when *internal tensions reach breaking point*, give rise to fundamental changes of **quality.**” For Hegel, **the focus of this process was on the mind, that is, thinking or thought**, while Marx and Engels stressed it was “inherent in the nature of the material world.” (Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 7, p. 357)

In a discussion between two people...diametrically opposed points of view [thesis and antithesis] may be advanced in the first instance. Each party, however, may gradually come to understand (empathize with) the other position, and ultimately both of them may come to agree to reject their own partial views and to accept a new and broader view...the original opposition has been reconciled in a higher synthesis.

Hegel believed that thinking always proceeded according to this pattern: it begins by laying down a positive thesis (belief) which is at once negated by its antithesis (opposing or diverse belief); then further thought produces the synthesis. But this in turn generates an antithesis and the same process continues once more...Ultimately thinking reaches a synthesis which is identical with its starting point, except that all that was implicit there has now been made explicit. (E. B., Vol. 11, p. 301)

Harvard University's Carl Friedrich notes:

The ‘vast power of negation’ which fascinated Hegel is the originator of ever-new thought. Hegel does not pretend to understand how this can be; all he knows is that it is so...No synthesis, no matter how unique, can help arousing this power of negation, can help eliciting a contradiction and thus starting the process all over again. In terms of abstract logic, the Hegelian position amounts to claiming that: A is non-A. This formidable challenge to established logical principles is rooted in an ontological, that is to say, metaphysical assumption. This metaphysical assumption is the core of the Hegelian philosophy: **the absolute is reason. Hence Hegel can assert that dialectic is God's thinking himself in man...** (Friedrich xli-xlii)

Hegel taught that thought or thinking is a dialectical “process” of moving from one stage to another, “moving from the simple to the complex **by** a gradual **development** or ‘unfolding’ **into synthesis** which became thesis for still higher synthesis.” To him, reality consists of this “logical process of thought obeying the laws of evolution.” Moreover, he believes that everywhere in the natural world as well as in the **minds of men**, we find this process of development that he called the dialectical process or **principle of contradiction**. This **dialectical** or “**reasoning**” process is “contained within God, thus God must be thought of as a ‘developing’ God” as well as the “entire process of evolution.” According to Hegel, **as the world evolves God becomes “self-conscious, comes to know himself more fully. In**

man he reaches the clearest self-consciousness.” Since God is **“Idea”** or **“creative reason,”** God becomes fully **“conscious only in the minds of human beings.”** (Frost)

Hegel believed that the universe is a **“whole”** and nature and man are **“one”** within this whole. The “processes” of the human mind and those of nature are the same. The highest function of the mind is **“that activity which enables one to see things whole, to see opposites unified”** (dialectical or systems thinking). He asserts that in **studying the mind, one will find it full of opposites or contradictions.** But also within the mind, as in nature, he found what he called the dialectical process at work, a process by which each pair of opposites is reconciled in a synthesis. According to Hegel, the **“mind does not stop with contradictions, but strives to get rid of them by effecting a synthesis...In a true synthesis the values of both the thesis and the antithesis are conserved and together they move toward new values.”** (Friedrich xli-xlii)

Several of the Marxists at the Frankfurt School studied the Bible as did Hegel which is where their knowledge of man’s inner conflict originated. They, in turn, took this knowledge and used it to wash the belief in God from the minds of men. Over 2000 years ago the apostle Paul explained this spiritual conflict, this inward struggle within the mind of man with sinful desires as a struggle between the flesh and the spirit.

For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. ...I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. ...O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?

Paul then gives the *only* solution to this spiritual conflict:

I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin. There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh. but after the Spirit. (The Holy Bible, Romans 7)

Hegel, as well as his disciples, had rejected Jesus Christ as the solution to the spiritual conflict and sought rather to use this conflict for their own ends. Sigmund Freud, the so-called father of “American psychology” who’s students worked with the Frankfurt School, postulated that man’s behavior was determined by repressed sexual drives, a “continual war going on between the id (biological impulses/desires/flesh) and the superego (conscience).” Thus “on the super-ego level, one can turn on oneself, as it were, and condemn as sinful and immoral one’s own id impulses and ego lapses. And because one can so turn on oneself, the *possibilities of conflict* become multiplied and intensified” (Griffiths 12, 262-263; Turner 93).

Humanistic psychologist **Carl Rogers**, drawing on the work of Freud and the National Training Laboratories, applied Hegel’s process to group therapy with the goal of making “congruent” the flesh and the spirit, eliminating even the very knowledge and awareness of sin. Rogers’ work then was merged with the work of the Frankfurt School which helped create a safe therapeutic climate/environment for group brainwashing. Carl Rogers, William

Coulson, and Abraham Maslow then applied the process to education and called it *decision-making and/or values-clarification*. Is it coincidental that the primary outcome of this process, when applied to children, is *rebellion against higher authority*, which was the *original sin*? Today, management books stress how to use this fallen or “shadow side” of human nature for the so-called good of the corporation.

J. P. van Praag was one of the “leading figures” in secular **humanism**. He held a chair at the University of Leiden, served in the Dutch government and was the founding chairman of the **International Humanist and Ethical Union**. In his book, Foundations of Humanism, he traces the historical roots of humanism in classical Greece and the Renaissance, going back to Socrates: “the man who is considered the father of humanist thought.” Although the term “humanism” was only coined in 1802, the defining characteristic of the humanist, according to Praag, is “**atheism**.” Another characteristic of the humanist is the belief that “**part of the divine is present in each person**” and “that part is man’s **reason**, which in a way **recreates the world** by considering it as a harmonic order,” he explains. (Isn’t it interesting that the rebellious Satan, who is now working to create his own world order in his own image, first tempted Eve with this same approach, and that is, ‘If you’ll only obey your flesh rather than God and eat the apple, *ye shall be as god*’). Another characteristic of which the humanist is most noted, van Praag indicates, is their desire to re-make the world, and specifically man, in their own image. Among the most renown “humanists” of the past century, according to Praag, is: Hegel, Feuerbach, John Dewey, Karl Marx, the Gestalt psychologists (a group in which Kurt Lewin was initially a member), and the “**critical Marxists like Lukacs, Marcuse, Horkheimer, Adorno, and Habermas**,” (of which Kurt Lewin was also included). The *tool* of the humanist, says Praag is “*praxis*.” He explains: “Experience shows that humanist political beliefs vary...however, it must be said that because of their convictions **humanists have a critical attitude with regard to all existing forms of society...This is the reason that most **humanists do not shrink from radical criticism of society...Putting humanism into practice is impossible without changes in society, and that means changes in the power structure.” In changing the existing society, admits van Praag: “Most humanists will not out of hand reject violent revolutions in all circumstances and in all parts of the world. But for as long as possible they will use other *means*...” (van Praag 21, 19, 102, 104).****

Not only had Hegel rejected the Savior but sought to make himself and everyone else god. His “whole system may be interpreted in a sense in terms of the basic metaphor of the incarnation, that is to say, the **union of God and man**.” The “**true community** - a concept closely akin to the traditional ‘invisible church’ - is by Hegel seen as the ‘**general divine man**’ which comes into existence as the incarnation is believed in,” that is, where everyone has come to the “self-realization” that they are god. *This was liberty* to Hegel. He wrote to Schelling: “**Reason and liberty** remain our key-words. Our point of **unity**, the invisible church.” Hegel saw his dialectical process as a means for manipulating the universal masses into a universal spiritual oneness, with this “force” that he called “God” realizing itself in the mind of man in the same process (Friedrich xxxvi, xxxvi, xxxvii, xlii).

The “development of **reason**” is “itself the most intense expression of this living and working God. For it, namely **reason**, is itself...the **Divine Spirit**.” Friedrich explains that dialectics is “intuitive” and not a type of deduction. “Dialectics is descriptive: descriptive of the process of thought which one must have experienced in order to be able to understand it.”

This “force” or “spirit” is the god of this world, not the God of the Bible or his Holy Spirit. Hegel explains:

Spirit, in so far as it is the Spirit of God, is not a spirit beyond the stars, beyond the world. On the contrary, God is present, omnipresent, and exists as spirit in all spirits. God is a living God, who is acting and working. Religion is a product of the Divine Spirit; it is not a discovery of man, but a work of divine operation and creation in him.

The lifting of the spirit to God occurs in the innermost regions of the spirit upon the basis of thought; religion (God is Absolute spirit and Absolute spirit appears as religion and religion is the knowledge of this Absolute spirit) as the innermost affair of man has here its center and the root of its life; **God is in his very essence thought and thinking (man), however his image and configuration be determined otherwise.**

Man knows about God only in so far as God knows about himself in man; this knowledge is self-consciousness of God, but this knowledge is at the same time God’s knowledge of man, and thus God’s knowledge of man is man’s knowledge of God; the spirit of man knowing God is only God’s own spirit. (Friedrich xxxiv, xi, xxxiii, xxxiv, xxxv)

Hegel sought a “synthesis of antiquity and Christianity” (Friedrich xvii). His pantheistic antiquity is akin to Maurice Strong’s ageless wisdom or theosophy, which, in turn, is the foundation of the New Age Movement. Moreover, Laszlo and von Bertanaffy wedded Hegel’s secularized antiquity with so-called “science” and called it General Systems Theory, the philosophy of TQM. In 1843, Ludwig Feuerbach wrote to Karl Marx concerning Hegel: “Ah! one need only open his lectures to fall unconscious before the corpse-like odour of Duns-Scotist scholasticism and Jacob Boehme’s **theosophy**” (Hook 233).

“It has been maintained that ‘the deepest roots of Hegel’s system was a personal religious experience,’” explains Friedrich. Hegel saw the universe as a “living spiritual unity,” as an “organic whole” of which the “spirit is the most comprehensive.” He saw the spirit as a “real, concrete and objective force,” and this “spirit is a *personalized being* through which **God actualizes himself**.” For Hegel, the spirit was “completely outside the self. as well as inside it.” (Friedrich xvii, xxv, xxxvi, xxv).

Hegel is also the philosopher of the “national authoritarian state” (xxii). He believed that “persons, not individuals, are the subject of rights, and what is required of them by law is mere obedience, no matter what the motives of obedience may be” (E. B. Vol. 11, p. 301). This law or right, according to Hegel, is an “abstract universal” and the “embodiment of the human will,” but only does justice to the “universal element in that will”:

My will, however, is also mine, and this element of individuality cannot be satisfied unless the act which he does accords, not merely with law or custom, but with his own conscientious convictions... Thus the problem in the modern world is to construct a social and political order which satisfies the claims both of the universal law and of the individual conscience. (301)

Since constructing such a world would be impossible short of “slavery” or “chaos,” Hegel’s “ideal state,” from which Max Weber gets his “ideal states,” turns out to be disgustingly familiar with a TQM state. Keeping in mind the findings of social scientists who point out that it is not actual freedom that makes man feel free but rather the “**perception**” of freedom, Hegel’s ideal state would be a state in which a...

synthesis of universal and individual claims is achieved. It rests on...institutions in which, in personal and in communal life, the individual is **taught** to find in co-operation with others the full satisfaction of his individual needs. Thus schooled, the individual can recognize the state not as something alien and oppressive but as something which, in so far as he participates in it, does satisfy him as an individual... (302)

THE “YOUNG HEGELIANS” & THE DIALECTIC

In the 1820s, the philosophy of Georg Hegel reigned supreme in Germany. A year after his death in 1931, a union of his friends and pupils from Berlin was formed to carry on his teachings and prepare a complete edition of all his works. By 1840, a Hegelian movement had formed who published a journal that provided a rallying-point for Hegelians and the University of Berlin was their focal point. Among those associated with the Young Hegelian movement were Bruno and Edgar Bauer, Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, D. F. Strauss, L. Feuerbach, Arnold Ruge, August von Cieszkowski, Max Stirner, and Moses Hess. All came from “well-to-do, middle-class families” that could afford to send them to a university. Several of them began their studies in “theology,” others in philosophy. All wanted to teach, mostly in universities, but “owing their un-orthodox ideas, the universities were gradually closed to them and they found themselves without a job and cut off from society.” Thus their energies were concentrated on employing Hegel’s “**critique or dialectical method**” first on “**religious and then on political problems**” (McLellan 6, 7, 18).

The Frankfurt School took their guidance from the Young Hegelians. This group placed great emphasis on the role of “ideas and theory” and their philosophy is “best called a **speculative rationalism**.” This because they added to their romantic and idealists elements the “**sharp critical tendencies** of the Auf klarung (the second half of Feuerbach’s book “*Das Wesen des Christentums* was full of the old Auf klarung arguments against religion”) and an **admiration for the principles of the French Revolution**.” They believed in “**reason as a continually unfolding process**” that “**would achieve an ultimate unity**” but this unity would be “**preceded by an ultimate division**.” They considered themselves the “heralds” of **reason** and “thought it their duty by their **criticisms** to force divisions to a final rupture and thus to their complete **resolution**.” Having “no roots in the society that they were **criticizing**, they could allow their ideas to range at will” (7, 8).

As noted, the Young Hegelians placed great faith in the “*power*” of ideas. Such notions as “thought precedes actions as lightning does thunder;” “theory always precedes new action as John the Baptist did Christ;” “theory blazes the trail and prepares the arrival of the new Messiah,” echoed from their work. By the late 1830s, the Young Hegelians began to feel that theory alone wasn’t enough to inspire and move the masses. August von Cieszkowski, the

son of a Polish count, went to Berlin in 1832 as a pupil of the “orthodox Hegelian Michelet.” In 1838, he published in German a book with the objective to “replace speculative philosophy by a philosophy that brought **practical action within its reach.**” According to him, it wasn’t enough “**to discover the laws of past history, men must use this knowledge to change the world in the future**” (8, 9).

Although Cieszkowski thought Hegel’s philosophy was the “long awaited discovery of the alchemist’s stone,” still it was “in no position to extend itself to a *conscious shaping of the future.*” The “**deep divisions and contradictions in man’s consciousness would ultimately be resolved into a final unity**” and the *method* Cieszkowski proposed for this *resolution* was historiosophy. The main agent in this *transformation* was not to be thought...but **will**, which was the **motive force for that synthesis of thought and action** for which Cieszkowski coined the term, so influential later, of *praxis*. (During his Berlin days, Kurt Lewin’s work revolved around this area). The future role of philosophy was to become a practical philosophy or rather a philosophy of practical activity, of *praxis*, exercising a direct influence on social life and developing the future in the realm of concrete activity.” Cieszkowski’s book, with “its emphasis on the **philosophy of action was as prophetic for the Young Hegelians in politics as Strauss’s book had been in religion.**” (10, 11)

This book written by D. F. Strauss had the “most influence” on the movement’s “development.” Written in 1835, *Das Leben Jesu*, was purely theological and its affect was “immediate and profound.” Strauss had been a pupil of the “radical Old Testament critic F. C. Baur, and had come to Berlin to attend Hegel’s lectures just before his death. He considered the Gospel narratives as the essence of the Christian religion and “treated them as myths translating the profound desires of the people.” Whereas Hegel had treated the “historicity of the Gospels as a comparatively unimportant question and concentrated on a **speculative interpretation of their symbolic content.**” For Strauss, the Gospels were the “imaginings of facts produced by the *collective consciousness* of a people who had arrived at a specific stage of development.” This implied that the “revelation and incarnation of the **divine** essence could not be limited to one individual and that its sole adequate field was **the whole of humanity.**” (2, 3, 6)

As you’ve probably already noted, the “origins” of the Hegelian School were theological. Initially, they were “exclusively preoccupied with religious questions,” on which they first “employed their critical powers.” The “ideas of the Hegelian left” included “**openly proclaiming as a political dogma the necessity of destroying the church.**” Eventually, they began to have differences of opinion and arguments started to break out inside the School. Some considered Hegel a “pantheist” while others thought him an “atheist.” Hegel’s lectures on the subject varied greatly and his written works were ambiguous. (6, 17)

For Feuerbach, the “necessary turning point of history is this plain confession and admission that the essence of God is nothing but the **consciousness** of the human *species* (‘community’).” Feuerbach sometimes spoke of his own philosophy as a new religion. It “takes the place of religion, it contains in itself the essence of religion, it is in truth itself religion,” he said. He explained that “God is really the perfected idea of the *species* (group/community) **viewed as an individual.**...The fundamental **unity** of mankind that the idea of a *species presupposes* arises from the fact that men are not self-sufficient creatures; they have very different qualities, so it is only *together* that they can form the perfect man.” For Feuerbach, all “**knowledge** comes to man as a **member** of the human *species* and when

man acts as a member of the human *species* **his action is qualitatively different. His fellow human beings make him conscious of himself as a man, they form his consciousness and even the criterion of truth**” (92).

For Bauer, and Freud following after him, the “true source of religion” was “illusion.” Bauer moved toward a “radical form of **criticism** based on destroying religious beliefs.” (Sidney Hook would later say of Bauer’s teachings: The “**critical process**” is the “**iron broom which will sweep the earth clean of the Christian state**” (Hook 110). Religion was the *source* of man’s “self-alienation,” according to Bauer, and later Marx. It is a “division in consciousness where religious beliefs become opposed to consciousness as a separate power. Self-consciousness makes itself into an object, an imaginary separate being” and self-consciousness loses control of itself” and “feels itself as nothing before the opposing power.” Bauer’s focus now was the “*object* of **criticism** rather than the **method**.” Before, “**criticism** merely showed the deficiencies of past religious ideas and how they stood in contradiction with developments towards the perfect harmony, now criticism began to demonstrate the absurdity of any kind of religion. **Criticism** became **exterior** as well as **interior**.” (48-49, 65)

The “God men worshipped was their own imaginary, inflated and distorted reflection,” insisted Bauer. Protestantism envelops men from the “inside” and where “religion is conceived to be the essence of man, there he will find it most difficult to grasp his own true essence.” Bauer claims that “Need is the powerful motor of civil society. Every person uses other people for the *satisfaction of his own want*.” Civil society is kept in being by “need” and this type of society “had as its principle Christianity.” To Bauer, Christianity “separates men from each other and their true essence,” and his goal was the “integration and the recovery of man’s universal essence.” In Bauer’s philosophy, materialism destroys the “domination of religion over men’s minds and thus prepares the way for self-consciousness.” The means to which self-consciousness was to be attained was “**criticism**,” a word which was the “constant battle-cry of the Young Hegelian Movement.” Influenced by Bauer, the young Marx, in his dissertation wrote that “**philosophy was against all gods in heaven and earth that do not recognize human self-consciousness as the highest godhead. There shall be no other beside it**” (McLellan 66-67, 71).

Criticism “is the activity that transforms *objects* into self-consciousness” which in turn, “represents the unity and power of the universe. Its objective is to “do away with all obstacles that impede the progress of history.” But “criticism will not always be negative: **Up till now history has brought forth no truth that has not fallen to the fire of criticism...**” The highest truth that history can produce through **criticism** is “man, freedom, **self-consciousness**” or “development at last freed” which is the **least calculated to block criticism** and future progress.” “History” says Bauer, “does not come towards us; our own action must bring it towards us. That action is called criticism.” For “**criticism is the action of applying theory to reality as it exists, the critical negation of what exists.**” Indeed, explained Bauer, **criticism was the “terrorism of pure theory.”** (60)

History was the “journey on which men’s minds became enslaved to their own creations (Christianity) and gradually, through an antithetical development, set aside these false idols and attained to unimpeded **self-realization**.” For Bauer, criticism had to be “linked to the present **needs** of mankind,” and that meant becoming “**practical**.” A theoretical principle must “straightway become a **practical act...the overthrow of what exists must be the**

main aim—so philosophy must also work in the political field and...attack **existing situations**” (63).

O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings (such as do not honor God), and oppositions of science falsely so called.

Which some professing have erred concerning the faith... (Holy Bible, I Timothy, 6:20-21)

HEGEL’S DIALECTICAL PROCESS IN ACTION **is** **MAO TSE- TUNG’S BRAINWASHING**

In Mao Tse-tung’s China, the dialectical process was applied and thus experienced by the intellectuals as well as the masses. In 1949, the People’s Republic of China was officially proclaimed with Chairman Mao as its head. Mao desperately needed the aid of the Chinese *chih-shih fen-tzu*, that is, the “elements with knowledge” or “intelligentsia,”—the professional people such as scholars, teachers, writers, etc.—in order to carry out his communist policies. But Mao wanted more than their “voluntary” help, he wanted their *hearts and minds*. The Marxist concepts, **contradiction/conflict** and **struggle**, are key to bringing about the latter. Theodore Chen writes in Thought Reform of the Chinese Intellectuals:

Quoting Engels and Lenin on the ‘universality of contradiction’, Mao [Tse-tung] said, ‘There is nothing that does not contain contradiction; without contradiction there would be no world’...The Communist Party could not be free of contradictions, either. ‘If in the Party there were neither contradictions nor **ideological struggles to solve them**, the Party’s life would come to an end’...Progress, in the Marxist view, came through the **process of struggle, of solving contradictions**. There was **unity in contradiction**, theorized Mao, because, as Lenin had taught, ‘**opposites can transform themselves into each other and become identical**’, and **identity meant unity**. (128)

Chen quotes Mao:

Contradiction and struggle are universal, absolute, but the methods for solving contradictions, that is, the forms of struggle, differ according to the nature of the contradictions. Some contradictions are characterized by open antagonism, some are not...(128)

Conflict/contradictions between the “correct” ideology of Marx and Lenin and the “**erroneous ideologies**” of everyone else, for instance, become antagonistic if the others “persist in them.” **Antagonistic contradictions meant open opposition**; that is, openly and publicly opposing Marxism and Marxist policies. Thus antagonistic contradictions were “solved” differently than non-antagonistic ones. Chen explains:

The specific question discussed in the latter part of 1956 was whether or not after the ‘socialist transformation’ of private enterprises there still existed class contradictions between the bourgeoisie and the working class, and, if so, whether these remaining contradictions were antagonistic in nature. This was not a purely academic question, because its answer would determine the nature of the ‘struggle’ to be waged against the bourgeoisie. If there were no more contradictions, there would be no further need of a ‘bitter class struggle’. **If there were remaining contradictions but they were non-antagonistic in nature, it would be possible to ‘resolve’ them by ‘peaceful methods of struggle’, namely, by ‘persuasion’ and ‘education’.** If, however, the contradictions were antagonistic, then...more drastic, even violent, methods of struggle would be in order. (129)

In 1957, Mao implemented a campaign towards the intellectuals which he called “Let a hundred flowers blossom together; let a hundred schools (of thought) contend together.” This brainwashing scheme eventually came to be called “hundred flowers,” for short. In a nutshell, hundred flowers involved the organization of intellectuals as well as the masses into diverse groups with a plurality of beliefs and values that contended and dialogued together until everyone reached **consensus**. To those to whom it was applied, it meant actually experiencing the dialectic process in a concrete or real situation. To be successful, these *experiences* had to be planned or “staged” and lead by comrades trained in the facilitation of group processes. The hundred flowers campaign was the **“application of the dialectical view of history to the present.”** **If you recall, this is the same process that Ervin Laszlo advocated for America’s “transition” period into world government in A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order: A “plurality of views are championed and a hundred flowers bloom,” he boasted (Laszlo 108).** Consequently, it is the very foundation of TQM. The hundred flowers campaign was based on Mao’s formula **“criticism-unity-criticism”** as a means of *resolving contradictions*. The method had “been in use by the Party since 1927.” Chen quotes a few “key passages” from Mao’s 1937 treatise *On Contradiction*, explaining that from the opening two sentences comes the basic idea of Mao’s **“criticism-unity-criticism”**:

The law of contradictions in things, that is, the law of the unity of **opposites**, is the most basic law in materialists dialectics. Lenin said: ‘In its proper meaning, dialectics is the study of the contradictions within the very essence of things.’ (Chen 128)

The hundred flowers campaign was a “method” of “struggle” in which people with non-Marxist ideas were to be encouraged to come out into the open so their views might be ‘discussed’ and their errors shown.” Kuo Mo-jo, resident of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, stressed “the **struggle aspect of contending**. ‘We must criticize any ideology opposed to socialist construction - *this is what we mean by struggle*.’” Lu Ting-yi, director of the Propaganda Department of the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party, explained that permitting the “hundred flowers” and “hundred schools” was “a policy to strengthen *unity*.” *Lu-Ting-yi* distinguished between “two kinds of **unity**.” The “unity that comes from mechanical obedience and the **unity based on conscious and voluntary**

agreement; the latter was wanted... (120, 122).

The prior six years of the regime had seen the “internal enemies” of China “subdued” and brainwashing/thought reform had already produced “a fundamental change in the political outlook of the intellectuals.” But as the propaganda chief “candidly admitted, the counter-revolutionary elements could be suppressed and wiped out but **ideological questions cannot be settled by administrative orders.**” Only through “open debate” could this be accomplished. The *contending* was to be done by “the people within their own ranks” (peers) so as not to “disrupt the unity of the people” explained Lo Lung-chi, the Democratic League leader (123).

Brainwashing had been carried on within the ranks of Mao’s Red Army as earlier as 1929 and through the years “**a vigorous ‘thought struggle’ was one of the chief methods of forging the unity**” of the Chinese Communist Party. (10) Brainwashing worked and Mao knew it. As “earlier as 1939, Mao declared that the intellectual elements are indispensable and to win over all progressive elements is one of our most important tasks.” A 1939 resolution of the Chinese Communist Party made clear that enlisting the intellectual’s services wasn’t enough, that **ideological “remoulding” was necessary and spoke of “cadres who are capable of handling the intellectuals.”** (Today’s term for these particular “cadres” is change agents/facilitators.) Actually, everyone was to be “re-educated” but the intellectuals posed a special problem. Chen explains:

The reform of the intellectuals is thus essentially a **reform of their thought or ideology**...It is specially important for the intellectuals because they are more likely than the uneducated population to resist indoctrination and propaganda...they cannot be swayed so easily by emotional appeals which are effective with the uncritical masses. They are more likely to question the new ideology they are asked to accept. Consequently their thought reform is of primary concern to the new regime. (11)

Chen defines Mao’s thought reform:

The Chinese term for thought reform, *ssu-hsiang kai-tsao*, literally means the remaking or the reconstructing of thought. As ‘thought’ in Communist vocabulary is practically synonymous with ideology, ‘thought reform’ and ‘ideological remolding’ are also almost synonymous. Its negative aspect has been colloquially called **‘brainwashing’, the cleansing of the mind of non-Marxist thoughts and ideas.** Thought reform is more than thought control, more than the suppression of ‘erroneous ideas’. It has for a positive aim the remolding of thought to produce **new patterns of thinking.** (72)

Of the campaigns specifically directed towards the intellectuals, one had for its objective the “uprooting of existing attitudes and habits of thought” while the other had for its objective “their indoctrination and thought reform” (Preface). The “**first precondition of achieving a new orientation is to be free of the shackles of the old,**” explains Ervin Laszlo in *A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order* (Laszlo 93) that is, it’s necessary to wash the mind of its existing facts, beliefs, values, worldview, before replacing them with others. As already noted, the primary methods used by the Chinese Communist to

accomplish this task was “**group discussion, criticism and self-criticism**” (Chen 72). Chen writes:

‘Struggle’ is a key concept in Communist ideology. The Marxist holds that all existences are ‘complexes of opposing elements or opposing forces’, and that **conflicts or contradictions** between opposing elements are inevitable and produce changes. Therefore **conflict and change are inherent in all existences. Conflict means struggle** which...is a normal function of existence. Moreover, progress comes through struggle; to avoid struggle is to stop progress. (72)

Chen says that reformists believe that progress or change can be brought about by “peaceful” or non-violent means, whereas revolutionary individuals believe in the “overthrow of a class by another class by violent means” [TQM is the former]. Thought reform means “struggle” and therefore the **process** is often **painful** and can only be accomplished in **groups**. Chen quotes Communist Ai Ssu-ch’i, who “has been called China’s ‘Number One Brainwasher.’” (14)

Thought reform must be carried out through **thought struggle**. Anyone who is willing to learn...must be prepared for a strenuous **struggle between his new and old ideologies**. The old things in this world cannot be expected to die of themselves, they fall only under the struggle and the blows of the new...It would be difficult for them [intellectuals] to **change without the criticism and encouragement of people close to them (group) and without an ideological inner-struggle of their own...** (73)

According to Chen, the campaign against the intellectuals was a “purge of anti-Marxist ideas and *practices*,” as opposed to their “physical purge.” The slogan was “to cure the disease and save the patient.” The emphasis of thought reform initially was on study groups and/or occupational training classes. “Thought reform,” said Mao, “is one of the most important prerequisites for the realization of *democratic reform and industrialization*.” Everyone, including “workers, peasants, housewives, old men and women and the unemployed” were required to attend, as well as “government workers.” Group study was also “taken up by students and faculty in schools and universities, and by other intellectuals within their own professional groups or organizations they were associated with.” Group discussion or dialogue was a regular feature of study. As Chen explains: “**The pressure of one’s colleagues and personal acquaintances is...more effective than the naked coercion of the Party or state.**” Hence, Mao’s injunction to the masses: “Study, study and again study” (12, 13).

The “**psychology of the human desire to appear to be consistent in the eyes of fellow men is exploited**” in this Chinese brainwashing process, writes Chen. The collective or group, as noted earlier, was all important in Chinese thought reform as it is in TQM. The reason being is that brainwashing consists of using “**various forms of group pressure instigated by progressive elements and activists**” (change agents/facilitators) to bring about the conformity of group members.

Brainwashing involves putting the dialectical process into action. This entails organizing individuals into groups (student groups, work groups, planning groups, groups to study

specific problems, committees, professional groups, leadership groups, etc., etc.) for various benign sounding reasons (decision-making, problem-solving, planning, to groom future leaders, economic development, etc.) Behind the scene, much planning is going on with which the group is unaware. The groups must consist of individuals who hold diverse beliefs, values, worldviews, etc. Other than in Encounter or T-groups, which are for personal development, the group has a task to perform, a problem to solve, a decision to make or the like. The initial ambiguity and confusion of group members, brought on by this new situation, being unfamiliar with group members, not knowing where to begin or exactly what to do, etc. helps unfreeze the group. The facilitating cadre usually begins by telling jokes, and/or playing games that calls for interaction between group members or something of the sort. This is intended to put everyone at ease and help lower their defenses. By using various techniques, the facilitator eventually has everyone emotionally involved and participating.

The building of **trust** and a sense of **security** for group members is crucial. The facilitator creates a safe climate where individuals feel free to express their most intimate thoughts and feelings, not only about the task at hand, but also about life, work, their values and beliefs, world views, etc. Group norms forbid any put-downs. There are no right or wrong answers and all ideas, beliefs, values and opinions are given equal status, regardless of how absurd or radical they are. A non-authoritarian atmosphere is created where everyone participates as equals and status or rank is not acknowledged. Individuals must base their judgments and choices on their own knowledge, values, beliefs and so forth rather than some higher or ultimate authority (law, experts, existing cultural norms, community standards, God, etc.).

Anyone with strong convictions, who believes in facts, universal absolutes, right and wrong, must necessarily set aside those facts and convictions in order to conform to group and reach consensus [synthesis]. This they unconsciously learn to do in response to feedback from the group. When an individual violates a group norm, they receive negative feedback from their peers. When they conform to the group, they receive praise and acceptance. When conformity to the group violates the individual conscience, he finds himself torn between “strong psychological pressure to avoid conflict with other members of a group,” or with his “own value system”—a “choice between satisfying group expectations or satisfying our conscience by living up to a moral code.” The resulting **inner tension** within the individual is what social psychologist Leon Festinger called “**cognitive dissonance**” or a feeling of guilt. Moreover, says Festinger, individuals are “highly motivated” to reduce cognitive dissonance and do so mainly by changing their beliefs and attitudes to make them accord with their actual behaviors. (McConnell 722). Initially, in order to relieve his guilt for going along with the group as opposed to standing up for what he believes, the individual will rationalize, that is, make excuses for his conforming behavior. But as this process is repeated over and over again, the conscience of the individual becomes seared. Eventually, he changes his beliefs to accord with his behavior. The “attitudes and values” of the group then “**serve as a kind of conscience for the member,**” that is, the God-given conscience of the individual is discarded and replaced with the *group* conscience (Miles 46). The group has become the ultimate authority of the individual to whom he looks for guidance and direction and to whom he *feels* he must answer to even when not in its presence.

The objectives of Chinese thought reform included: “to establish the standpoint of serving the people;” “to develop the collective spirit;” to develop the “concept of belonging

to the organization;” to learn “the **democratic way;**” and to “foster **internationalism** and friendship for the Soviet Union.” Actually, the aims of the Chinese Communist are an apt description of TQM of which those who have studied it cannot deny:

The Communists want a collective society; they preach collective living. **The individual must submit to the group, and obey the ‘organization.’** Consequently, a specific target of the thought reform is the individualism of the intellectuals...

...the intellectuals must give up their individualism and place themselves without reservation at the service of the Party and the state. Personal needs and personal interests should be subordinate to the needs of the state and the ‘people’...(S)tudents in China today are **assigned** to study certain subjects and at certain schools to meet the **personnel quotas of the state...For effective state planning presupposes state control of all human as well as material resources.** (Chen 67)

The most important reason for Communist insistence on “ideological correctness,” explains Chen, is that the...

Communist revolution is a ‘total revolution’, which aims to bring about radical changes in the entire social structure and in the **patterns of human behavior**. It sets out to replace the old way of life with a new ‘**working style**’, to substitute **new allegiances** for old loyalties, and to introduce a **new code of personal and social ethics**. While economic reform, political reform, social reform, educational and cultural reform are all important to their programme, the most fundamental of all is the **ideological reform**. An ideologically correct person, according to them, is likely to overcome old habits of thought and action and to become a successful worker for the proletarian revolution; whereas a person committed to bourgeois and reactionary ideology is bound to fall into serious deviations in actions and in thought. (9)

The Communist make a “fetish of voluntarism.” Although “pressure” is exerted by “propaganda and persuasion, which is most often mandatory in nature,” the Communist want the individuals to yield voluntarily so as to avoid “direct, undisguised coercion” when possible. Chen explains...

...Though force or compulsion is always around the corner, to be exerted when necessary, the preference is to resort to different forms **of persuasion, at times semi-coercive or covertly coercive, until resistance is overcome** and the victim ‘**chooses**’ to submit. His submission can then be hailed as ‘voluntary’ action. This kind of pressure is more subtle than direct, undisguised coercion; it is less likely to arouse a violent reaction; and, furthermore, **it enables the Communist to boast that they use ‘democratic’ instead of dictatorial methods on the people...** (74)

It was along these lines that Mao intended for the Chinese people themselves to reject and discard their own beliefs, values and religion. Thus, “**re-education**” had to be “**self-education**.” The individual “must wage a relentless *struggle*” against his “own set patterns of thought.” Moreover Chen explains: “If action can be compelled, a person’s inner thoughts

cannot. To be sure, the *stage should be, and is, set in such a way* that thought deviations are subjected to prompt and sharp criticism (**feedback** from fellow group members) as soon as they are detected, but the Communists realize that the *transformation* takes time and the **final change from the old to the new must be made by the subject himself.**” The **individual “must virtually destroy himself** for a new self to be born.” This because the individual himself must “be brought to see” how “a new outlook and a new standpoint” is necessary. Ideological remolding is “neither accomplished overnight, nor is completed once for all.” Thus we get lifelong learning. In thought reform, facilitators or “positive elements set the pace” for consensus:

The most effective indirect compulsion comes from group pressure. While the original source of pressure is the Communist agitator who works behind the scenes, the immediate pressure comes from the group of which the individual is supposed to be a member. **The group is the medium through which the Communist Party or the state controls the people;** though the control is sure and firm, it is nevertheless indirect; and the Party can claim that the individual submits to the majority of his own group and the procedure is ‘**democratic**’.

The groups range from the small discussion groups...to such ‘voluntary people’s organizations’ as the women’s organizations, the trade unions, the teachers’ federation, the writers’ union, and so on. **Within each group, a select number of ‘positive elements’...are chosen as leaders** who call upon their fellow members to rally a worthy cause. These ‘positive elements’ may be genuinely inclined to Communism, or they may be opportunists on the bandwagon. Under the **suggestions** or the instructions of the Communists and their cadres, they set examples...and endeavor to **create an atmosphere** in which lukewarm or indifferent members feel the heat to move with the group. They are often the most articulate members of the group and are actually the voice of the Party or the state, but since they are not Party members or state officials but **speak as members of their group, they help to maintain the myth of ‘voluntarism’ and minimize the feeling of direct Party or state control.** (74- 75) [Emphasis added]

In addition, by “placing trusted cadres or activist in key positions, the Party directs the activities of such organizations from behind the scenes, while it maintains that the people are mobilized by their voluntary organizations.” (75)

Large meetings and rallies arouse the *emotions*, but it is in the “process of free discussion in small groups” where “everyone comes to speak his mind” that “the **individuals are caught off their guard and are led to reveal their inner thoughts,**” explains Chen. These discussions may be on “current events,” “Marxist theories,” or individual reflections, that is, “thought conclusions” growing out of study, but to “refuse to participate is to commit the offense of ‘alienating one’s self from the group’” (76-77).

As noted earlier, thought reform “must be integrated” with “action”/“direct experience.” Chen writes:

The Chinese Communist...say that “Marxism is not a dogma, but a guide to revolutionary action.” Their slogan is “**the integration of knowledge and action**”

(theory and practice).” Their theorists explain that knowledge (**theory**) must be based on action (**practice**) and tested in action, that theory must grow out of experience so that it may serve as a guide for future...action. In the reform of the intellectuals, the Communist do not rely entirely on...study; they demand that the intellectuals identify themselves with “the masses” in action as well as in thought and that they “heighten”...their... consciousness by taking part... (21)

Chinese intellectuals were made to work alongside the masses for short periods of time to “heighten” their consciousness in order to “identify” or empathize with them. In TQM, one of the ways this is accomplished is by role-playing, where empathy—I see through your eyes and you see through mine—is an objective. Another means is management taking part in cohesive teams (that includes labor) where everyone is considered equal. Job “rotation,” supposedly a concoction of modern management theory, was a technique used by Mao over 50 years ago. So-called site-based management is not a new technique either. Chen writes:

In the universities and other higher educational institutions, joint **committees** of faculty and staff members were established as an expression of the new ‘democratic’ spirit of the day. They were composed of professors, instructors, assistants, clerks and janitors, and all had a voice in the administration of the higher institutions. In cooperation with the student body organizations, **these committees...became the channel through which the Communists directed the programme of political re-education...** (13)

W. EDWARDS DEMING’S TQM
is
MOA’S BRAINWASHING
(Putting Hegel’s Dialectical Theory into Practice)

This similarity with TQM is no accident. In Peter Scholtes book, The Team Handbook, which is recommended by Deming for the implementation of TQM, Deming writes in the Foreword: “Change is required. There is a process of change, just as there is a process of manufacturing. Mr. Scholtes provides the route in this book for change. He has my respect and best wishes.”

When we think of someone being brainwashed, all sorts of dark notions come to mind. With just a little effort, our imaginations can run wild. In any case, most people think of brainwashing as something that is done *to* someone. Our minds don’t grasp the idea that brainwashing is something that you are forced to do to yourself. But if you think about it, a person’s inner thoughts *cannot be compelled*. The *only* way to cleanse the mind is by controlling the environment in such a way that the individual himself is deceived into discarding his existing facts, beliefs, and values. The Chinese brainwashers affirm that this takes time which is the reason government today wants the children at the earliest age possible. Because if they can begin training children as they see fit at a very early age, then brainwashing won’t be necessary later on.

In the Foreword, **Malcolm Knowles** explains that people were encountering problems “in

their experimentation with quality circles, and project teams” because “the leaders and members of the groups **lacked sufficient skills in managing group processes - particularly in regard to...planning and decision-making.**” Knowles writes:

I find that in this book Peter Scholtes (**one of the brightest students I have had**) and his associates have taken sound theoretical principles of adult learning and group dynamics (**theory**) and translated them into clear, practical, easy-to-apply strategies and techniques (**practice**) for enabling project teams to do their work effectively and smoothly.

Knowles, a “faculty member of the (brainwashing) *National Training Laboratories* in Bethel, ME, in the early ‘50s,” is considered a “**pioneer in adult education**”⁵ (*Training*, March 1998). By the end of World War II, adult education had become a “mass movement” and was “based on the theories of Kurt Lewin.” In the early fifties when the National Training Laboratories split from the National Education Association with which it had been affiliated, the Adult Education Association of the U. S. A. was founded to “provide a unified focus for all workers in the field.” (E. B. Vol. 1, p. 176) **Malcolm Knowles** was “elected founding executive director,” a post he held until 1959. (*Training*, March 1998)

In the forties, Knowles began applying his “notions about adult learning to the setting of Christian adult education” in the YMCAs of Boston, Detroit and Chicago. As a faculty member at the National Training Laboratories, these notions would be **putting theory into practice**. In the fifties, he would merge these notions with the non-directive therapy of **Carl Rogers** and later call it andragogy. His “andragogical **model** of adult learning” is/has been “**applied in educational institutions, business and industry, religious institutions (especially the Evangelical community), government agencies, and voluntary organizations.**” As a self-avowed “facilitator,” Knowles explains that his perspective “in all my writings, teaching, and workshops has been that of a **practitioner**” (Knowles in Gangel & Wilhoit 92-94, 102).

Scholtes explains that Project teams are a prerequisite to the implementation of TQM because among other things they help get the “buy-in” of “top management.” They are created under the guise of finding solutions to perceived problems but have a “hidden agenda,” explains Scholtes. They “are an instrument of widespread education (re-education), a purpose equally if not more important in the long run than their focus on improvement.” (Scholtes 1: 1718)

The “transformation” to Quality Leadership is “almost always **traumatic**,” says Scholtes, because “People don’t resist change; they resist being changed.” And since people resist being changed, the entire workforce must be “**re-educated**” with which, at least initially, the Project team plays a major role. “External consultants and trainers” train the Project team members in “how to work as a team” and to “**blend teamwork and scientific methods,**” while the team leader is taught to “facilitate group processes.” The “project team’s

⁵ In the 1960s, Knowles termed his **adult education “andragogy.”** This because a “**Yugoslavian adult education, Dusan Savicevic, participated in a summer session**” he was conducting and came up to him later and told him: “Malcolm, you are preaching and practicing andragogy.” Soon Knowles “was on intimate terms with it.” Andragogy had been “coined by a German teacher in 1833, was reintroduced by a German social scientist in the 1920s, and then was more or less forgotten until 1957, when it was picked up by adult educators in Europe.” (*Training*, March 1998)

importance in this **re-education** of all employees cannot be underestimated,” warns Scholtes. (1: 18, 20, 21)

Typical of TQM material, the book is a virtual how-to in subverting a traditional organization. Identifying and targeting informal social groups [loose network of friends] in the workplace who “offer their members support and friendship” is key to **overcoming “traditional barriers”** to change. The loyalty of the leaders of these groups must be redirected to the company. Scholtes urges: “Identify the informal leaders. Get to know them. Spend time listening to them. When you understand their **needs** and concerns, you **will understand how the changes you seek might be fashioned.**” In the early stages of change, says Scholtes, a “critical mass” builds as “opinion leaders shift from a neutral to supportive position, or at least from resistance to indecision.” Therefore these **opinion leaders must be identified “both in the formal and informal networks” to “find out how you can sway their opinions.**” This critical mass can “vary from just a few key people to the whole company” but gives the “*impression* of a growing, formidable movement.” Scholtes explains that you must “create *emotional* acceptance” of change: (1:22-23)

Since people resist being changed, transformation is a campaign for **their hearts as well as their minds.** Even when there is a lot of detailed planning and fancy words, very little actually happens as a result of a rational, logical process. **Change happens because people as a group accept it.** (1-23)

Scholtes suggests that change that is attempted “through commands and fear of the boss” won’t work in the long run. The idea is to create an environment where the workers will feel that change was their own idea, that change is not mandated and forced on them from above but that they themselves have chosen the changes. “Help them to understand the need to change. Listen and respond carefully to their **needs**, fears, desires, and concerns about change.” Include them in “**decisions**” about change. Approach change “as you would a courtship, slowly and with a sense of surprise.” “Woo the people. Listen to them.” It never enters the individual’s consciousness that he/she is being facilitated into planned and predetermined change. Not unlike the Chinese brainwashers forewarned, Scholtes says it takes “years to **transform** the entire organization” and the “journey to where **teams are an ingrained part of the organization** is long.” The book covers everything from facilitating the various “stages of team growth” that results in “cohesion” to “planning” as the “heart” of the “scientific approach.” (1:23-24)

Scholtes explains that team members must participate in “**criticism,**” “**work out personal differences,**” “**build relationships,**” and “**provide for team members’ needs,**” among other things. He writes: “Every group must therefore spend time on activities not directly related to a task, activities that build understanding and support in the group. You need to resolve issues that fall into...the ‘**interpersonal underworld.**’” When “team members begin talking about their youth or **feelings**, many facades and poses disappear,” he says. (6: 1-46)

To the Christian, his facts include his faith and God’s Word, the Bible and his world view is based on these facts. And as MIT Systems theorists Jay Forrester says, individuals make decisions based on their mental models or world view. All the facts and knowledge that one has is, in one way or another, wrapped up and around this world view, and according to

social scientists, individuals accept only that information that confirms their world views as *legitimate* facts and knowledge. The group/teams that TQM requires is designed to be far more than a work group. They are designed and intentionally developed to be cohesive wholes or collectives. (6:1-46)

Scholtes warns: “**Some team members express personal beliefs and assumptions with such confidence that listeners assume they are hearing a presentation of facts. This can be dangerous, leading to an unshakable acceptance of various...assertions.**” Therefore, “team leaders” are taught various negative re-enforcers to “deal with unquestioned acceptance of opinions as facts” within the team. This results in a group environment where “personal” individual convictions are not tolerated by fellow group members. Moreover, Scholtes explains that TQM is based on the “scientific method” and one of the group **norms** of the organizational work-group is that **all decisions** are based on “**data.**”⁶ (6:146)

Something along these lines occur: (1) Individuals traditionally base their behavior as well as their choices and decisions in life based upon *their facts* (which includes their **faith**) beliefs, values which reside in their **conscience**; (2) A *norm* of the TQM work-group is that *all decisions*, including those of the *interpersonal world*, must be based on *data*; (3) Basing one’s decisions and choices on *data* as opposed to one’s conscience *violates* that conscience; (4) Unaware of his controlled environment and the spiritual conflict he has deliberately been thrust into, the individual rationalizes away the violation of his conscience (I have to work. It’s my job, etc) (5) Belief in a higher authority, that is, any and all authority outside the individual and particularly God the Ultimate Authority, is based *on faith*; (6) “Norms” determine and control group behavior, thus individual behavior; (7) The violation of one’s conscience is sin and results in guilt or to put it another way: When an individual’s beliefs don’t accord with their behavior, they experience **cognitive dissonance**; (8) Since the individual rationalizes the violation of his conscience, he experiences the guilt as an unconscious tension or stress; (9) The individual who violates a group norm is subjected to criticism or **negative** feedback from fellow group members; (10) In order to reduce the stress, the individual conforms to the group; (11) Repetitive **criticism** results in continuous conformity; (12) Continuous conformity results in automatic or habitual behavior, a way of life on or off the job; (13) Consistently and repetitively violating one’s conscience results in a **seared conscience**; (14) The **individual discards his faith** and changes his beliefs, values, etc. to be consistent with his behavior.

Mao as well as Kurt Lewin called their dialectical re-education campaigns “self-education.” Behavior *can* be compelled but a “person’s inner thoughts *cannot.*” And because they cannot compel an individual to give up their faith, beliefs and values, they create a strong delusion for the individual’s self-deception you might say. On the surface, it all appears normal and natural. The individual is experiencing tremendous stress but doesn’t have a clue as to the cause, thinking that he alone of all the group members is having difficulty. “It is within the group that the power, *basic and immense*, human beings have over one another occurs; the power of **acceptance** or **rejection**” (Anderson 115).

According to Chen, “guilt” was the tool the Chinese Communist used to brainwash their

⁶ “**And the data base must include affective, attitudinal, and aspirational information from participants blended with relevant ‘objective’ factual and technical information, as these enter the area of **planning and deliberation** through various channels of specialized expertise.**” (Benne et al 30)

victims or more correctly, that the Chinese used to entice their victims to wash their own brains. TQM, based on *cognitive theories of learning and motivation*, uses guilt/cognitive dissonance as a motivational tool as well. The cognitive theory of motivation is “intrinsic” and based on the arousal of “disequilibrium” which must be “induced” in the individual. This means it uses *internal* as opposed to *external forces to motivate individuals to change*. It is based on the deliberate **creation** and **use of internal conflict** or cognitive dissonance to motivate/force individuals in the desired direction. Motivation is defined as “the forces that account for the arousal, selection, direction, and continuation of behavior.” Since “motivation comes from within a person,” one person cannot “directly motivate another.” What you can do with “motivation theories” is “**create the circumstances**” or environments that “influence” others “to do what you want them to do.” This intrinsic view “stresses that human behavior is influenced by the way individuals **perceive** things” or their **perceptions**. As individuals are “subjected” to “forces” (group/peer pressure) in their environment, they “experience some sort of disequilibrium, which they **feel impelled** to overcome.” This in turn helps them to “recognize **gaps** in their thinking” and to “**revise their perceptions**” (Biehler). TQM sets the stage for and facilitates cognitive dissonance (the arousal of disequilibrium within the individual) to force/motivate individuals to change. **Cognitive dissonance** is defined as the “**feeling** you get when your *behaviors differ* markedly from your **intra-psychic values**” (McConnell 723).

THE COLLECTIVE

As long as intellectuals retain their individualism they will be **independent** in thought and behavior. Individualism is therefore a central target of attack. The new way of life is the collective life. The methods of thought reform utilize **group pressure**. To the group the individual bares his thoughts in self-criticism and confessions. He must tell all without any reservations. He must not have any secrets. Inasmuch as the ‘group’ is always directed by capable manipulators and the acme of group life or collective life is the Party or state, the **replacement of individualism by collectivism means** in the last analysis the total surrender of the individual to the Party or state. **Once this has been accomplished, thought reform will have been complete.** (Chen 79)

The studies on conformity, obedience, and cognitive dissonance have, for the most part, dealt with individual “subjects put under strong psychological pressure to avoid conflict with other members of a group. or with their own value system” (McConnell 723). In America, these studies began in the 1930s and documented some general principles that cause conformity in small groups which, consequently, are required components of TQM. These principles include:

(1) The reorganization of individuals into facilitated teams or “interaction groups,” defined as “Sets of individuals, psychologically related to each other, who have frequent face-to-face contact” results in a “**system** - that is, a set of persons considered as a *single entity*” or “whole.” Individuals facilitated into these *cohesive*

teams or collectives must, consciously or unconsciously, give up some part of their “own personal independence to create a state of inter-dependence” between themselves and other group members. (708-709) A set of persons not yet facilitated into a collective or one mind is considered a *heap*.

(2) One of the “major characteristics of any group is the *shared acceptance of group rules by all the members*. This acceptance may be conscious or *unconscious*, but it is almost always present in one form or another.” (Ibid. 709). These “group rules are almost always stated in terms of *behavioral or attitudinal norms*. That is, the rules specify what the average or normal behavior of each member should be, or what role(s) each member should play.” (Ibid. 710) In addition, false “perceptual” group *norms* can be created by “stooges” within the group, that is, individuals who deliberately set out to deceive group members about concrete facts by speaking up “first,” and giving “false” information. In fact, the “stooges do not have to be physically present in order to pressure” the subjects into “conforming” to the false information. (713-715)

(3) The team/interaction group becomes a *reference group* (super-ego/conscience) for its members. Reference groups “give you *feed-forward* by *stating the goals* you and other group members should attain, as well as giving you **rewarding** or **punishing feedback** as you move toward or away from the goals.” Reference groups “influence your behavior in at least two ways. First, by providing comparison points which you use in evaluating yourself and others. Second, by setting **standards** or **norms** and enforcing them by rewarding you when you conform and by punishing you when you do not conform to these standards...**members who express opinions, attitudes, or judgments too far from the reference group norm are typically pressured by other members to fall back into line.**” (713)

(4) “If the group is to have an influence on you, then you must know what the group’s opinion or norm actually is...” (716). The norms are often initially agreed upon or discerned/learned during interaction with the group.

(5) “Group **norms** not only influence your **attitudes** toward complex social issues, but your *perceptions* of even the simplest objects as well.” (714)

(6) “Group **pressures** to conform **develop**...**when** your *perception* of the stimulus **differs** significantly **from** that offered by some *reference group* you belong to” (716). According to psychologists, all human being’s perceptions are different because of their past experiences, background, beliefs and values, education, etc.

(7) “One of the functions of any group...seems to be that of inducing the highest *possible commitment* among its members” and “Group **commitment** involves each member’s giving up her or his own freedom to work toward **common or group goals.**” The “more committed to the group’s **norms** and **goals** the members become, the more **cohesive** the group typically will be and the more homogeneous [alike] its

attitudes.” The “more cohesive a group, the longer it will typically last and *the more resistant it will be to external pressure*” (712-713). The primary reason for TQM’s insistence that everyone “participate” in so-called decision-making and problem-solving is so they will accept the decision as their own and therefore be emotionally “committed” to it, a strategy used by both the Chinese and Soviet Communist.

(8) “The way you perceive the other group members is...crucial. The...more **trustworthy they appear to be, the more powerful agents they become in pressuring you to conform**” (716). “Building trust” is a primary and ongoing goal of TQM.

(9) “The more ‘*out in the open*’ you are *forced* to be in making your judgments, the more likely it is that you will yield to group pressure.” Once team members come to “**consensus**” about an issue, it is highly publicized. Like all the rest, the Chinese brainwashers used this strategy too of which Chen commented: “When a person...records his reactions in black and white he has made a commitment not so easily set aside...he finds it even *harder to retreat from a position he has declared in public*” (61).

(10) “If you are told that the whole group must come to a unanimous decision (**consensus**) on the matter at hand, you will be strongly pressured to yield.” The stated rationale behind TQM is joint decision making by teams where decisions are reached by consensus. **Consensus** is defined as “a harmony of viewpoints, opinions, *or feelings*.” Please note that there are no “facts” in consensus because attitudes about “almost anything are easier to shift than are judgments of *concrete* facts.” (715)

In the Hegelian system, there are no absolutes, universal truths, morals and values because the dialectical process destroys them. In a world of flux/change/motion, everything is relative. Even facts and knowledge evolve or change continuously, nothing is static. The application of the dialectical process to groups makes them “adaptable to change,” that is fluid or plastic, capable of being remolded into the new man.” Fixed beliefs, facts and knowledge, personal value systems and convictions prevent this change or remolding. Those “rigid” individuals with “closed” minds who believe in and hold to these “fixed” beliefs prevent group cohesion—synthesis, unity. Most important of all, facts presuppose a higher authority—God. It was to rid the American psyche of the knowledge of and obedience to this Higher Authority that motivated Kurt Lewin and Company to apply this process to America. Nothing in TQM is accidental. Every method, every technique, every strategy, every single element was deliberately planned and therefore serves some purpose. Even seemingly benign components were added for a reason, if only to camouflage what they’re really doing.

“General Systems Theory⁷ insists on a new humanistic image of man” (Gray & Rizzo, Vol. 9, part 1, 170). In this process, the old man is destroyed and replaced by new humanistic man. An interesting note about these studies that brings the seriousness of America’s plight

⁷ According to Deming, General Systems Theory is the philosophy of TQM. (Deming Talks to Educators, a video and manuscript of a Deming Conference in Washington DC)

home is that the research subjects on conformity were “**never told that he or she had to yield to the group norm. Indeed, many of the subjects were quite unaware that they had given in to group pressures and denied that they had done so.**” This explains why trying to communicate with the new humanistic man about what is taking place is like talking to a brick wall. Dissonance “arose when people failed to recognize the great influence that *social inputs* have on their attitudes and actions...” Another discouraging note: “...there is no reason why we should expect that all people who conform to group norms should have the same sort of personality. In fact...we might assume that **we would all yield if the *situational factors* were strong enough.**” Furthermore, the researchers found that there “is little or no evidence that conformity is an innate or inherited trait. Rather, it seems to be a **behavior that you learn - primarily because your reference groups reward you when you conform and punish you when you deviate.**” **Criticism, Unity, Criticism.**

THE 3-STEP PROCESS “MODEL” OF BRAINWASHING is (Putting the Dialectical Process into Practice)

As Deming noted in the Foreword of The Team Handbook, there is a “process” for change as surely as there is a process or recipe for making brownies. This 3-step process has quite a long history. Indeed, the only thing new about it is that it’s being applied by our government in partnership with international corporations and non-governmental organizations to the entire public education system, government agencies, organizations, churches, etc. in the name of Total Quality Management. We have already seen how this process was used by Mao on the Chinese intellectuals, but it was also used on our POW’s held by the Chinese during the Korean war. Nobody could understand what made any number of our fighting men turn pink and pliable when captured, with some refusing to come home when the war was over. Journalist Edward Hunter interviewed hundreds of POW s after the war and coined the term “brainwashing” to describe what had been done to them. In his 1958 book, Brainwashing, he concludes:

The most important Red purpose in brainwashing is not its employment against foreign enemies but against the populations of communist countries themselves. They are always suspect to the Red hierarchy, actually its main enemies...Decent humanity has not the right to permit people to be caught in a **controlled environment** and to be made into guinea pigs for ultimate dehumanization under a perverted Pavlovian technique.

The war against men’s minds has for its primary objective the creation of what is euphemistically called the “new Soviet man.” The intent is to change a mind radically so that its owner becomes a living puppet—a human robot—without the atrocity being visible from the outside. The aim is to create a mechanism in flesh and blood, with new beliefs and new thought processes inserted into a captive body. What that amounts to is the search for a slave race that, unlike the slaves of olden times, can be trusted never to revolt, always to be amenable to orders, like an insect to its instincts. The intent is to atomize humanity.

... Secrecy and the darkness of a controlled environment are required for it to work. Wherever this secrecy is denied...or the **controlled environment** penetrated, brainwashing cannot succeed.

Surely there can no longer be a trace of doubt that brainwashing is sheer evil...
(285)

Now consider the conclusions of **Edgar H. Schein**, then Professor of Organizational Psychology and Management at the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology** (MIT) who literally helped to apply this process to America. He also interviewed Korean POWs but obviously not for the same reasons that Hunter did. Schein concluded:

The outstanding conclusion one comes away with from a study of these events is that the methods of brainwashing are not diabolical, new, or irresistible. Rather, the Chinese have drawn on their cultural sensitivity to the nuances of interpersonal relationships to put together some highly effective but well-known techniques of indoctrination. Their sophistication about the importance of the small group as a mediator of opinions and attitudes has led to some highly effective techniques...of using groups as a mechanism of changing attitudes, as in the political prisons. (Schein in Bennis et al, 425-426)

In his 1987 college text, Social Psychology, Donelson Forsyth of Virginia Commonwealth University clarifies Schein's summary of the brainwashing process:

When Edgar H. Schein interviewed former POWs, he discovered that the Chinese did in fact use systematic indoctrination techniques to alter the prisoners' attitudes. The Chinese referred to the program as hsi nao, which literally means "**to cleanse the mind.**" The Americans called it brainwashing...In his summary of the program, Schein identified three basic phases. First the Chinese sought to disrupt, or unfreeze, the POWs' current attitudes and values. The second phase involved changing these attitudes to conform with communist doctrine. In the final phase, new attitudes were ingrained with the POWs' overall value system. Schein calls this phase refreezing. (Forsyth 278)

The Chinese used "physical and social-psychological tactics to unfreeze the men's attitudes." In the second phase they used "both direct and indirect techniques to change the prisoners' attitudes." Forsyth explains...

Just as the direct techniques relied heavily on persuasive methods, the indirect techniques capitalized on the **need to maintain consistency among cognitions and behaviors** (Festinger, 1957).⁸ Time and again the men were coerced into performing procommunist actions...Each small concession led to a slightly larger one, however, until men unwittingly found themselves collaborating with the Chinese. In some cases, such simple methods succeeded in extracting confessions to war crimes and

⁸ This is Forsyth's reference.

pledges of allegiance to communism. In the final phase, men who cooperated with the Chinese were asked to make public commitments to communism...These men were allowed to form committees that helped run the camp, and they assisted in preparing propaganda leaflets and testimonials. All in all, these tactics sought to provide social supports for the newly acquired attitudes.

How successful was this program of coercive persuasion? Schein points out that at one time or another nearly all of the men performed actions that helped the enemy... (278-281)

According to Forsyth, Schein “felt” that brainwashing was “too strong a term” to describe this cleansing of the mind because the “methods” used were “neither unique or exotic.” The playing down and redefinition of brainwashing as the social engagement of social science is typical of how Communist redefine language to deceive the masses. Indeed, the planners/transformational Marxist’s were already using these Hegelian “methods” to brainwash Americans. Furthermore, it was MIT that played the leading role in legitimizing its use. In addition, it was MIT’s Research Center for Group Dynamics, founded by Kurt Lewin, that helped sponsor the National Training Laboratories (NTL) in the summer of 1947 at Bethel, Maine. In fact, NTL was the “first *residential* laboratory” in America that was used as a training ground for Hegelian style brainwashing (Benne 4). The application of this process was initially called “laboratory method,” later changed to “T-group,” short for Training group. The very “origin of the term **cohesiveness**” in groups “scholars trace...back to the early theoretical efforts of Kurt Lewin and his colleagues at the Research Center for Group Dynamics,” originally “located at **MIT** but later moved to the University of Michigan” (Forsyth 349).

Edgar Schein writes:

What is distinctive in this approach is the sophistication of the CCP [Chinese Communist Party] in the use of social and interpersonal forces in the service of creating a situation in which persuasion was likely to be successful. Given that the individual could be coerced into exposing himself to...group forces...it was highly likely that he would come to accept firmly the premises and attitudes which the leaders espoused. (Schein in Bennis et al 408)

In an essay in Interpersonal Dynamics on Chinese brainwashing entitled, “The Special Role of Guilt in Coercive Persuasion” by Edgar Schein, I. Schneier, and C. H. Barker, the authors explain that unfreezing an individual results from anxiety deliberately induced by manipulating his feelings of perceived guilt. From “the point of view of the prisoner there are a number of predispositions which lead to psychologically distinct types of guilt, though they **may not be experienced as different**,” they explain. The “captor’s presentation of the nature of guilt begins to unfreeze the prisoner by **stimulating in him a sense of guilt...**” The prisoner’s experience of guilt “results from a combination of **external pressures and internal predispositions...**” (426). “*Feelings* of guilt” in the POW’s was “stimulated, both intentionally and inadvertently, by the **exacerbation** of old [psychological] **conflicts** or the **creation of new ones**.” This guilt is felt as “guilt-anxiety” in which “**psychological conflict itself was unconscious**.” Although “the *feeling* is present,” no “psychological basis for it is

perceived” or “it may be consciously perceived to be related to one or more of the following areas of psychological functioning.”

1. Social guilt—“prejudices” against members of the lower class -
2. Ego or **Identity Guilt**—a “recognition on the part of the prisoner that he has failed to live up to *his image* of himself” - [“Ego or identity guilt is thus produced by *eliciting* from the prisoner *behavior which is inconsistent with his self-image...*” (434) “*ego or identity guilt...could be the basis for other guilt feelings such as social guilt. To the extent that basic identity components in the prisoner become involved in the intrapsychic conflict, the experience of thought reform could lead to **fundamental personality or character change.**” (436)]*
3. Personal or Face-to-Face Guilt—the “feeling of guilt which comes from wearing a mask” which means not revealing one’s true feelings and/or just pretending to go along with the group. (437)
4. Loyalty Guilt—a “recognition on the part of the prisoner that he has *failed in his service to a group with which he is strongly identified or has violated its norms* or defiled its image by behaving in a manner not consistent with what is expected of members of that group” “Loyalty guilt resulted from behavior, thoughts, or feelings which the prisoner felt to be a violation of the *norms* of important *reference* or membership groups.” (438)
5. Situational Guilt—guilt “which is aroused by the magnification on the part of others of minor infractions or petty acts which normally do not run counter to the prisoner’s basic *values or self-image, particularly when they are perceived to have been stimulated by great stress*; feelings of guilt in reference to such acts imply that the prisoner has already accepted some of the norms and standards of evaluation of the cellmates and authorities.” (430-431)

Moreover, the authors explain:

...all socialized people experience a substantial amount of guilt **when their behavior, desires, or feelings conflict with the dictates of the moral code or value system they have adopted or when they have not fulfilled some of the expectations held by themselves or by others.** Because of their personal history and/or culture some people have stronger drives or make stronger moral demands on themselves than others; they therefore experience sharper **conflicts** and are consequently more guilt-prone than others. (430)

In a 1962 article entitled “Management Development, Human Relations Training and the Process of Influence,” Edgar Schein writes:

Human relations training fits into a context of institutional influence procedures

which include coercive persuasion in the form of thought reform or **brainwashing** ...Suspending all judgment for the time being, this influence **model** is presented in terms of its capacity to make sense of what we know about the change process...to make meaningful predictions about the training conditions necessary for the creative growth of both individuals and organizations. (Schein 47)

Schein explains:

In the present paper, I would like to cast management development as the problem of how an organization can influence the **beliefs, attitudes, and values** (hereafter **simply called attitudes**) of an individual for the purpose of “**developing**” him, i.e., changing him in a direction which the organization regards to be in his own and **the organization’s best interests**... (47)

Schein goes on to explain that in order to change, an individual must be “motivated,” that is, “perceive some need for change.” Therefore, a **model** of the influence process “must account for the development of the motivation to change as well as the actual mechanisms by which the change occurs.” If it’s a matter of a deficiency in skills and technical knowledge, then motivating individuals is no problem:

However, when we are dealing with **attitudes**, the suggestion of deficiency or the need for change is much more likely to be perceived as a basic threat to the individual’s sense of **identify**...**Attitudes** are generally organized and integrated around the person’s image of himself, and they result in stabilized, characteristic ways of dealing with others...It is not at all uncommon for training programs in human relations to arouse **resistance** (48)

Given these “assumptions about the integration of attitudes in the person,” explains Schein, it is more “appropriate” to consider influence as a “process;” This process “**occurs over time** and includes **three phases**,” which, “are a derivation of the change **model** developed by Lewin (1947).” Schein describes the 3-step process:

1. **Unfreezing**. An alteration of the forces acting on the individual, such that his stable equilibrium is disturbed sufficiently to motivate him and make him ready to change: this can be accomplished either by increasing the pressure to change or by reducing some of the threats or resistances to change.
2. **Changing**. The presentation of a direction of change and the actual process of learning new attitudes. This process occurs basically by one of two mechanisms: (a) identification - the person learns new attitudes by identifying with and emulating some other person who holds those attitudes; or (b) internalization - the person learns new attitudes by being placed in a situation where new attitudes are demanded of him as a way of solving problems which confront him that he cannot avoid; **he discovers the new attitudes essentially for himself, though the situation may guide him or make it probable that he will discover only those attitudes which the influencing**

agent wishes him to discover. (49)

3. **Refreezing.** The integration of the changed attitudes into the rest of the personality and/or into ongoing significant emotional relationships. (49)

“Without unfreezing, no change will occur, no matter how much effort is put into selling, persuading, coercing, rewarding, or punishing,” explains Anselm Strauss. In a conceptual scheme “developed to encompass the kinds of changes in beliefs, attitudes, and values” which involve “the person’s self or **identity**,” Strauss lists three mechanisms used for “unfreezing,” that is, “creating motivation to change”: (a) “Lack of confirmation (of existing behavior, beliefs, attitudes, and values) or disconfirmation (of same);” (b) “**Induction of guilt-anxiety**” (cognitive dissonance); and (c) “Creation of psychological safety.” Strauss warns: “**For any change to occur, the defenses which tend to be aroused in the change target must be made less operative, circumvented, or used directly as change levers.**” (Bennis et al 348, 338-339)

APPLYING THE 3-STEP BRAINWASHING “MODEL” to AMERICAN INSTITUTIONS, INDUSTRIES & ORGANIZATIONS

The initial emphasis and focus on **Organization Development** from the so-called “behavioral science movement” began “with interventions aimed at individual behavior” (Craig 249). Specifically targeted were individuals in leadership positions—primarily industry, business, and education administrators/management and they called it **management training**. Individuals from these areas were brought together in *small groups* for “training” in *human relations*. Those trained came away clean as a whistle but the “changes” in these individuals “tend to fade out once the trainee returns to an unsympathetic (and uncontrolled) *environment* where company policy and the boss’s attitude may inhibit the exercise of newly-learned skills” (Strauss). In other words, their new values and behavior would become unfrozen because of lack of reinforcement, to use Schein’s logic for why many of the brainwashed POW’s regained their faith in America after being freed from the Chinese’s controlled environment. Soon the washmen realized that “what they really needed was *development* of the organization, giving rise to **organization development**” (Strauss)

Organization Development (OD) applies this process to individuals (organized into groups/teams) within the entire organization: “Those who practice OD use what is commonly called ‘**action research**’” (Craig 604). Action research (putting the dialectical process into practice) was “formulated” by Kurt Lewin and “he and his associates advocated and practiced it in the context of inter-group and community relations in the early forties. **Cooperative action research became a focal model of re-education and changing for the innovators of laboratory method**” (Benne 31). Today, “organizations throughout the world, such as Motorola, General Motors, Procter & Gamble, and General Electric, have OD departments and staff that manage systematic change. The OD functions in organizations come under many different banners such as organization effectiveness, change management, and continuous improvement. The *core purpose* of OD units is almost always to help the

organization **make smooth transitions from their current state to some desired future state.**” (Craig 603) “OD makes use of the social and behavioral sciences. The **change agent (cadre)** is the person who serves as the catalyst of the change process. She or he may be an internal or external consultant, a manager, in an organization” (603). The ASTD⁹ Handbook explains:

Like other areas in the field of management practices, OD is based on a variety of different professionals’ disciplines, the most popular being psychology, organizational behavior, sociology, and interpersonal communications. Because of this widespread basis, the practitioners in OD are required to have working knowledge of such subject areas as - Organization theory - Motivational theory - Learning process theory - Personality theory - Organization structure - Role theory - Power and authority - Leadership - Interpersonal dynamics - Small-group theory - (603-604).

Organizational development (OD), which gained acceptance during the 1960s, became the most popular and the most talked about training technique or practice of the 1970s. OD was a combining of many interlocking components...The trainers who became involved in **OD were now concerned with much more than “people development,”** for which the name **human resource development (HRD)** had now **been coined...** (15-16)

The management text, Personnel: The Human Problems of Management, explains that Organizational Development “must solve three problems: *confrontations* (information-getting or **unfreezing**), **change**, and carry-over (*action* or **refreezing**)”:

(Unfreezing) Confrontation. Perhaps the thing that distinguished OD from other types of consultancy is its imaginative use of confrontation. Broadly defined, confrontation is a diagnostic or information-getting process in which organizational members obtain **feedback** on their behavior in a form that will provide insights useful for improving their performance. Thus **confrontation** is change-oriented **feedback**.

The object of this feedback normally is to induce participants to compare their (or the system’s) actual behavior (what is) with their idealized concept of that behavior (what ought to be). The resultant ‘perceptual gap’ may serve a combination of purposes:

1. The comparison may reveal such a discrepancy between intended (or desired) and actual behavior that it will disturb the previously **stable equilibrium** and introduce ‘unfreezing’ i.e...a desire for change or a “conviction of sin.”
2. By bringing problems to the surface, confrontation can define (even dramatize) their nature.
3. It can help the organization make informed...choices as to possible behavioral change.

This confrontation should occur not just once, but it can be repeated at every stage of the OD process. Indeed, some observers say that a major purpose of OD is to make

⁹ American Society for Training and Development.

confrontation an organizational way of life.

Feedback must be in a form that is believable and that **leads to action**. Note that confrontation in itself does not automatically guarantee unfreezing. For feedback to be accepted, it should be dramatic enough to induce disequilibrium but not so threatening that it leads to greater defensiveness. It should be in a form that increases rather than decreases interpersonal **trust**, otherwise participants are unlikely to trust or learn from each other. Neither will they feel as free to experiment with new forms of behavior. (550-551)

Personnel¹⁰ explains that “forms of confrontation” (i.e. **deliberation**) vary greatly from the “T-group” and the “feedback of videotapes made in ordinary management meetings” to “simulations.”

The best-known OD technique, the management grid, uses a series of questionnaires (as well as simulations) to force managers to confront the gap between their idealized and their present behavior. ‘You have to build a model,’ says Robert Blake, the grid’s originator, ‘as if you had no past tradition, no past practices, cult, or ritual...So the **ideal** is a searchlight for seeing the **actual...You have to close the gaps once you see them. You can’t live with contradictions.**’

Other OD programs begin with an employee attitude survey or with a series of interviews with subordinates and peers... (551)

Change. Only a fuzzy line separates the confrontation and change stages...

...the initial confrontation unfreezes attitudes; the change stage requires participants to unfreeze their behaviors and to develop and test new skills. If the confrontation periods have generated a supportive atmosphere in which resistance to change has been reduced, participants will feel free to experiment with new behaviors... (552-553)

...To facilitate the learning process, OD programs utilize three main approaches. Didactic instruction...designed to suggest new ways of handling problems identified during the confrontation period...In modeling (or identification) participants learn to copy the behavior of their consultants or other respected members of their group. Finally, there is **internalization**. Here, instead of directly copying the behavior of others, the participant experiments with new patterns of behavior on his own...

Refreezing. Refreezing involves both making a commitment to try new behavioral patterns and then some form of maintenance activity to prevent slipping back into earlier behavior patterns. (553)

As we have seen...a formal commitment to try out new behavior patterns, particularly if made in a public setting, helps refreeze both behaviors and the attitudes associated with them... (553-554)

Feedback alone, of course, is not enough. The new behaviors must be rewarded by the participants’ peers and superiors...

OD: a continuous process. Refreezing should not be the last step, because OD involves...learning an entire process of **action research or problem-solving**. While

¹⁰ The full title is Personnel: The Human Problems of Management, 4th Ed; Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1980.

maintenance activities help ensure that participants are doing what they have committed themselves to do, **yesterday's commitments may not be appropriate in today's circumstances**. So...OD teaches groups to diagnose and evaluate their ever-changing problems on a continuous basis. The process as a whole may run as follows:

- | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| >Problem Identification | >Research on nature of problem | >Evaluation of alternative solutions |
| >Commitment to a solution | >Maintenance | >Re-evaluation |

Personnel explains:

OD has been highly controversial. For some it is almost a religion. Others see it as a form of **charlatanism**. There is a continuing debate among OD's critics and supporters... (554)

...OD goes beyond traditional training in that it seeks to introduce change in the organization as a **whole, not just in the individual**. It seeks alterations in reward systems and structures, not just in attitudes...**and it makes heavy use of group influence...**

...OD is not a solution in itself It is only a means...it should be viewed as a **continuing process** in which the organization continually reexamines its processes to keep them consistent with a changing environment.

Finally...OD is increasingly being combined with more conventional training...A second noteworthy new development is that OD is being offered in conjunction with structural changes... Thus OD is being viewed...**as a critical part of a systems approach¹¹ to organizational change.** (559)

APPLYING THE 3-STEP BRAINWASHING "MODEL" to EDUCATION

In 1959, Matthew Miles, then Associate Professor of Education at the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation at Teachers College, Columbia University wrote, Learning to Work in Groups: A Program Guide For Educational Leaders on the application of the dialectical process/brainwashing to education. He was inspired by his work at the National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine, in which **"the experience was a graphic demonstration of how the method of science can infuse and guide the exciting process of learning better group behavior."** The goal of this how-to book was to help those in education "apply this knowledge" to "American public education." Incidentally, he credits Malcolm Knowles, a "professional laboratory *practitioner*," for reviewing his manuscript (Miles Preface).

¹¹ As noted earlier, General Systems Theory is the philosophy of TQM.

In the book, and remember this was written in 1959, Miles writes:

...It is not widely realized...how far the early evangelistic, cultist, technique-centered aspects of 'group dynamics' have been replaced by...concern with the nature and functioning of small groups. **Social scientists (theory) and practitioners (practice) from all fields are helping to make training in increased group effectiveness more and more a part of the American scene.** The methods and procedures discussed in this book **are being used extensively today** in industrial executive development and supervisory training programs, in **religious education**, in the training of youth leaders, in the in-service education of professional staff in large voluntary health organizations, in crew performance improvement in the armed services, in the preparation of community workers, and in the preparation of medical and nursing personnel. (Preface)

The book is "designed to help people put on training programs" and is concerned with the "improvement of the **quality of work**" in "face-to-face" working groups with **specific goals or tasks "about which members want to—or are required to—make decisions and take action."** Good **training**, which is "impossible without attention to **theory**" is a "**systematically-planned** approach to learning better group behavior, with certain important features," Miles explains. It is a "**means**" to "**solving system-wide problems**" in an **organization**, most often initiated by one person who must be "trusted and accepted" by others in the system. It begins by the "initiator" and friends "assessing the state of the system" to determine its "needs," or some other *technique* which helps "sensitize people to needs that were dormant, vague, or only hesitantly voiced before." (2, 4, 6, 48-52)

Effective group work is "essentially a **re-educative task**" and therefore involves "whole-person learning," says Miles. Important factors include "attitudes, feelings, sensitivities, understandings, and behaviors." The "process" of learning specific skills in group behavior "requires thinking, feeling, choosing, and acting-out." He explains: "Ideas, values, principles, attitudes, feelings, and concrete behaviors are involved in whole-person learning, and good **training...includes them all.**" The trained person, in turn, "can apply these skills whether the other group members are kindergartners or adults." Writes Miles:

.. learning better group behavior is an example of complex, comprehensive learning, involving new understandings, attitudes, skills. Since adults learn some of their ways of working with other people quite early in life, we are faced with the need for much **unlearning**. and **re-education** in new ways of seeing, hearing, and acting in groups. Everyone experiences normal resistance to change, and it could be argued that bringing about real **personal change**, especially in adults, is a near-hopeless undertaking from the start.

But, on the other hand, **new knowledge** about how people learn in group situations suggests that much more **change is possible** than many of us are inclined to think. Quite clear **changes can take place** in the way people see group situations (including their view of their own role), and in the way they act, **as a consequence of training experiences**. But all is not magic, and in thinking about training we need to **plan** for learning conditions that will evoke realistic and feasible **changes in**

people... (27-28)

Training skills are concerned with the tools a person needs to **“bring his actions into line with his intentions.”** These helping skills include: “Helping group members work through a conflict”; “Testing for the presence of consensus in a group at a given point” and “increasing other members’ willingness to express frank feelings.” Leadership within a group exists when a person is “perceived by a group as controlling means for the satisfaction of their **needs.**” Leadership functions include “group building,” “encouraging,” “standard setting,” improving “relationships,” getting and keeping the “group action moving,” “influencing the direction and tempo of the group’s work,” “bringing information and opinions to the group,” **“creating an emotional climate which holds the group together,”** helping the group to “evaluate its decisions, goals, or procedures (examples: testing for **consensus**, noting group process).” In the “analysis of group behavior,” careful attention must be paid to the “process or procedural aspects of group behavior. Noticing *what* is said is not enough. The effective group member must also be aware of *how* things are said, by whom, when, and what function they serve in what group context.” A fundamental “process skill is that of diagnosing group difficulty and sensing needed, missing functions” and taking “appropriate action” in light of this “diagnosis.”

The “process” of learning, explains Miles, is **“cyclical”** and the problem of **training** is “to provide conditions to help this learning process go forward effectively.” The **conditions include placing the learner within a group in a “psychologically safe” environment** for “trial-and-success learning.” This because training...

also implies practice - repeated performance of particular skills, with explicit, immediate information (feedback) on the results of a particular try. If we are to train the whole person, then the whole person must think [cognitive], feel [affective], act [psychomotor] - and then learn immediately how well he has done...The person needs to experiment with his own behavior, learn what the consequences are [rewarding feedback for conforming and punishing feedback for nonconformance], and try again...

...the learner needs to experiment and explore, try things out for himself, learn from doing, until he can behave appropriately. He must learn that...his **own actions are a part of a problem** situation...

Such learning requires a ‘not-for-keeps’ setting because the learner must be free to be creative, to think provisionally, to make missteps, and to try out new ways of behaving without fear...When the usual constraints on the individual are temporarily lifted, the results can be dramatic. Methods like **role playing, ‘brainstorming,’ and client-centered therapy** seem to free the individual... (33-34)

Miles explains that under these *conditions* “a three-step process can be said to take place:”

1. “The learner enters a safe situation and, in a sense, **‘unfreezes,’** or relaxes, his usual set ways of behaving.”
2. “In the unfrozen, **fluid state** he creatively explores and tries out new behaviors.”

3. “He **refreezes**, or makes firm, the new behaviors as he moves back to the usual demands of the job situation.” (34)

Miles states that individuals “stay frozen most of the time, and **training’s** biggest contribution is making a *temporary thaw* (unfreezing) not only possible, but **safe** and *desirable*.” He then lists several “stages” in which learning/training occurs:

Stage 1—”The learner must, in effect, come to *feel* some more or less specific inadequacy in relation to his own role in groups, or learning cannot go forward.” This “inadequacy” is “relative” but it causes the learner to have a “**vague, unfocused feeling of discomfort**.” This discomfort (guilt anxiety) signifies “**intrinsic** motivation for changing” and when it occurs. “Immediately, emotional problems are involved; frequently the natural desire is to protect the self.” So an “**atmosphere** must be developed in which people can safely talk about tensions, dissatisfactions, and difficulties they personally are experiencing. Such expressions serve as a basis for training.” (39-40)

Stage 2—The person “must become aware of, and consider trying out, new actions which promise to help him solve the problem(s) *he faces in his work with groups*. That is, the learner needs to think creatively of different practices that might *reduce his dissatisfactions with his present behavior*.” Unconsciously “the learner is now framing an action hypothesis which might read: ‘If I try this...then some desirable consequences will result.’”¹² In this stage a “non-judging atmosphere” is important because most people have behaved the same way for so long that “considering the idea that one could behave differently is quite difficult.” Also, “if the group members hold the *expectation* that everyone is in the process of changing and learning - and that this is to be *desired* - then visualizing new...behaviors is really aided.” (39-40)

Stage 3—”Given the felt need to learn,” the person must have “numerous opportunities to practice” some of the “behaviors that he and the others consider to be promising.” This practice should “involve a minimum of threat and risk.” During this stage the individual has “**unfrozen** some of his old ideas” and therefore the “primary emotional need is for support.” Explains Miles: “**He is defenseless** and awkward at this point.” (42-43)

Stage 4—The learner now needs to get “evidence as to the effectiveness of what he does.” The learner “must, in addition, see the actual effect of his behavior on others.” This is important evidence for the learner to serve as a basis for “applying his learnings further.” Miles explains:

...In the language of **training**, the term for a report to the learner of how his behavior is affecting others is ‘**feedback**.’ This technical term comes originally from the field of automation...but seems clearly applicable to training as well. To be most helpful for learning, feedback must: (1) be clear and undistorted; (2) come from a

¹² This is where Tolman’s Expectancy Theory, a part of TQM, comes in. Expectancy Theory states that “people will behave in ways that they expect will produce outcomes that they value” (Jones 159).

trusted, non-threatening source; (3) follow as closely as possible the behavior to which it is a reaction. **With quick, accurate, trusted evidence, the learner can proceed to correct his behavior effectively.**

...Much of the power of human relations training seem to stem from building in regular feedback procedures as a part of the training setup... (43)

Stage 5—”Now that the learner knows what works (or perhaps more frequently, what doesn’t work), he must tie this new knowledge into his picture of himself...”During this stage, the learner “needs support and positive emotional *reinforcement* from other learners in the group. Otherwise, as he considers “new learnings that are **hard for him to accept, deep down**,” the learnings will “never really become a part of his normal ways of behaving.” (44)

Stage 6—”Finally, the learner almost inevitably emerges from a process...with new dissatisfactions and problems, in addition to new insights and ways of behaving.” These “new ways of behaving lead to new problems” and the **“training cycle continues”**:

...In other words, after the feedback of evidence which helps him see the consequences of his own group behavior, the individual realizes that his behavior is still inadequate...He then repeats the process...It is through steady repetitions of this experimental learning process that he becomes most sensitive to what is going on in groups...and can act more effectively. (44-45)

This process is “more than a *rational* process,” says Miles, and at “each of the stages” the “person faces emotional problems and stresses, since what is involved is **change—change in me**.” A good group member “**operates habitually much of the time**” and his group behavior becomes “**automatic**.” Miles admits in as subtle a manner as possible: “Often recollection of what went on in the **training** group seems to **serve as** a kind of ‘**conscience**’ for the member, continuing to encourage him at difficult points. Attitudes or values learned in the training group often have considerable carry-over, **for this reason**.” (31, 38, 46)

It is little wonder that Professor Stephen Robbins of Concordia University cunningly wrote in his college text, Organization Behavior, in 1979:

Nearly two centuries ago, the German philosopher Georg Hegel stated that thinking develops out of conflict. He argued that for every positive thesis there exists an antithesis or counter position that negates the thesis. He believed that the conflict between these two positions produces a synthesis that does justice to the substance of both the thesis and antithesis and yet is superior to both. While Karl Marx used Hegel’s **dialectic** to formulate a theory of revolution, **this same dialectic** is also the fundamental basis upon which education is built.

The objective of education is...to cultivate an inquiring mind. Educated people supposedly are less dogmatic; they recognize that few issues are black or white and that **reasoning abilities** allow us to change our minds as facts or conditions change... (11)

America has been feeding on a lie for the last sixty or seventy years. This new diet has

made her lazy and sleepy. Freedom without vigilance is an *illusion* and both our vigilance and our freedom have given way to the lie we've been ingesting. As our political leaders continue to hand over our country's sovereignty to the godless and pagan Hegelianized United Nations, we're busy selling our *souls* for a bowl of pottage. The window of freedom is now closing fast and soon that window will be closed forever. Will we stop feeding long enough to see what is happening or have we been eating a lie for so long we no longer have a taste for the Truth? That is the question.

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, Ralph. Human Behavior in the Social Environment: A Social Systems Approach. University of Iowa and I. Carter, University of Minnesota, 1984.
- Benne, Kenneth., Leland Bradford, Jack Gibb, and Ronald Lippitt, eds. The Laboratory Method of Changing and Learning: Theory and Practice. Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1975.
- Bennis, Warren, Edgar Schein, Fred Steele and David Bedew. Interpersonal Dynamics: Essays and Readings on Human Interaction, essay entitled “Brainwashing” by Edgar Schein (it was adapted from a 1961 book Coercive Persuasion written by Schein with collaboration from I. Schneier and C. H. Barker. The Dorsey Press 1964, 1968 Revised Edition.
- Biehler, Robert F. and Jack Snowman. Psychology Applied to Teaching. Southern Illinois University.
- Chen, Theodore H. E. Thought Reform of the Chinese Intellectuals. Hong Kong University Press, 1960
- Craig, Robert, chief editor. American Society for Training and Development Handbook: A Guide to Human Resource Development. McGraw-Hill, 1967; 1996 Edition.
- Deming, Edward. Deming Talks to Educators, a manuscript and video tape of a Deming conference for educators and “human resource professionals” in Washington DC, in January, 1992.
- Deming, Edward. User’s Guide. American Association of School Administrators and Quality Enhancement Seminars Inc, 1993.
- Forsyth, Donelson R. An Introduction to Group Dynamics. Virginia Commonwealth University.
- Forsyth, Donelson R. Social Psychology. Virginia Commonwealth University, 1987.
- Friedrich, Carl, ed. The Philosophy of Hegel. Harvard University, 1954 Edition.
- Frost, Jr., S. E. Basic Teachings of the Great Philosophers. Anchor Books, 1989.
- Gangel, Kenneth O. and James C. Wilhoit. The Christian Educator’s Handbook on Adult Education. an essay by Malcolm Knowles entitled, “Contributions of Malcolm Knowles,” Baker Books, 1993.
- Gray, William and Nicholas D. Rizzo, eds. Unity Through Diversity. Vol. 9 “Festschrift for

Ludwig von Bertalanffy.” Part I. “Current Topics of Contemporary Thought.” Gordon & Breach Publishing, New York-London-Paris, 1973.

Griffiths, Joseph Harry. The Psychology of Human Behavior, 1935.

Heilbroner, Robert. Marxism: For or Against. W. W. Norton & Co., New York and London, 1980.

Hook, Sidney. From Hegel To Marx. originally published in 1936; 1994 Edition.

Hunter, Edward. Brainwashing. Pyramid Books, 1958, 1970.

Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute for Social Research. (1923-1950). Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Jones, John E. and J. William Pfeiffer, eds. The 1981 Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators. Pfeiffer & Co., 1981.

Krohn, Claus-Dieter. Intellectuals in Exile. The University of Massachusetts Press, 1993 American translation.

Laszlo, Ervin. A Strategy for the Future: The Systems Approach to World Order. Princeton, George Braziller, 1974.

Marcuse, Herbert. Reason and Revolution: Hegel and the Rise of Social Theory. Beacon Press, 1941, 1960 Edition.

McConnell, James. Understanding Human Behavior. University of Michigan. Holt, Reinhart, & Winston, 1980.

McLellan, David. The Young Hegelians and Karl Marx. Frederick A. Praeger, Inc., 1969.

Miles, Matthew B. Learning To Work In Groups: A Program Guide For Educational Leaders. Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1959, 1971 Edition.

Robbins, Stephen. Organizational Behavior. Concordia University, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.

Schein, Edgar and Irving Weschler. Issues In Training. National Training Laboratories and the National Education Association, 1962.

Scholtes, Peter (and other contributors). The Team Handbook: How to Use Teams to Improve Quality. Joiner Associates, Inc., 1988.

Strauss, George and Leonard Sayles. Personnel: The Human Problems of Management. 4th ed. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.

Training: The Human Side of Business, Lakewood Publications, Inc., Minneapolis, March 1998.

Turner, Francis, ed. Social Work Treatment: Interlocking Theoretical Approaches, 3rd Ed. Free Press, 1986.

van Praag, J. P. Foundations of Humanism. Prometheus Books, 1982.

**THE MARXIST
THEORY & PRACTICE
BEHIND
TOTAL QUALITY
MANAGEMENT**

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 4

**THE MARXIST
THEORY & PRACTICE
BEHIND
TOTAL QUALITY
MANAGEMENT**

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 4
(Second Edition)

©2002

Institution for Authority Research

Dean Gotcher

Herndon, KS 67739

www.authorityresearch.com

THE MARXIST THEORY & PRACTICE
BEHIND
TOTAL QUALITY MANAGEMENT

by
Judy McLemore

Total Quality Management (TQM) is the most dangerous totalitarian idea social scientists have proposed for America in its history. It is sold worldwide to organizations, industries, businesses, governments and their institutions (schools, agencies, etc.) by Marxist social engineers posing as management gurus. The selling points normally consist of a promise of increased efficiency and/or productivity which one must have to succeed in our so-called rapidly changing society, or as a means of neutralizing unions and employees in preparation for change. W. Edwards Deming's Statistical Process Control has been around since the twenties when it was pioneered by Bell Laboratories' researcher Walter Shewhart. It was used by American industries to standardize their products by controlling the variation to which processes were generally subjected and then utilizing statistical techniques in analyzing this variation. After World War II, Deming carried it to Japan, but by then collectivist Quality Circles had been added and it was called Total Quality Control. "Control" was later changed to "Management" for American consumption.

Today, it is used to plan and control the economy while standardizing the workplace through the International Standards Organization (ISO) and the people (via re-education/brainwashing) to fit into that workplace. This is a worldwide movement, and standardization of our people in preparation for the planned New World Order involves the destruction of American Christian culture and/or Western Civilization. In order to destroy our culture, the planners must first eliminate the Christian conscience (which is the primary focus of this paper). TQM was the foundation of President Clinton's reinventing government, as well as today's restructuring of public schools, the collaborative efforts of social service agencies, the partnerships between government and private industry, economic development, etc., etc., etc. (In Alabama, it's behind the corporate/big business effort to re-write our state constitution). International corporations (wanna-be monopolists), Chambers of Commerce, foundations, Marxist social scientists/engineers, change agents/practitioners, and government (including the Department of Labor and Education) are heading this transformation of America, while the people haven't a clue as to TQM's real agenda. This is understandable because to ascertain the agenda one must go back at least half a century or more to when it began in earnest.

In the 1951 book, Human Relations and Curriculum Change, the National Education Association's Kenneth Benne and Bozidar Muntyan selected the research experiments and writings on group development and human engineering by various transformational Marxists to create a blueprint for the "**re-education**" or **brainwashing** of the masses and subsequent transformation of America. It is a master plan for "inducing and controlling changes in social systems," that is, changes in the individuals within schools, government, universities, industries, etc. by way of the "group" (Benne Preface, 24). "Conflicting beliefs and dispositions" of individuals, "stand in the way" as they "shape up into competing ways of

molding the world to their patterns,” declares the authors. The plan includes a dialectical method of “resolving” personal individual beliefs and dispositions of traditional Americans into a “common social outlook” defined by these Marxists (336). By common they mean of the same mind, feelings, habits, knowledge, motivation, beliefs and values. In effect, they mean to mold each individual personality to conform to a facilitated group adaptable to change.

This method is more generally known as brainwashing. It consists of Marxist *praxis*, putting theory into practice, the dialectical process into action. Marxist *praxis* wedded to Deming’s Statistical Control Process is the foundation of TQM. This process explains how and why a freedom-loving nation is on the verge of giving up that freedom, not unlike in Hitler’s Germany, for slavery.

Loosely defined, *praxis* was used to designate a kind of self-creating action, which differed from the externally motivated behavior produced by forces outside man’s control...Although originally seen as the opposite of contemplative *theoria* when it was first used in Aristotle’s *Metaphysics*, ***praxis in the Marxist usage*** was seen in **dialectical relation to theory**. In fact, one of the earmarks of *praxis* as opposed to mere action was its being informed by theoretical considerations. The goal of revolutionary activity was understood as the **unifying of theory and praxis**, which would be in direct contrast to the situation prevailing under capitalism. (Jay 4) [Emphasis added]

The book details a “clear-cut theory” of “group development” as well as “practical” ways and “means of implementing this theory” by way of the group or collective into America society (Benne, Foreword). According to Kurt Lewin, member of the communist founded Institute for Social Research (Frankfurt School)¹ who wrote several articles in Human Relations in Curriculum Change, there is a “three-step” process involved in group development for effectively changing an individual’s behavior, and thus their facts, beliefs, values, and standards. This process includes: (1) “**unfreezing**” (the individual’s “**inner resistance to change**”); (2) “**moving to the new level**” (changing the individual’s facts, beliefs, values, behavior); (3) “**freezing group life on the new level**” or refreezing (stabilizing the individual’s new facts, beliefs, values and behavior via facilitating his commitment to this “new god”) (Benne 29, 43).

According to management guru, Edgar H. Schein, this process of group development or “**human relations training fits into a context of institutional influence procedures which includes coercive persuasion in the form of thought reform or brainwashing**” (46). It shouldn’t come as a surprise that it was the German Marxist, Kurt Lewin, who originally developed this three-step “change model” of brainwashing. Schein has been a trainer as well as practitioner in this area for decades. After the Korean War ended in the fifties, he interviewed American POWs that had been held captive and brainwashed by the Chinese. A few of the Americans actually defected and “at one time or another nearly all of the men performed actions that helped the enemy,” a first in American history. He reported that the Chinese used certain “techniques to alter the prisoners’ attitudes.” The Chinese “referred to

¹ See also the “New School for Social Research: University in Exile,” another paper in this series.

the program as *hsi nao*, which literally means ‘to cleanse the mind.’ The Americans called it brainwashing...” In his summary of the Chinese program, Schein...

identified three **basic phases**. First the Chinese sought to disrupt, or **unfreeze**, the POWs’ current attitudes and values. The second phase involved **changing** these attitudes to conform with communists doctrine. In the final phase, new attitudes were ingrained with the POWs’ overall value system. Schein calls this phase **refreezing**. (Forsyth 278-281)

The Chinese had used “physical and social-psychological tactics to unfreeze the men’s attitudes” in the first phase. In the second phase, they used “both direct and indirect techniques to change the prisoners’ attitudes.” The direct techniques relied on “persuasive methods,” and the indirect techniques “capitalized” on **cognitive dissonance**, that is, an individual’s “**need to maintain consistency among cognitions and behaviors.**” By using these techniques, “Time and again the men were coerced into performing procommunist actions...Each small concession led to a slightly larger one, however, until men unwittingly found themselves collaborating with the Chinese. In some cases, such simple methods succeeded in extracting confessions to war crimes and pledges of allegiance to communism.” In the final phase, “men who cooperated with the Chinese were asked to **make public commitments** to communism...All in all, **these tactics sought to provide social supports for the newly acquired attitudes**” (Forsyth 278-281).

America was warned by the Communists many years ago that she would be taken without a shot being fired. That was no hollow threat, because the prediction is being fulfilled by way of “**transforming the social order through human praxis,**” that is, Marxist *praxis*/putting theory into practice/the dialectical process into action.² This half-Century old plan is based on the work of German-trained Americans and German transformational Marxists. In it you can clearly see the elements of Total Quality Control/Management that is being implemented not only in America but around the world. The key to the revision is Marxist *Praxis* (Jay 42). (As noted, Marxist *praxis* is the essence of Total Quality Management.) The historic American defections in Korea testify to the power of these deceptively “simple methods.” Beginning in the sixties, this three-step process can be found in hundreds of texts on Management Development, Organizational Development, and Organizational Behavior. The latter two being an outgrowth of the first and concerns the application of this brainwashing process to an entire organization, industry, institution, etc.

The Chinese had used this process before and after the fifties on their own people, so too did Germany and Soviet Russia. Kurt Lewin, the ultimate practitioner, died in 1947 but his comrades organized The National Training Laboratory in Group Development³ with a grant from the Office of Naval Research. Today, the process has been perfected to almost a science and is simply called reaching **consensus**. Like the POWs, the consensus reached of which the

² See “The Aspen Institute and Marxist Praxis,” another paper in this series for an example of how this has/is being accomplished.

³ The first National Training Laboratory was sponsored by the Research Center for Group Dynamics at MIT of which Lewin founded, the National Education Association with which it was connected, the Teachers College at Columbia University after emigrating to the U.S.), Springfield College, U.C.L.A. and Cornell University (where Lewin had been visiting professor after he first came to America).

group member believes is his/her own decision, is **already predetermined by the facilitating comrade**. This shows the hubris of these Marxists in that they have no trouble cleansing the minds of group members and facilitating them into choosing predetermined outcomes from controlled alternatives.

At about the same time that the National Training Laboratory (whose group dynamics work “was deeply influenced by the **Tavistock Institute of Human Relations**” in London) set out to re-educate the masses via the group, another Hegelian movement at the University of Chicago, headed by psychologist Carl Rogers, was also developing **intensive group experiences** for training personnel counselors for the Veterans Administration. The Chicago group was oriented toward **personal growth** and the improvement of **interpersonal communication and relationships**. Over the years, the Chicago orientation toward “personal and therapeutic growth” has become merged with the focus of training in human relations skills, and this combination forms the core of the trend which is spreading so rapidly throughout the country today. Rogers and Abraham Maslow “who had been so important to the National Training Laboratories,” would eventually apply the dialectical process to education. Douglas McGregor would use Maslow’s work, as well as the work of the Tavistock Institute⁴ (who’s work was geared toward industry), in applying the process to American businesses and industry. Moreover, in 1948 The Aspen Institute was founded to put dialectical **theory into practice** within the political sphere of America (Rogers 3-4; Trist Vol. I, Preface; Kleiner 63,359).

The goal? A malleable **collective** people adaptable to change. More specifically, a people who’s existing conscience, which traditionally guided individuals in their choices and decisions of life, **has been destroyed and replaced by the group “super-ego,”** which henceforth controls their behavior. This because the Christian norms, absolutes, and “thou shalt not’s” stored in the conscience, stood as barriers to change (Benne 86). The group can then gradually be facilitated into replacing our Constitutional Republic with a Marxist society as they have been doing for the last fifty years.

Human Relations in Curriculum Change was deliberately written in a language unique to Marxists in order to deceive the casual reader. But a careful reading exposes the *origins of* and *reasons why* America is moving from a society of principled and moral people to a society of self-absorbed, valueless, whining, dependent collectives that can be manipulated at will. Moreover, the sadistic and brutal murders, crimes (especially those against the very young and old), killing of the unborn, pornography, drugs, alcoholism, homosexuality, suicide, and political corruption and subversion in high places occurring in our society today testify to a decadent nation without a conscience.

When they began implementing this process over a half century ago, rugged individualists with Christian convictions to die for was the *norm* of our society. The average Joe was polite, honest, self-controlled, principled, and virtuous. Whereas today, most would fear meeting average Joe alone after dark. In fact, there are so few principled individuals left that the planners have found little resistance to the wholesale restructuring of America. So the 1990s saw the mass restructuring of America’s government, institutions, public schools, industries, etc., by way of Total Quality Management and this process. The extensive quotes

⁴ The Tavistock Institute of Human Relations was founded in 1946 with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation but its subversive history goes back another twenty-five years.

included herein reveal this Marxist plan in their own words. Consequently, this paper may require studying rather than a casual reading. Although I've only touched the surface in explaining this process and how it is implemented, I believe those involved in TQM who study it carefully will recognize many of the techniques.

Thus, this paper is an attempt to explain not only the process but the preparation, the planning, and the evil deception that goes on behind the surface in restructuring an organization, industry, or institution on TQM principles. It is applied in the corporate workplace via teamwork, in problem-solving groups, policy groups, training school board members, legislative groups, leadership groups, etc. If you have ever wondered why it is that you elect a truly principled conservative to Congress, but within a year or so he's voting in opposition to those principles, herein lays the answer. When your community forms a local partnership (usually headed by the Chamber of Commerce which is controlled by international corporations) to restructure your local school and the resulting plan turns out to be identical to the blueprint created by the Business Roundtable, herein lies the reason. If you've even attended a so-called Town-Hall meeting and come away feeling that you have accomplished nothing, it's because you haven't. It was a predetermined agenda and controlled environment.

This paper also attempts to reveal how this process is applied by way of **problem-solving** and **Marxist planning**. It attempts to show the reasons for reorganizing individuals into cohesive groups/teams. How traditional beliefs, facts, and values of these individuals are replaced with Marxist norms. It explains the reasons for **deliberation/dialogue** in the process of planning, implementation (or common action) and evaluation of the group's decision/solution and how this decision is predetermined. In group planning/problem-solving, all of the above and below is interrelated. In attempting to explain it, it appears that it occurs in steps or stages but in practice much occurs simultaneously. A great deal of preparation has already been done before the official planning group is organized. The group member has no idea that his new environment has been carefully planned and will be strenuously controlled. Initially, groups or teams targeted for change will often be taken to a secluded off-site area/retreat away from fellow workers, friends, outside information, etc. The initial game-playing and humor utilized by the facilitator works marvelously as a tool to put everyone at ease and lower their defenses. They begin exposing their souls to fellow group members with whom they've created a bond or belongingness. In the mean time, the facilitator is taking mental notes of these details to be recorded and used later.

The writers in Human Relations in Curriculum Change indicate that the deliberate inducing of change in "people, their ideas, their values, their skills and their relationships" cannot be "brought about **without the organization and use of groups**" as well as a discipline of skills (Preface). The book contains over 350 pages of the "discipline" required to destroy/cleanse the existing conscience of a nation of people and therefore our Christian culture, which is the very structure of the nation itself. This is done with such cunning deception that the people themselves haven't a clue, that's why it's called Transformational Marxism rather than revolutionary Marxism. The ends are the same, only the means differ.

...the individual's behavioral norms, values, and perceptions are shaped as he participates in the related activities of group life and...he offers the least resistance to change in these reciprocal behavior patterns and the attitudes that sustain them, when

the group itself shifts its support to new relationships within and between social systems. From this point of view...change strategy will be most successful not when it is focused directly on changing individual(s)...but when it attempts to induce the group involved to accept the change. Now a group resists change attempts which it perceives as external pressures and accepts those which it sees as resulting from its own decisions. Plainly, the problem is not “How does a ‘strong leader’ change the group?” but rather “How can a group be helped to change itself?” The knowledge and skills necessary for giving a group such help are another important kind of equipment needed ball who are working for a change... (12-13)

In 1951, these Marxists insisted that “our unevenly and drastically changing society” dictated the “necessity” for change and that they intended to control it. They surmised that to deny the “rights to **democratic leadership**” (i.e. democratic socialism/communism) in “influencing” the course of change would be to “sell out control of required changes to non-democratic leadership.” So their control of changing America into a Marxist Society is planned and maintained by the “translation of the **norms of democratic ethics** into principles of **procedure** in the engineering of **deliberate changes in human conduct and interrelationships**.” If change is to occur, then “**these norms must be observed by educational leadership at all times, and the norms must also be communicated and taught to those participating along with effective methods and techniques for inducing changes in persons, groups, and social systems**.” (294-295) [emphasis added]

Conscience, by its very nature is nonconforming...to the degree to which a person conforms he cannot hear the voice of his conscience, much less act upon it. (Fromm [in Bonner] 215-216)

Traditionally, the guiding norms of society issue from that society’s highest authority. In Communist societies, they issue from the Communist Party (man). In Fascist societies they issue from the dictator (man). In Humanist societies they issue from the ruling elite (man), etc. In Western Civilization, and specifically the United States, these norms (rules, absolutes, “thou shalt not’s”, etc.) historically issued from God, the Ultimate Authority and Norm Giver, via the Bible via the pulpits. Families in America were structured and based on these norms and through them, our Constitutional government and its institutions. These norms then, made up our culture and were embedded in every area of traditional American life. In effect, they formed the very foundation of our civilization. They were traditionally passed on from generation to generation primarily by parents inculcating them in their children, thereby becoming part of the child’s facts and values and hence the next generation’s **conscience** as God intended “Train up a child in the way he should go: and when he is old, he will not depart from it.” (Holy Bible, Proverbs 22:6) Long-term studies by social scientists have shown that this Proverb holds true if there is no outside intervention, thus the need for re-education. Since these norms are embedded in the culture, even atheists raised in a Christian society are enculturated in them to some extent. Hence, the “Protestant **conscience** is regarded as **patriarchal and authoritarian**” by Frankfurt School member, Erich Fromm. He stressed the importance of the superego/conscience as “internalized domination, replacing external coercion in the bourgeois economic order” (Hammond 30).

The individual's facts/norms/rules/beliefs of right and wrong are stored in the conscience and habitually, though often unconsciously, guide the individuals within our society in their daily choices and decisions, and thus their behavior. As our founding fathers warned, our Constitutional Republic is designed for a moral people, and that is a people who (as opposed to external force) are guided internally by norms/absolutes/rules of right and wrong. Since individuals guided by **internal authority** resist external manipulation, this internal authority/conscience within individuals must be destroyed.

...The **re-educative** process has to fulfill a task which is essentially equivalent to a **change in culture**...

...The **re-educative process** affects the individual in three ways. It changes his **cognitive structure** (cognitive), the way he sees the physical and social worlds, including all his **facts, concepts, beliefs and expectations**. It modifies his valences (likes and dislikes) and values, and these embrace both his attractions and aversions to groups and group standards, his **feelings (affective)** in regard to status differences, and his reactions to sources of approval or disapproval. And it affects his **motoric action (psychomotor)**, involving the degree of the individual's control over his physical and social movements. (Lewin [in Benne] 24)

Since capitalism has always been a part of our Judeo-Christian culture, German sociologist Max Weber theorized that American "culture," "character" and "work ethic" was a result of the "Protestant Ethic." Sigmund Freud taught his disciples that "internalization of cultural norms and standards" takes place in the family via the "process of internalizing **paternal** norms, prohibitions, and ideals" resulting in the formation of a "patriarchal" super-ego/conscience/ego ideal in the child, thus making the conscience the "vehicle of (cultural) **tradition**" (including the tradition of capitalism) while serving as "monitor and judge" of the ego/self and id/instinctual impulses or **flesh/fallen nature**. (The writings of both Weber and Freud suggests the "origin of conscience in Judaism," that is, the God of Judaism). Marx believed that "bourgeois Protestant individuals standing alone before God and **governed by conscience**" were produced in "response to the needs of capitalist economy" and so this conscience "speaks with the voice of the prevailing capitalist ideology." He taught that "religion, like the family, is a part of the societal superstructure" and "Religious doctrines are ideologies that justify and defend the existing socioeconomic order;" therefore, they must be eliminated in preparation for a Communist society. Consequently, a "synthesis" of these "**critiques** of bourgeois culture and character," of the "Weberian, the Freudian, and the (Hegelized) Marxian perspectives," was "accomplished" by "members of the **Frankfurt School**" that resulted in a "body of theory that has application." This theory has now been applied to America for over a half century with the resulting and expected demoralization of the masses, a major tenant of Communist subversion (Hammond 13, 15, 18,20,210) .

...[Max] Weber's seminal work, The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, made the case that the Protestant ethic that emerged at the time of the Reformation constituted an essential basis for the rise of modern capitalism. This "Weber thesis" became one component in the synthesis of the **Frankfurt School** and an important aspect of the **school's approach to conscience**...

...Weber seeks to show that the general availability of persons of a particular character type was a prerequisite for early capitalism...true capitalism in the modern sense developed only where this type was already present. What requires explaining is the rise of persons with a disciplined, self-controlled diligence that was quite out of keeping with traditional attitudes. In the outlook of an individual of this type, labor and its products are considered goods for reasons other than the pleasurable results for the worker. Weber contends that this view of work is explicable only in terms of a religious sense of vocation or calling to one's secular labors. He explains the appearance of this new person by referring to the rise of the Calvinist ideology, which built upon...Lutheranism...Weber argues that out of this configuration of beliefs a new ethic, a new character type, and ultimately a new **culture** were born.

In Weber's eyes...this was a culture of a very peculiar sort. **Each individual was understood to stand alone in the presence of God, apart from the commonalties of the group**. One sought to scrutinize oneself, as it were, from the **perspective of God**. The "we-consciousness" of traditional culture was replaced by the "I-consciousness" of the Puritan-Protestant perspective. **"Obeying God rather than men"** meant obeying **one's own conscience**, understood as having **divine authority, rather than obeying external authorities. Thus the Puritan conscience became one of the major sources of Western individualism...Weber perceived the Protestant ethic as a major breach in the collectivism of traditionalist culture...** (Hammond 12-13)

The Frankfurt School determined that the only way to rid this society of capitalism and replace it with their Marxist vision was to destroy the traditional American "**conscience**" which was based on the "father's unquestioned **authority as God's representative,**" and thus the need to rid the minds of group members of all **higher authority**. So the "**critique of conscience...was initiated in the past generation by several members of the Frankfurt Institute for Social Research...**and continued in the contemporary work of Jurgen Habermas," a second generation Frankfurt School member. (Hammond 6-7, 38, 65)

Consequently, you will find this **process** is designed to destroy the individuals' existing conscience (the vehicle of cultural norms and traditions) and to **habituate** individuals to base their personal decisions/behavior on **group norms** which forbid the acknowledgment of any and all **higher authority** outside the group. Henceforth, the group super-ego becomes the individual's highest authority or conscience. And as social scientists have found, if an individual is required by a situation, for example the demands of his job, to say or do things that contradict his personal beliefs and his conscience, he experiences **Cognitive Dissonance (CD)**. CD is an inconsistency or incompatibility between an individual's beliefs and his behavior as perceived by the individual (such as believing one thing and saying or doing another). When it occurs, it generates in the individual "great tension" or "pressure" (**guilt**) which he/she is "compelled to reduce." In order to reduce it, individuals tend to initially justify/make excuses for the behavior. But if they are forced or pressured to continue in the behavior, eventually they modify their belief in order to make it compatible with their behavior. So **beliefs follow behavior** which means that if an individual is manipulated by way of group pressure into changing his/her behavior, eventually a change in beliefs will follow to be consistent with that behavior. (Robbins 50) [emphasis added]

The critique of religion disillusioned man so that he will think, act, and fashion his reality as a man who has lost his illusions and regained his reason, so that he will revolve about himself as his own true sun.

...For Germany the critique of religion is essentially completed; and the critique of religion is the prerequisite of every critique. (Marx in Taylor 22, 24)

Habituation in the process is designed not only to destroy the individual's faith and sear his existing conscience, but to effectively eliminate God from his very consciousness. This is a primary goal of Communists, and is accomplished by organizing society into collectives and putting the dialectical process into action.

According to Matthew B. Miles, then Associate Professor of Education at the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute of School Experimentation, Teachers College, Columbia University who applied this process to teacher education, if "we are to train the whole person, then the whole person must think (cognitive), feel (affective), and act (psychomotor) and then immediately learn how well he has done..." In the "language of **training**," which is a, "means" to "solving system-wide problems," the "term for a report to the learner of how his behavior is affecting others is **feedback**," says Miles. Much of the "power of human relations training seems to stem from building in regular feedback procedures as a part of the training setup." Not surprisingly, in the group regular feedback/reinforcement is built in (praise, stroking, ridicule, cold shoulder, acceptance/rejection by the group, etc.). Since, "any training aims at change in the person," the point of view taken by Professor Miles is that "**training for better group behavior represents re-education in the fullest sense.**" Moreover, explains Miles, "whole-person learning" seems the "easiest label with which to remind the reader that the process of learning to perfect particular skills in group behavior is not narrow." It "requires **thinking, feeling, choosing, and acting-out.**" Traditionally, Miles says, "education has been concerned often with solely verbal learning, less often with growth in the expression of feelings, and...least often of all with what people actually do. **Ideas, values, principles, attitudes, feelings, and concrete behaviors are involved in whole-person learning, and good training for improved group work includes them all.**" This Pavlovian feedback is the key to group conformity. (Miles⁵ 31, 33)

I repeat, **feedback is a method of controlling a system** by reinserting into it the results of its past performance. If these results are merely used as numerical data for the criticism of the system and its regulation, we have the simple feedback of the control engineers. If, however, the information which proceeds backward from the performance is able to change the general method and pattern of performance (behavior), we have a process which may well be called learning. (Weiner 61) [emphasis added]

One of (Russian) Ivan Pavlov's experiments (which inadvertently began by a flood which flooded his laboratory) consisted of conditioning dogs to respond to specific stimuli, after

⁵ Several individuals at the Horace Mann-Lincoln Institute, including Miles, were associated and participated at the initial training sessions of the National Training Laboratory in Group Development at Bethel, Maine.

which they received positive reinforcement (food). After they were well conditioned to respond a certain way, Pavlov then switched the expected positive reward with a negative reward. In other words, when the dogs responded the way they had been trained to respond, they received negative reinforcement rather than the usual positive reinforcement. According to Pavlov, this experiment resulted in the dogs having almost the human equivalent of a nervous breakdown. All prior conditioning was completely destroyed but given time to recover, they could then be conditioned anew. This is akin to the initial loss of identity group members experience in a facilitated group. The individual's normal way of doing things that had previously brought him/her praise and respect (positive reinforcement), now in the group results in negative reinforcement. Here, the individual is considered un-cooperative, they want to run the show, they don't get along well with others, they're intolerant, they're not team players, etc. But after a while, they too submit to this new conditioning. They become obedient to the process and the group and like Pavlov's dogs, it never even enters their awareness that their facilitating masters have retrained them.

Again, re-education, washing the minds of individuals of their existing facts and beliefs, requires putting the dialectical process into practice/action or *praxis*. This in turn, requires creating a dialectical environment (an environment consisting of an organized group of individuals with different/diverse personalities and different facts, beliefs, values, and motivations who must, through group discussion, come to agreement or **consensus** over a specific issue) **and carefully planned conditions** (the norms of the group allow individuals to feel emotionally secure, to speak their minds, where everyone's opinion is respected, where status or higher authority is not recognized as such, where individuals feel a sense of belongingness/we-ness with fellow group members, where everyone participates, where self-esteem is high so individuals are easier to change) **for the conflict of contradictory, interacting forces called Thesis and Antithesis so as they eventually culminate in Synthesis which becomes a new Thesis. And on and on this cycle goes.** This because according to German philosopher G. W. F. Hegel, for every belief/position/thesis there exists an opposite belief/position/thesis that negates/denies the thesis. Conflict between these two beliefs/positions/thesis produces a synthesis/**consensus**/whole.

In other words, putting dialectical theory into practice requires putting individuals who hold opposing or diverse beliefs (Thesis and Antithesis) about an issue into a facilitated face-to-face group where they dialogue/deliberate (conflict) over this issue until the group comes to consensus (Synthesis), which becomes the new Thesis and so on. "Conflict of views" in the democratic group is not a "condition to be abolished" but rather a "creative opportunity for common improvement" of group members, explain the authors. Hegel believed this process was the evolutionary means to *universal oneness*, a one-world utopian society. "Democratic deliberation," boasts these Hegelians, is the "best way which men have devised to attain common action in and through conflicting outlooks and purposes." Consequently, "...conflict **controlled** and **directed** by disciplined and appropriate methods of deliberation is regarded," boasts the writers, "as the source of all our major social gains" (Benne 296, 302-303).

However, the primary conflict manipulated by these transformational Marxists, as opposed to the class struggle of revolutionary Marxism, is not only external but internal. The

observable conflict in deliberation is causing a much more serious inner conflict⁶ within the minds of those participating in the facilitated group. As discussed earlier, cognitive dissonance is experienced when there is a conflict/incompatibility between one's beliefs and one's actual behavior and the resulting stress/tension/guilt constrains him to conform what he believes to what he says and/or does (Bennis, et al. 324).

Since several of the Frankfurt School Marxists studied the Bible themselves and gained insight into man's fallen nature, they took advantage of the war between the flesh and the spirit that goes on within the **mind**, as explained by the apostle Paul. The spirit (mind) is indeed willing but the flesh (feelings) is **weak**. Ultimately, cognitive dissonance causes the individual to conform to the beliefs, values, and expectations of the facilitated group while negating his own. By careful preparation and control of the environment and the conditions under which the group must participate, the **mind** of the individual group member is forced again and again into contradictions or dilemmas, which are age-old conflicts between the flesh and the spirit. He experiences simultaneously psychological pressure to avoid conflict with his group (flesh) and pressure to avoid conflict with his value system/conscience (spirit). He has three choices as to what to do. He must choose either to satisfy the group's expectations, satisfy his conscience, or compromise and conform to the group's expectations and then "justify"/make excuses for violating his conscience. Individuals initially tend to compromise their beliefs (violate their conscience/sin) by conforming to the group and then justify their compromises to themselves. Research shows that beliefs follow behavior, and so it is that the individual eventually modifies his beliefs to accord with his group behavior. Finally, the individual becomes habituated to following the flesh (group) and his Christian conscience becomes *seared*. It is replaced with a pagan group super-ego. If not stopped, this process will eventually destroy Christian Civilization (Marxism's primary target), which they believe is the only thing standing in the way of a world-wide Marxist/Humanist/Socialist society.

In the generic negative feedback loop, a discrepancy between the **actual state** of a system and some **desired** condition results in **action** designed to reduce the discrepancy.

The dialectic of Hegel and Marx's variation on the theme, contain "discrepancies between desired and actual conditions." The contradictions between thesis and antithesis set up pressures that eventually force a new state of affairs, the synthesis...The "desired condition" is synthesis, the elimination of contradiction and conflict between thesis and antithesis. Conflict between thesis and antithesis bring about a restructuring that reduces or eliminates (negates) the conflict. (Richardson 71)

When well facilitated, this process is so unbelievably subtle and everything appears so very natural and normal on the surface that often groups don't even know **what** a change agent/facilitator is let alone *who* he/she is or his/her real objectives. The inner conflict individuals are made to suffer is experienced as a feeling of deep stress and therefore, they are often not consciously aware of it or its cause. Little do they realize that it was deliberately

⁶ Lewin points out that it is the "reduction" of this "inner conflict" which furnishes "part of the motivation that brings persons into a process of re-education."

orchestrated for the purpose of destroying their very **identity**.⁷ Nor do they realize that others within the group (who have never been brainwashed/processed) are going through the same thing. This inner conflict is within the mind of each individual but evokes outward behavior which a good facilitator recognizes and thus can tell what stage of transition the individual is in at any particular time.

Most people never realize the power a controlled environment has over them perhaps for the simple reason that they never know their environment is deliberately controlled. Indeed, it would probably anger individual group members to even suggest that they are being brainwashed. Even though their beliefs, faith, and worldview have drastically changed, most believe they have merely outgrown these old dogmas or perhaps become better “educated” than their former peers, family, friends, etc. Because no one escapes this process with their core beliefs intact, even devout Christians can lose their faith if they remain in the process long enough. It was with just such subtlety that the serpent deceived Eve. Satan first engaged Eve in dialogue; then confused her by questioning her Higher Authority; he then lied to her about that Authority. Once he got her focused on the apple/flesh, he took advantage of her ‘pride of life’ and easily convinced her that if she only tasted the apple all her needs would be met (that is, she could be her own god—which was Satan’s predetermined outcome).

NORMS OF “DEMOCRATIC” ETHICS—*PRAXIS*

The “norms of democratic ethics” define the “*conditions of participation* by persons and groups.” The first task of “believers in democratic ethics” is **theory**—“the **theoretical job** of translating (Socialist/Communist) **democratic values** into methodological norms for the control of **processes** of planned change.” The second task is **practice**—“The second task is the practical one of devising ways, in training teachers and others as social engineers, to develop the skills and techniques for effective **stimulation and induction of change in persons and groups** and the social-psychological knowledge required for accurate diagnosis of change-situations in integral relation to developing **commitments** to the **norms of democratic methodology**.” Since this knowledge and the techniques “**divorced**” from these methodological controls can “be used for promoting undemocratic or anti-democratic ends,” the teaching of the “techniques of social engineering” must be “taught as the *hands and feet* (**practice**) which the ethical and methodological *heart and head* (**theory**) of **democratic action** require in today’s world” (Benne 295,316). In other words, you have to put theory into practice or the **dialectical process into action**. So those trained to use this process on others must first undergo/experience the process themselves, because the training itself consists of participating in the dialectical process.

To (W. Edwards) Deming, quality is not an entity but away of doing things, a way in which desired states are translated into concrete processes. More generally, the

⁷ Lewin points out that a “value system” is a “system or whole which the re-educative process must replace as a whole. It functions to help individuals “**maintain their identity**” in the “choices”/dilemmas that this controlled “conflicted environment thrusts upon them.” Thus effective re-education must destroy the individual’s existing “identity.” (Bennis, et al. 324)

concept of quality addresses the connection between **theory and practice** - theory being the desired state and practice being the process or device that critically influences quality. (Phi Delta Kappan, January 1993)

Norms of Democratic Co-operation: The writer explains that “Democratic co-operation” is a “method of social control” and a “means of attaining **common action**” in a group. The “ideal goal” of democratic co-operation is “**a consensus in the group** concerning what should be done,” a consensus “based on and sustained by the deliberation of the group in the **planning, execution, and evaluation** of the **common action** of the group.” No other “method of social control depends so centrally for its effective working-out upon the **habituation...of all its members** in conscious **methods of deliberation and discussion.**” This because democracy of the Lewinian “must be learned anew in each generation.” This learning/training in turn is dependent upon social science and cannot succeed without the knowledge of, and obedience to, the laws of human nature in group settings.

The **norms of democratic co-operation** or the **collective/group include:**

(a.) The “engineering of change” and the “**pressures** on a group or organization toward change” must be collaborative.

First, this means that “Individuals and groups *must be helped* to see that the task is to **discover and construct a common** interest out of the conflicting interests” within the group. The second collaboration “required” is across lines of Marxist “**theory and practice.**” This means that “planned change” must be based on “knowledge of relevant relationships (informal groups or cliques within the system) and structures (pecking order), of social forces (individuals) and factors promoting and impeding various possible changes” as well as the “result from alternative lines of action proposed and considered.” It also “calls for knowledge from various social sciences” (**theory**) as well as “skills in creating those *social psychological conditions*⁸· which will support a **problem-solving approach** in various phases of change.” In short, successful planned change requires the “**collaboration of practitioners** (practice) **with social scientists** (theory) **and with engineering methodologists** (scientific method)” and with “persons and groups with different interests in change” (Communist/Socialist/Humanist/Useful Idiots, that is, “action leaders”) (Benne 310).

...There are other triggers which lead to conditioned reflexes besides hunger and pain. It will be using anthropomorphic language to call these **emotional situations...** (Wiener was referring to Pavlov’ s dogs) Such experiences...**produce strong reflexes...** (Wiener 69)

(b.) The “engineering of change must be educational for the participants.”

Regardless of the publicly stated task of a planning group, committee, work group, etc., the reorganization of individuals into groups, from the facilitator’s point of view, is **re-education**. Therefore, “each person is to be treated as an end” and groups “are to be judged

⁸ As Dean Gotcher, head of the Institution for Authority Research, might say, these conditions would include a controlled environment where a diverse group of people dialogue to consensus over a social issue.

by their *effects on persons* influenced by them.” This means that the re-education of each single individual is an end in itself and therefore the group is judged by its brainwashing effects on individual group members. Every group member must **actively participate** in order to “learn the skills of contribution to **collective thinking**” as well as “**eliciting**” contributions to “**group thinking**” from their fellow members. But more important they must actively participate because “No problem is meaningful until it **evokes a feeling response**.” Therefore without emotional involvement which requires active participation, “no objective (hand-picked) fact is likely to reach the status of **fact (internalized) for the individual** and therefore **influence his conduct**.” But emotional participation in thinking “collectively” isn’t enough, the “social engineer” or change agent must leave the “persons and groups with whom he works” with the “**habits** and skills required for further growth,” that is, the **process** itself must become a habit or automatic to group members (and this habitual behavior is expected to be “transferred” to any and all relationships of the individual members outside the group). Moreover, the change agent “must also leave them better equipped to solve subsequent problems of change, including the **management of personal adjustments which change in social adjustments always requires**.” The destruction of one’s faith and **identity** is devastating for individual group members and not unlike Pavlov’s dogs, leaves them with a deep and depressing void that must be replaced with something that gives meaning to their lives. From the change agent’s point of view, the ideal replacement is a **passion** for putting the dialectical process in action.

(c.) The “engineering of change must be experimental.”

Engineering of change must be experimental in the sense that “democratic ideology” requires that “**all** social arrangements” be “subject to **modification and alteration** when their effects upon the persons influenced by their operation” are not the effects the social engineers desire. These include the social arrangements “formed and re-formed in processes of planning” as well as “those shaped and perpetuated by custom” [This ties in with (b) above.] Those social arrangements shaped by custom include natural friendship groups of like-minded individuals that form in any organization, institution or workplace. Also, in implementing the dialectical process, “social arrangements” must be subject to “modification and alteration” because the groups must be made up of individuals with diverse beliefs and values, worldviews, status, etc.

(d.) The “engineering of change must be task oriented, that is, **controlled** by the **requirements** of the **problem**” to be solved and its “**solution**,” rather than the “maintenance or extension of the prestige or power of those who originate contributions,” that is, **authority**. This “means that democratic change must be **anti-authoritarian**.” (The *attention* and *focus* of the group is directed to the task at hand, leaving their critical faculties oblivious to what is really taking place in this *diverse group* wherein everyone’s contribution to the problem and its solution must be given the same weight and consideration, whether they are the boss, an expert in the field, or the janitor.) Change agents who “implement this norm” must be constantly aware of the “social-psychological fact” that individuals form “emotional identification with ideas (like freedom and constitutional government) and proposals.” This can be “both an asset and a liability,” in that it is a “source of effective motivation” on one hand and a “source of *resistance* to counter-ideas” on the other. “**Democratic persons**” must

learn to “**inhibit their tendencies to defend and promote ideas which are in need of objective evaluation and reformulation,**” and at the same time to elicit ideas from all participants so as they can be publicly criticized by the group. In addition, they need to learn to “assess the sources of influence upon themselves and to differentiate between dependence upon status figures (any and all authority) and dependence *upon fact-oriented and task-oriented* influences.” Again, the goal here is to **eliminate all authority** within the **minds** of individual group members in order to replace that authority with the authority of the group.

Although Democratic groups need authority “*rolls*” to “coordinate” their “problem-solving activities,” they must “learn to judge authority roles in terms of their contribution to such coordination (their group contributions) and *not* in terms of the general prestige, respectability or status of certain members.” **The goal of “democratic social engineers” is to “convert” the participants’ “principles” and “viewpoints and ideas” from “dogmas to hypotheses.**” This entails converting the individuals existing deep-seated personal beliefs, facts and convictions including his faith which are stored in his *conscience* and based on a higher authority, into *assumptions/opinions*. To the “democratic planner dogmas are seen methodologically as intellectual attempts to save some privileged *position (thesis/belief)* from **open collective criticism and modification.**”

Moreover, resource persons and/or so-called experts (authority outside the group) that the group may require in gathering their facts are hand picked and consists of “laboratory practitioners, applied social scientist, facilitators, trainers, consultants” (Benne, Bradford, Gibb, & Lippitt 22)

(e.) The “engineering of change **must be anti-individualistic**, yet provide for the establishment of *appropriate* areas of privacy and for the **development of persons as creative units of influence**” in society. (The facilitated *mature* group will function as one mind and one personality, acknowledging no authority outside itself.)

Since the “more pressing problems” of change has a “**collective character**” and the “necessity for **collective solutions,**” a “**democratic methodology must be anti-individualistic.**” From this Marxist point of view, “**Individual personalities** are now seen to be **products of social experience.**” They explain that “norms and standards by which a person **thinks and judges** are **learned** in the **processes** by which he is acculturated. (That’s why TQM stresses the essentiality of a new culture). **Human rights** and duties **are grounded in the institutions and ideologies of a culture,**” that is, in “**man’s social relationships.**” Therefore, if “human rights are to be guaranteed, they must be guaranteed by appropriate social, political, and economic controls of human behavior” (Benne 28, 85, 310-314). Replacing God-given rights and responsibilities with rights and duties dictated by man is the goal of a dictator. What man can give, he can and historically has taken away, as these Communists very well know (Benne 28, 85, 310-314; Allport & Lewin xi).

So too, **individualism** tends to threaten the “value” of “creative individuality.” When the “realization of this value is blocked by certain social arrangements, as it is today” (1951), then the “task is to change these social arrangements. And such change today **requires collective planning and action,** not reliance upon **providential** processes...” The “individualism which democratic ideology leads us to oppose is the elevation of unchecked **private, individual judgment** as an ultimate arbiter **in the control of human conduct**” (Benne 314). In other words, individuals guided by their own personal beliefs, faith,

convictions (their conscience), will no longer be permitted to do so.

Although a “wise social policy” can establish “*areas of privacy*” for individuals as well as “voluntary associations” where “private judgment may rule,” the “determination of the proper *boundaries* of these *areas* must, in an **Interdependent society**, be based on a **collective judgment**.” Thus, it is “**only** by the *processes* of **collaborative planning**” that the “rights of private judgment can be defensibly **defined and enforced**.” Therefore, the “**methodology of planned change** which is consistent with **democratic ideology must elevate** informed and **experimental collective judgment** over unchecked **private judgment**” (Benne 314-315). The group will not only determine the individual’s beliefs but actually define and enforce his “rights” of private decisions as well. Those independent souls who refuse to go along with the group will/does get very large but subtle doses of Political Correctness until he/she conforms to the group’s *expectations*.

Again, training for participation in planned change must “emphasize the development of skills necessary for creating **common public judgments**” out of the “**conflict of private points of view**.” It must “develop persons who see **non-influenceability of private convictions**” as a “**vice rather than a virtue**.” (When this was written in 1951, moral people with deep-seated principles and *convictions*, whose word was their bond, was the norm in our society. It was a society where very few people locked their doors at bedtime. Today, people of conviction are ridiculed and ostracized as intolerant, racist, Victorian, narrow-minded, etc., and one goes out at night without a weapon at their own risk.) Moreover, groups and organizations need to be “trained” to “develop **standards of acceptance** of individual *differences* and *expectations*,” so that out of these differences “human resources” can be developed for “group and institutional improvement.”

Furthermore, groups and organizations “should be **helped to define and redefine those areas of life** in which **common values and standards are necessary**.” They also need help to “**define and redefine those areas of life**” where “efforts to **build common out of contrasting beliefs** and practices are required.” In the “same process,” areas of life in which “threats to the common **welfare**” are not involved, “**divergence in standard and belief**” is to be “tolerated” and even “supported” but as noted above, these areas must be “**well-defined**” by the Marxists (Benne 315). Again, individuals who **refuse to replace the Almighty God with the “new god”** will be ostracized and lose any chances he may have of climbing the career ladder as a result of remaining loyal to his Christian conscience.

In a totalitarian society, an independent mind set on liberty is always seen as a threat to the “common welfare” as the actions of Communist governments have proven throughout the past century. It is no accident that in the old Soviet Union the collective/group was facilitated by a Communist Party member and so it was the Communist Party via the facilitator who determined the group’s beliefs, standards, values and thus behavior as the situation demanded.

For the last five decades, this process has been applied in some form or other to areas of our universities, government, institutions, industries, and schools by way of health education, drug education, and sex education. But the 1990’s witnessed the wholesale restructuring of America into groups/collectives for every conceivable purpose and in every area of life—partnerships/groups/committees/task forces—to study everything from the economy to family life; co-operative groups in school classrooms; team teaching by teachers; economic

development committees; committees to run the schools; groups to formulate strategic and/or restructuring plans for various public/private institutions and organizations; town hall meetings where the masses “participate” in predetermined decisions. Work groups or teams are the essence of Total Quality Management on which the entire U. S. government and its institutions (including all public schools) have been restructured with international corporations leading the way. In fact, the facilitated group has become one of the 21st Century *norms* of America’s “new god” (more later). Worst of all, many churches have jumped on the TQM bandwagon through the so-called *Church Growth Movement*, with pastors filling their pews and running their churches by the counsel of the ungodly rather than the counsel of God. And this ungodly counsel in some form is sold to pastors by even the most conservative Christian publishing houses in America. “And what concord hath Christ with Belial? or what part hath he that believeth with an infidel?” (II Corinthians 6:15)

GROUP PROBLEM-SOLVING, DECISION-MAKING, and MARXIST PLANNING

The authors of Human Relations in Curriculum Change explain that the “**methodology of problem-solving**” is a “**methodology of practical deliberation.**” Therefore part of the “discipline” required for the change agent lies in the “**methodology of problem-solving,**” which allows one to see all the parts/steps/phases “in relationship to each other.” This because “*changes* to be made” are presented to groups as “*difficulties* to be overcome.” And to overcome them, the group “must first convert these difficulties (complaints/dissatisfactions generated by *surveys, interviews, etc.*) into specific **problems**” to be solved. Thus, a “**quest for the solution to the problem** as it has been defined” becomes a “**quest for a plan or program of change.**” (Benne 318-319) To think, a few *perceived* discomforts begins the process which results in America worshipping a “new god.” There is no job, position, appointment, profession, etc. that is perfect. In the best of all worlds, if you look hard enough you can always find something to complain about or be dissatisfied with. Marxist consciousness-raising is like constantly focusing one’s attention on a leaky faucet. Little do Americans know that the fix will not only destroy the faucet but the home as well.

In **group deliberation** we should always work toward **community persuasion**⁹ as the basis of action...In such phrases as “of one mind” and “common consent” our language has expressions for designating this **quality** of resolution... (332).

Democratic deliberation/dialogue is “argumentation,” a “method of social deliberation and control,” a **means** of “inducing people to work together” and “attaining and maintaining common action” that has been predetermined. It is the “study and discussion” of the normative issues involved in group decisions and thus “should be carried on with a view toward eventually **building a common persuasion** which all concerned accept and **which is**

⁹ defined, along with “community orientation” as a “communion of belief, feeling, purpose, and direction”

consistent with the basic **long-range** normative principles on which **we** profess to build...society.” Therefore, the “function” of deliberation and discussion is to resolve “**conflict and problems**” within the group. The “points of *conflict*” between “*competing perspectives*” constitute the “**difficulties**” to be “*overcome by the processes of deliberation.*” No “*conflict* is fully resolved until all have come, *through deliberation*, to accept the resolution (decision) **as their own.**” This because the decision must be **internalized** by the group member before he will commit himself to it.

This conflict concerns “**conflicting conceptions of what should be, conflicting standards of good or bad, conflicting value perspectives.**” **Common action** then “must involve the minds, and purposes of those engaged in it as well as their bodily efforts” (cognitive, affective, and psychomotor). Thus, “in a democratic culture the **ideal of deliberation** is to **rebuild character**¹⁰ **as well as overt behavior**” so the problem-solving/decision-making process should “be directed toward the **reconstruction of persuasions**”¹¹ as the basis of common action (Benne 296, 303-306, 340-342, 345).

The method in which the group facilitator must be skilled is one “**designed to build common agreement** concerning the *values we should* strive for” as well as “**common agreement** as to what ‘**facts**’ we can depend on in *building our policies and decisions...*” This “**methodology** must **guide** our deliberations to clarify values and to *find and interpret facts* in the same process.” (Benne 319) Those participating in inducing, guiding and controlling change must have a basic knowledge of human nature including, but not limited to, specific knowledge found in psychology, social psychology, sociology, and engineering. An example of the knowledge and the skills they must be trained in include:

1. The discipline of “understandings and skills required for **helping strategic work groups to form** and move effectively in **planning, executing, and evaluating** changes needed.” These groups are facilitated to *maturity* through the *four stages* involved in the “process of group development as **it changes from a collection of individuals to a social organism** capable of **common purposing, feeling, and thinking.**”

2. The discipline in “the diagnosis of the changes that are possible within the *social system*” of the school, industry, institution etc., as well as the “overlapping social systems” of the community.

In strategic planning, planners must have some way of “mapping and estimating the strength of all forces supporting and all forces resisting” the change (this includes the people who support the change and their importance/status and likewise those resisting the change). In light of this mapping, strategy “becomes a process of **planning steps** to increase supporting forces and to reduce resisting forces.” Frankfurt School’s Kurt Lewin developed his “force field analysis” to serve this function.

¹⁰ to “rebuild character” means to rebuild the individual’s basic “personality,” including but certainly not limited to “these three aspects of personality”: (1) “changes in the knowledge of those concerned,” (2) “changes in the philosophy, in value outlooks,” and (3) “changes in skill and technique” by which they operate (Benne 18).

¹¹ Persuasions include one’s “beliefs, feeling, purpose, and direction” (Benne 332).

3. The “discipline of skills for *converting* (group members’) *dissatisfactions* with *things as they are*” into an analysis of “*things as they might be*,” that is, “what should be done”/“what should I (we) do” with the *perception* that *what should be done* would afford “greater opportunities for **need satisfaction**” of all concerned.

The assumption here is that “All human behavior is directed toward the satisfaction of needs.” Therefore, the individual “behaves always in accordance with his perception of his own needs and of the possibilities for satisfying them in the environmental situation.” The individual “will change his established ways of behaving for one of two reasons: to gain increased need satisfaction or to avoid decreased need satisfaction.” Changes in his conduct for “either of these reasons are inevitably a consequence of the way he perceives the situation,” not as it really is. The expected increased or decreased need satisfaction may be “illusory” or the “individual may rationalize, delude himself, ignore or misinterpret facts” or whatever, but he “behaves always in accordance with his perception of his own needs and of the possibilities for satisfying them in the environmental situation. “

Satisfaction of these needs is “possible only through participation in group life by means of *roles* associated with positions in various social systems.” It is here that “he satisfies his biological needs as well as his need for security, for belongingness, for recognition, and for *response* from others.” To develop “competence in the performance of a role” is to “add that much to one’s security and recognition” within that system. So to “**accept group standards and attitudes**” within that social system is to “**gain that much belongingness to a group and response (praise and recognition, acceptance) from its members.**”

Consequently, if the desired “change in behavior” of the individual is “related closely to perceived opportunities for need-satisfaction” then the areas of his “dissatisfactions” would “offer strategic points for initiating changes.” In addition, “capitalizing upon dissatisfactions” is a promising way “of securing initial interest in deliberate social change,” although it’s not a “simple matter to make dissatisfactions function actively as a motivating force.” An “emotional receptivity” to change is closely related to the “extent and intensity” of dissatisfaction in the group. The problem is “converting a vague sense of discomfort and unrest into strong convictions that certain specific ills should be attacked” (leaky faucet). This may be accomplished in part by “**helping**” group members “arrive at a **common definition** of the situation (problem) through **analysis of conditions** and **making explicit the maladjustments involved.**” In the case of “apathetic” members, “much new information and many new experiences will be necessary if they are to become **actively dissatisfied.**” Dissatisfactions are to be used not only to “furnish initial motivation” but “utilized at all stages of the process to keep crystallization from setting in.”

4. The “**norms of democratic co-operation** furnish a part of the required discipline” as well (See “norms of democratic co-operation above) (Benne 10-11, 19-22, 44, 59, 61, 63, 67, 161, 318).

Three “Problems” To Be Solved In The Problem-Solving/Decision-Making Process:

While individuals within groups believe they are there for a variety of purposes, the problem to be solved as the Marxists see it, is to rid/wash the minds of individual group members of their existing beliefs, values and principles and create a “common mind” within the group that can be manipulated at will by the change agent. These “practical problems” are of three “major types:”

1. Situations in which the “general principles or deep-seated life norms” of the groups are “clear,” and the group has a “stable, common mind about what is desired or desirable.”

This group’s deep-seated beliefs are clear to the facilitator and therefore the problem is “relatively simple” to solve (Benne 321).

2. Situations in which “common principles or *norms* in the groups” are stable but have become “obscured by some disturbing conflict or controversy.”

The “task” of the change agent here is to “rediscover the basic character of the community, its common ideals, beliefs, and goals.” Once this has been done, it becomes relatively simple to solve as well. Although the beliefs of this group are initially obscured, it doesn’t take long to discover what their beliefs are nor the fact that they all hold the basically the same ones (Benne 321-322).

3. Situations in which there is a “**deep cleavage in orientation**” and “ideals, attitudes, and goals are in basic **conflict**.”

These Marxist falsely argue that the American people “have this kind of *problem* today (in 1951) more acutely than any other time in their history.” This problem is more “difficult and usually requires more time to solve” because the “need is for a **restructuring of the community itself**” which means the “**profound reshaping of characters**,” which means reshaping the basic “personalities” of the American people by way of the group. This because “we need community of understanding¹² and belief and purpose where such does not now exist...” (Benne 322). The Marxists’ real problem in 1951 was that the majority of the masses held similar basic traditional beliefs (belief in God, family, anti-Communist, America first, etc.) as opposed to the Marxist/Humanist beliefs then popular in academia and intellectual circles. And it was the traditional minds of individuals within academia, business, labor, industry, government, universities, etc., that they *originally* targeted for washing, paving the way to the masses.

These three problems are seen as different parts in a *spectrum*. At one end of the spectrum, group members have the same “identity of characters” and thus basically the same “outlook.” At the other end, there is “no **common ground** whatever.” Ultimately, “we should assume reconcilability” of “differences of character”_of everyone wherever we “find acceptance of life as a good” (Benne 322-323). Meaning that in any country where life itself is valued, they can remake the personalities of the people (via the process) so that they all have the same common mind, beliefs, facts, values, motivation, feelings, the exact same

¹² defined as “communion of beliefs, feelings, purposes, and direction” (Benne 332).

personality. In that day, they will all worship the “new god” alike. So further means to a discipline of brainwashing are: (1) “clearly define the kind of practical problem involved, that is, getting its location in the spectrum range” and (2) “**discovery of and provision for the interdependence of the different kinds of practical problems.**” In other words, find out the beliefs/position of individuals in order to organize/reorganize them into **groups made up of individuals with conflicting beliefs**. For these are “added places to *take hold of practical judgment*” and “do something toward its improvement.” These Marxists place their “hope for a *better world*” upon “how successfully people can (be facilitated to) find **common ground**” (Benne 323). This because they can then be manipulated in the direction of a Socialist/Communist/Atheistic society without any idea as to where they’re heading!

Decisions To Be Made In The Problem-Solving Process: The judgments/decisions of problem-solving groups or teams always involve a “settling of some *issue*” by “deliberately determining a *response* appropriate to that situation” and judgmental behavior is always grounded in some “process of inquiry or **deliberation**” and “issues as a *result of that process.*” Therefore, **judgments of practice** always require that the group “be in an unresolved situation, one which requires something be done, with that something not yet determined sufficiently to remove competing alternatives” and the “**choice among alternatives be worked out through the inquiry or deliberation of those choosing**” (Benne 326-327).

According to the authors, these “problems” to be solved are “practical problems” in that “*solutions*” must incorporate **judgments of value**, that is, “judgments of what *we ought to do*” as well as **judgments of fact** which means “judgments of effective *means to employ.*” **Judgments of value** are **personal decisions concerning** “*what we ought to do,*” that is, “**what should I (we) do.**” The “**philosophy**” or worldview of the individual, which determines “**whether or not one should,**” is involved in these decisions. **Judgments of fact** concerns the decisions of “effective means to employ,” that is, “limits and possibilities,” such as “what the *conditions* are.” (Lewin’s force field analysis is useful here.) These decisions concerns “**science,**” or the Scientific Method in that they “**can tell one how to.**”

The “interdependence” of the functions of both these judgments are “pervasive and subtle,” insist the authors. “We do not intend,” they explain, that **judgments of practice**¹³ “be isolated from the other functions in judgmental acts,” that is, from the Scientific Method. In fact, “**Scientific Method,**” they say, is a part of the “method by which **democratic judgments of practice should be made.**” On the other hand, these “**practical judgments**” or decisions are “generally *influenced by (an individual’s) existing ideals and principles.*” These principles in turn, are “*deeply embedded in characters (the conscience of individuals), in the moral structure of the community (as norms).*” And in a diverse group, these “**existing social-moral ideals and principles are inadequate or in conflict.**” All problem-solving therefore, involves “broad principles of social-moral action or general norms of *private and public conduct.*” Hence, they involve the “**characters (personalities) of the judges (group members) and of their communities**” (Benne 306, 319, 321, 327-328).

¹³ Practical judgment and Judgments of practice are used “synonymously” in Human Relations In Curriculum Change. Both imply not only “daily decision,” but those decisions dealing with “broad policies and general norms and principles of conduct” and “broad principles of social-moral action or general norms of **private** and public conduct.” (Benne 320, 321, 328)

Three “types” of decisions to be made in the Problem-Solving Process: Since “changes typically occur in a setting of dissatisfaction, confusion, and conflict with respect to the goals and the means of common effort,” the need for **practical judgment** arises when group members “are faced with the question of *what to do*” concerning the problem to be solved. They may be uncertain regarding what they “desire or approve, or what others desire or approve.” They may be uncertain about “what the resources and obstacles in the situation are, and about what can be done with them.” Practical judgment is the “resolution of one or all of these uncertainties” into a “plan of action” (Benne 294-295, 320).

There are “three interrelated types” of practical judgments/judgments of practice:

1. **Decisions:** “Whenever *what to do* in a particular state of affairs is concluded without explicit regard to the reconstruction of our guiding generalizations#¹⁴ concerning the control and management of similar affairs at other times and places, we shall call the judgment a **decision**.”

These decisions are concerned with *what should I do* in “everyday affairs” as well as “professional matters” and “**focus our attention** in judgment upon the **events at hand**.” In these instances of decision-making in which “no conscious use is made of principles of conduct as a basis of the decision,” the individual’s decision/behavior reflects the “general rules of conduct” (our society’s Christian norms stored in the conscience) which “**habitually**” guide that individual. In serious matters of decision, the “prudent person will *examine his judgment* in the light of the **general rule or rules it assumes**.” This examination, aided by the facilitator, is designed to make the individual *conscious* that his facts, beliefs, values, etc., are based on a higher authority and are not **his own**. Remember, higher authority is not allowed to aid the individual group member in his decisions. Remember also that to the “democratic planner dogmas (deep-seated beliefs from higher authority) are seen methodologically as intellectual attempts to save some privileged position from **open collective criticism and modification**.” The authors explain that it is these judgments of practice with which their book, Human Relations in Curriculum Change, is “primarily concerned.”

2. **Policy**—When institutions are “confronted directly with a great many different situations, each bearing some similarity to the others and yet differing enough one from another to require individual consideration,” the need arises for a “stabilizing plan” to maintain “consistency of action” from one case to the next.

The “establishment of a **policy** satisfies this need.” These policies are man-made “**rules and regulations**” that are made to guide the decision-making of individuals/groups in institutions. The “interdependent relation between policies and decisions” arises in institutional activities which have been brought under “regulation and control.” Policies, which “help to shape” individual decisions, should be made “in light of the broader social context and of an **ideal (Marxist) order of norms, rights,**

¹⁴ Practical or guiding generalizations are the “broad principles of social-moral or general **norms** of private and public conduct.” These norms/generalizations “make up the deep mental equipment of persons” and “function to determine their conduct” Practical generalizations are “referred to variously...as an ideal, a principle, a normative generalization.”

and duties” and not merely in terms of the “cases at hand and the institutional structures involved.” Existing policies in institutions “tend to remain unchanged” unless there arises an “occasion for a decision” that is an “exception to the established policy that requires its **reconstruction or abandonment.**” [In my view, the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU)¹⁵ has virtually destroyed the traditional norms of American institutions in this manner.]

3. The “**reconstruction of basic norms of conduct**”—which means the reconstruction of practical generalizations or individual group members “**principles** of social-**moral action** or general **norms** of **private** public conduct.” In other words, the destruction of the Christian conscience and its replacement with the super-ego.

Practical generalizations “make up the deep mental equipment (conscience) of persons” and “**function to determine their judgments.**” They “**can be forces for good or for ill and we can have something to say about which it shall be.**” Thus, this third type of **judgments of practice** “has to do with situations that require the reconstruction or formulation of general rules of conduct or *norms*.” These “**norms** include the deep-lying general notions that make up the intellectualized **value elements** of a **group** culture and of the **personality structures** of those who have grown to maturity in that culture. As *objects of judgment*, they are the **moral principles and ideals** which *issue from situations requiring* the construction or **reconstruction** of such general rules of conduct.” These situations are “occasioned by difficulties encountered in the search for more adequate decisions or policies,” **that** is, they are occasioned by and issue from deliberation/conflict in problem-solving groups/teams. It is these situations that provide the opportunity to “examine and reconstruct” America’s traditional norms.

Such, for example, as the norms that “lie behind” the “**meaning of democracy.**” A *reconstructed/redefined* “notion of **democracy**”¹⁶ could be “*employed* to guide activities of the home, the **church**, and the school as well as those of economic and political institutions. **Democratic norms** and ideas have a *history* and, at least for the minds and persons of their proponents (transformational Marxists), a *future.*” Moreover, existing traditional norms as “objects of judgment” (targets of Critical Theory) are often “**objects of intellectual reconstruction** in their own right, even though the *occasion* for attention to them arises out of the demands of some *situation* for their **clarification and reconstruction...**” (Benne 313, 320-321, 325-326, 327, 328-332).

¹⁵ Harvard Law school professor, **Felix Frankfurter**, a “paid political lobbyist and lieutenant” of Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandies, was a member and “advisor” of the ACLU, as well as a member and “counsel” to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP). He officially dropped his “memberships” in these organizations when he was appointed to the Court in 1939 but not his activism in transforming America (Murphy 10, 188, 249)

Read also Between the Norm and the Exception: The Frankfurt School and the Rule of Law by William E Scheuerman, The MIT Press, 1994.

¹⁶ When this redefined meaning of democracy is applied to the home, the parents forfeit their authority over their children. When applied to the church, the church loses its authority. When applied to the school, the teachers, administrators lose their authority. When applied to the workplace, the boss loses his authority or “status.” When this redefined meaning of democracy becomes a norm, the existing government, for all practical purposes, loses its authority.

These three types of judgment are “inter-dependent” and “interact upon one another.” The “soundness of anyone of them *depends* upon the soundness of the others,” and this is “one way definitely to *take hold of practical judgments* to improve them,” a “point in the discipline we seek.” Consequently, the “function of **practical intelligence**” is the “**making, or remaking, of all these forms of judgment.**” In fact, “all the elements” of a discipline of practical intelligence is “**rightly a discipline of human characters,**” because they are “points at which to develop characters” (remake personalities) and this means “making them into...characters aimed directly and effectively toward an **improved human community**” (Benne 321,326) .

...From the standpoint of General Systems Theory¹⁷ ...we can consider the group itself as a kind of “super-organism” that should be subject to social pressures to conform to the standards set by other groups or organizations. Groups should also show many of the same sorts of internal processes as do individuals. Not unexpectedly, most of the factors that influence individual conformity and **internal conflict** have their direct parallels when we study the behavior of groups as groups. (McConnell 723)

Three “Phases” in the Decision-Making Process: There are “three phases” in a “complete act” of practical judgment. In practice, these “processes do not go on separately or in any regular chronological order.” Rather, they “interact with one another, in mutual correction, as the total judgment (of the group) shapes up in a **common course of action and a common acceptance of the actions as possible, necessary, desirable, and efficient.**” To recognize these phases and their characteristics and “to be able to deal with them” improves **practical intelligence** and helps toward “making practical judgments produce better *outcomes.*” These phases are:

1. The “formulation of a **purpose**” or “**goal,**” that is, a “**desired end**” or “state of affairs” (*What ought to be*). Sound familiar?

This phase necessitates the “**fusion and interpenetration of outlooks**” of group members. It is through their *active participation* in forming a purpose or goal that the personalities and beliefs of each individual group member are revealed. This because their beliefs and personalities “both in their conflict and in their agreement, are **defined** by the ideal purposes and goals with which they are identified.” Goals define their “characters” and purposes define their “values.” So each must be “encouraged to project **publicly**” the *desired end* “which their *present* characters demand.” Otherwise, the “value perspectives and the characters” of individual group members “will remain **subjective, unreasonable, and unconstructed sources of dissent and non-cooperation...to the degree to which they are not brought out in the open, objectified, discussed, reconstructed, and made common...in the process of deliberation.” It is here that a “**common character** is built” through “**inter-persuasion**” via **Cognitive Dissonance**.**

Once individual group members are facilitated into an “*organism,*” that is, where

¹⁷ General Systems Theory is the philosophy of TQM, according to Deming.

the group itself thinks, feels, believes, behaves, etc. so alike that it is considered *one personality and one mind*, they are then treated psychologically as one *individual* which is far easier to control and manipulate than the original mass.

If this first phase of **deliberation** is “short-circuited or neglected,” a “reactionary swing” against the predetermined *what ought to be* may result. This because group members “do not find **identification** with common **long-range** goals” until their “aspirations” have been “stimulated and **revised**” by active emotional “**participation**” in the process. The “**imagination, the hearts**, (emotions) of people *must be stirred* to an **acceptance** of a plan or policy” if that plan is to “serve as a **guide for reorganizing** activity.”

In a problem-solving/planning situation, the *unwashed* group will probably accept “established priorities” or “available funds” as “setting limits” on *what ought to be*,” so it is “important to be on guard against letting a narrow, **short-range** view of the situation set false limits on the possibilities.” Also, the “**necessities**” in a problem-solving group are the “goals” that group members “come in deliberation to be so deeply committed to, so set on,” that their inclusion in the plan is “necessary” to obtain their support and co-cooperation. The “imperatives of a group which set the necessities” are not “external” but internal. They are set by “value identifications in the characters of members,” in their “normative outlook,” in “their commitments as to what *oughts* are imperative for them. The point here is that **necessities must undergo the challenge of competing desires before being too early accounted necessities. Necessities can be changed, in fact must be changed...The deliberation and study** through which these *conflicting* imperatives are resolved is a *searching process...the deliberative process* by which such **changes are made**. For the present...we wish to point out, in general, that the conception of what is necessary in this sense must be settled **after, not before, being disciplined by the other phases of the judgmental process.**” Moreover, decisions must include “what goals it is *desirable to pursue*.” Here, “additional surveys, revealing (hand-picked) *factual conditions* not before taken into account, must be allowed to have **their full effect upon desires that have already been formed**. We have seen...that judgments of *what is necessary* may be **altered** also during **deliberation as conflicting values are resolved** and as a wider range of *desirable* possibilities is explored. This same observation is true also of...judgments of what is *desirable*.”

2. The “description of *existing* conditions (*What is*)—getting *the facts*, defining relationships, noting possibilities.” The “tools (Lewin’s force field analysis) for analyzing social situations for their change possibilities” helps the change agent in “guiding” cooperative efforts “to see, to define, and to solve *implicit* problems.”

One of the “most difficult problems of modern (Marxist) **planning**” is to “**bridge the gap**” between existing conditions or “what is” and “what ought to be.” The primary job of the facilitator in this phase is to “**convince**” the group that the “**definition** of *what existing conditions* are relevant to a problem **depends** very closely upon notions of **what** the basic objectives **should be**.” So “**common judgments** concerning the **interpretation** of even the most accurate factual surveys of relevant, **existing conditions depends** upon **common judgments** concerning

what...should be.” And *what should be* “serves to select the matters of *fact* to be inquired into,” and the definition or “statement” of the problem is “subject to the results of the strict inquiry which is thus set under way.”

In fact-finding, the change agent can manipulate the group into “complete acceptance of previously rejected facts...through the **discovery of these facts by the group members themselves...Then, and frequently only then, do the facts become really *their* facts...**” (internalized thus resulting in **commitment**). An individual “will believe facts he himself has discovered...It can be surmised that the extent to which social research is translated into social action depends on the degree to which those who carry out this action are a part of the *fact-finding* on which the action is based” (Benne 32-33, 319).

3. The “formation of a **plan of action**”—steps to “transform *existing* conditions into conditions that are desired.” (to transform *what is* into *what ought to be*) This phase involves the “**fusion** of *fact* and desire, of present and future, of existing means and projected ends.” The group, having been helped to assess the “deficiencies, and limitations” of existing conditions and practices and *adjusted their beliefs* of *what ought to be* in light of these hand-picked facts of the facilitators, now must “in the context of all this, forge out the program of action” through which to move “toward the desirable *state of affairs*” that the facilitators have “envisioned.” If this phase is “properly conducted” by the facilitator, “it will have suffused, motivated, and influenced...all that is in the first and second phases” (Benne 324-325, 345-352).

But “**there is another step which adds much to the control we are after**—that is, the recognition and **provision for the interpenetration of these phases.**” All three phases of practical judgment are involved in the *exercise* of each phase and the “surest *directives for each* come through conscientious attention to its connections with the others.” Judgment is “whole” and these phases “are only important parts of it *where we can see and do something about making the whole go better.*” The “**general criterion of good judgment** - that is - **common acceptance and consent** - works through each of the three phases.” It is “operating” when group members “come together on the *facts*” and “dramatized” when “*differing points of view and conflicting interests and purposes move with their mutual tensions toward a fusion of goal and into a concerted plan of action.*” Community, that is, “communion of beliefs, feelings, purpose, and direction” is a “**necessity of man.**” Recognition of these three phases of practical judgment and “attention to their mutual dependence” can “convert our reckoning with this necessity” into a “passion” (Benne 324-325, 332).

Moreover, “**verbal symbols**¹⁸·people use can be helpful or harmful to good judgment, depending on how they come to have their meaning, and how *adjustable these meanings are* when confronted with the **requirements**” of a “problem” (remember former President Clinton’s allusion to the definition of “is”?) Thus, “our possession and *use of words* can be healthy or it can be pathological” when it concerns “what makes **good practical judgments**” (Benne 325-326).

¹⁸ Verbal symbols or words are symbols connected through associations to ideas implanted in the mind.

The authors ask the question: “How do we tell whether a decision or policy or general principle is a good or poor one?” They answer: “**Common consent and acceptance, active and uncoerced, is our surest test.**” In other words, if the facilitated group reaches *consensus on a predetermined solution*, and all group members actively participated and internalized the decision accepting it as their own, and even those who strongly disagreed were neutralized and accepted the decision, then the decision “is a good one” (Benne 323-324). By this logic, the group of terrorists, facilitated by Osama bin Laden, who bombed the World Trade Center, made a *good* decision when they conspired to do so.

The authors explain: “It is **not accidental** that the **ideal of democracy** and the overall criterion of **good practical judgment** tend to become **one and the same.**” This because “man can learn what is *good* from his experience” and he is “most *tolerant* when he stakes his quest for human good” upon the “capacity of people to say when *decisions* and *policies* and *general principles* are good and when they are not good.” With all **higher authority out of the way**, this “**leaves the way open**” for the “**common uncoerced persuasion**” of the group, which is the only “inclusive **criterion** of good **practical intelligence.**” In fact, “this inclusive criterion of good practical intelligence can **transfigure virtually every step in the making of decisions and choices in private and public life**” of group members. This, the authors stress, “illuminates and directs the whole field of *practical considerations and findings*” (Benne 324).

Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives. (James Madison [source unknown])

So you see, victims of the group are deceived into believing that it’s their *own* decisions to which they commit and thus help implement, when the reality is that **it is predetermined decisions for which problem-solving elicits “common consent and acceptance” as well as common action from the group.** More important, little do they realize that their faith and personal identity was sacrificed to the “new god” so that they would become habituated, like Pavlovian dogs, to doing the bidding of their masters. The ideal situation for a master is for his obedient slaves to love their slavery.

RE-EDUCATION—THE PROCESS OF BRAINWASHING

...Of course lots ordinary people engage in unethical, manipulative behavior. The difference with cult leaders is that they use powerful (Pavlovian) behavior-modification techniques to reshape recruits’ thinking, sense of identity and value systems.

An effective cult operates much like the “**re-education** camps in **totalitarian countries**, attacking the recruits’ sense of self (identity) so that he can be manipulated for the leader’s purposes. The techniques used to control members include...orchestration of intense emotional experiences, role playing...induction of feelings of guilt or fear, redefinition of certain words or introduction of new words into a recruits’ vocabulary, public confession sessions, use of punishment and reward

and the induction of altered states of consciousness or dissociate states, often through hypnosis (today's stress reduction techniques). Not only is the new recruit bombarded with all these techniques, but older cult members are often especially nice to him...

When disguised...these techniques will work on almost anyone who is not forewarned about the dangers. Over time, the result of an effective "thought reform" program is a diminished capacity by the recruit to assimilate and critically analyze information. The recruits' personal aspirations, view of past experiences and **religious and political beliefs** can be changed as well.

...the average American has to realize just how vulnerable he is to influence techniques, and start insisting that the next generation be taught how to recognize the warning signs of cult methods. (Kisser) [emphasis added]

Now to review the brainwashing/dialectical process. Since life is not perfect nor is human nature, there is and always have been complaints and dissatisfactions with day to day life itself, with our schools, with government institutions, with workplaces, with management/labor relations, businesses/industries, race relations, etc. Marxists are well aware of these ups and downs in life and have always capitalized on them in order to create conflict in whichever country they target by *raising the consciousness* of those concerned about these "dissatisfactions." In institutions, organizations, industries, etc., carefully prepared surveys and/or interviews are means to reveal areas where dissatisfactions might exist. After a little propaganda, these minor areas of complaint, like the leaky faucet, becomes major problems that must be solved. And to solve them in accord with the Marxist plan, all *stakeholders* (individuals concerned who may either openly oppose or support a specific change effort such as opinion leaders, community leaders, status figures, power brokers, etc., in government, in the workplace, in the local community, in the school system, in the labor unions, in the particular agency or institution targeted) must be involved in the problem and its solution.

The reader is surely aware by now that traditional problem-solving has nothing to do with the dialectical problem-solving/Marxist planning discussed in this paper. Compromise is often the traditional method used in solving problems when diverse interests are involved. But to the brainwashers, "Compromise is not the democratic ideal of method" because it "**leaves the minds, the outlooks, and the perspectives of the conflicting groups unreconstructed** or at best partially changed," which means that the Planners are unable to control/determine the outcome (Benne 299).

As noted earlier, the re-education of an individual has three tasks to accomplish if it is to eliminate his existing conscience. First, it must change the individual's **cognitive structure**. This includes his *perception* of his physical and social environment because it is perception which guides behavior. At the same time, his perception is guided by his world view, all his facts (an individual's facts consist of what he believes to be true which includes his belief in God and his Word), his ideas, his beliefs and values. Secondly, it must change or alter his likes and dislikes and the values he lives by. It must change his **feelings** about higher authority, including his (*emotional*) reactions toward all *sources* of higher authority (God, pastor, boss, existing government/laws) of whom he formerly behaved in such a way so as to gain their approval and avoid their disapproval. And thirdly, re-education affects the individual's **motoric action** in that the formerly rugged individualist must become the

habitual consensus seeker. Moreover, his behavior and habits that formerly were guided and controlled by his conscience must be guided and controlled by the group super-ego (Benne 24).

Therefore, an individual who has been successfully brainwashed must have (1) “a change in action-ideology” which consists of the “frequently **non-conscious system of values which guides conduct.**” The Christian norms, rules, absolutes, “thou shalt not’s” stored in his **conscience must be replaced by the “new god” and group super-ego;** (2) “a real acceptance of a changed set of **facts** and values.” This means that “new facts and values,” that is the “new god” has been accepted “not merely verbally” but “as an action-ideology” or as his/her new guiding conscience/super-ego; (3) “a change in the perceived social world.” In “any situation we cannot help but act according to the field we perceive” and our perception is determined by our “**facts**” in our conscience and our facts determine our “**values.**” Since behavior or “action is ruled by perception,” only a changed action-ideology, changed from a godly conscience to the group super-ego, can produce changed perception which guides behavior (Benne 28).

Consequently, a “change in action-ideology, a real acceptance of a changed set of facts and values, a change in the perceived social world—**all three are but different expressions of the same process.**” By some, “this **process** may be called a change in the culture of the individual; by others, **a change of his super-ego.**” Whatever these godless Marxists choose to call it, this process consists of replacing the conscience with what they call a “new super-ego” based on the Marxist norms of the group/change agent. Henceforth, the individual is guided by group facts, beliefs, and values that in turn, are inculcated by the change agent/facilitator. Lewin warns: “It is important to note that re-education will be successful, i.e., lead to **permanent change, only if this change in culture is sufficiently complete.**” Otherwise, the individual becomes a “marginal man,” that is, he is lacking the guiding force of the “old god” but neither is he guided by the new (Benne 29).

The “*manner* in which the **new super-ego** is introduced” has a “very important bearing on the success or failure of the re-educative process.” Of course, the “simplest” way is the “enforcement of the **new set of values and beliefs**” but when this is done “**a new god** is introduced who **has to fight with the old god, now regarded as a devil.**” Therefore “an individual who is made a subject of re-education against his will” is “likely to meet the **new set of values** with hostility.” And the “greater the loyalty of the individual” to the **old god** and the “less self-centered” he/she is, the more “pronounced” will be their hostility, so they “can be expected to offer stronger resistance to re-education, for the very reason that they are more firmly anchored in the old system” (Benne 29).

[Frankfurt school’s Max] Horkheimer’s conception of socialism implies a **collectively controlled society** which would provide the condition for the possibility for unfolding all individual...**differences.** In 1940 he made clear that in his view the **theoretical** conception which, following its first trailblazers (Lenin’s Russia), will show the new society its way - the system of workers’ councils¹⁹ - grows out of *praxis*...He envisioned a society based on the socialization of the means of production, planned management and, importantly, the participation of all...

¹⁹ soviets or committees.

[Says Horkheimer] Contemporary reflection in the service of a **transformed** society should not disregard the fact that in a **classless democracy plans cannot be forced on others through power or through routine, but must be arrived at through free agreement.** (Held 46)

Since “**re-education aims to change the system of values and beliefs of an individual or a group...it seems illogical to expect that this change will be made by the subjects themselves. The fact that this change has to be enforced on the individual from outside seems so obvious a necessity that it is often taken for granted.**” If “**re-education means the establishment of a new super-ego**” then this objective “will not be reached so long as the new set of values is not experienced by the individual as something freely chosen.” For instance, if the “individual complies merely from fear of punishment” rather than “dictates of his free will and **conscience**,” then the “new set of values he is expected to accept does not assume in him the position of **super-ego**, and his re-education therefore remains unrealized” (Benne 30).

Following one’s **conscience** is identical with following the perceived *intrinsic* requirements of the situation. Only *if* and when the **new set of values** is freely accepted and only if it corresponds with one’s **super-ego**,” does changes in perception occur which are “a prerequisite for a change in conduct and therefore for a lasting effect of re-education.” And when re-education only reaches the “level of verbal expression” and not “conduct” itself, it may result in “heightening the discrepancy between the (new group) super-ego (the way I ought to feel) and the ego (the way I really *feel*) (which is still guided by the old conscience) and leads to a state of high emotional tension” (cognitive dissonance/guilt) and thus “gives the individual a bad conscience,” but not “correct conduct” (Benne 28, 30).

How then can “free acceptance” of a new god be brought about when individuals are “hostile to the new” and “loyal to the old?” By the creation of groups! In order to avoid this hostility a “deception and smokescreen” must be used. The individual must be manipulated into a controlled group environment especially created to *force him to decide within himself* to accept this new god. This calls for “the creation, as part of the re-educative process, of an atmosphere of (perceived) freedom and spontaneity.” This atmosphere of “informality and freedom of choice” where “voicing grievances” and “emotional security” are norms suggests to many people that the re-educator is “clever enough in manipulating the subjects to have them think that they are **running the show**.” And so it is with TQM.

Marxists know that it’s virtually impossible to change the beliefs and convictions of single individuals and/or change their “convictions item by item.” When this is attempted, in “arguments” with the individual on any particular issue, he/she “will find some way...to retain his beliefs” and “no change of conviction” can be established. His conscience won’t allow it. Naturally, when someone deliberately attempts to replace an individual’s life-long convictions and cherished beliefs with their own alien beliefs, they are met with hostility. Therefore, “Step-by-step methods are very important in re-education.” Individuals don’t change, but put him/her into a diverse group where they are manipulated into trusting and believing that “we’re all alike,” where they feel acceptance and belongingness, where their needs are satisfied, and they will change their facts, beliefs, and values as the facilitated group itself changes. So they must be put into a diverse group where they find acceptance and belongingness. Here, the individual’s entire value system and worldview shifts as the

facilitated group as a whole shifts their beliefs.²⁰ These steps must be “conceived as steps in a gradual change” of the individual, a “change from hostility to **open-mindedness** and to friendliness to the **new culture** as a whole.” Need I point out that over the past half century the norms of the group have so pervaded or actually replaced our traditional Christian norms that “open-mindedness” (without absolutes, principles, Christian convictions, etc.) today is not only expected but demanded of citizens extending even to the church.

Consequently, “one of the outstanding means used today for bringing about **acceptance** in re-education,” explain the authors, “is the establishment of what is called an **in-group**, i.e., a group in which *members feel* belongingness.” This “feeling of group belongingness seems to be greatly heightened if the members feel free to express openly the very sentiments which are to be dislodged through re-education.” Re-education “influences conduct only when the *new system* of values and beliefs dominates the individual’s *perception*. Therefore the acceptance of the new system is linked with the **acceptance of a specific group, a particular role, a definite source of authority (super-ego) as new points of reference.**” It is “basic for re-education” that this linkage be “very intimate” because it can be made “a powerful means for successful re-education.” As noted elsewhere, intimacy/group belongingness/wholeness with a specific group is *the* key to the group member’s acceptance of the “new god.” In short, the basic tools used by Marxist facilitators for initiating and controlling changes include:

1. “**Theory** of social engineering”—which “provides conceptual tools (including Lewin’s force field analysis) for diagnosing the possibilities for change, for locating the forces which support it, and for devising change procedures for those who oppose it.” (Benne 12-15)
2. “**Understanding of the group process**”—including “leadership and membership skills and of how these are used to **induce** and stabilize the **restructuring of a social system** such as the school,” and “**Social-psychological understandings**”—in order “to be effective in **re-educating** the persons and groups involved in the change.” To have all this knowledge and these skills is to have “control of the tools and **process**” for inducing and directing change. To ensure that democratic (Marxist) values will be “recognized and honored in the functioning of the group process and the changes which it produces,” leadership will need an additional tool—the “**change agent.**” (Benne 12-15)
3. “**Change agent**”—trained individuals “who have a method of social engineering whose operating procedures incorporate both democratic (Marxist) ideas and values and the knowledge and skills relevant to initiating and controlling the change process.” There is also a “fourth kind of equipment needed as part of the discipline for democratic change agents”—“**problem-solving method.**” (Benne 12-15)

²⁰ A reading in a Social Psychology text will explain the universal characteristics of groups and thus will enable the reader to understand the all important emphasis that Marxists place on the group, because without it, there could be no brainwashing.

4. **“Problem-solving Method”**—In a highly industrialized society, the “**conditions** under which group life must be lived are **constantly changing**.” As “situations change,” the naturally and voluntarily “established relationships for cooperative activity” within the traditional groups in the various social systems of the wider community “are no longer an adequate way for dealing with these *situations*...” These groups then must “reinterpret the implications of (their) basic attitudes and values in the context of the *new situation*” as well as “restructure the human relationships” by which they operate. Therefore they need “a **problem-solving method**.” But when the “problem involves changing human relationships, the *method* must include the **scientific method** and something more. For it must also be *grounded in* the disciplines we already mentioned: the social-psychological understandings, the dynamics of the group process, and the democratic ethic.” (Benne 12-15)

For “only a *method* of this scope” can effectively deal with “changing human relations” for it “must consider not only *what is* and *what can be* but also, *what ought to be*.” Of course, only these would-be dictators know what *ought to be*. Indeed, a “problem-solving method of such breadth is necessary” to give change agents the “criteria for locating and defining needed changes, for planning the means to execute them, for weighing the adequacy of proposed solutions, and for evaluating the consequences after *acting* upon these proposals.” It is the change agent/facilitator, often posed as participant, as consultant, as leader, as management, and even as ‘one of us’/‘*one of the good ole boys*’—**who is really “running the show”** (Benne 12-15).

Fred Emery, member of the Hegelian Tavistock Institute in London (the sister organization of the National Training Laboratories and the first to apply this process to the workplace), wrote in 1997:

...Forty years ago social scientists emerged from the Depression...with a very clear **agenda** for their future. Human affairs had slipped out of human control and a powerful, influential body of social scientists were determined that such would never happen again if social science could prevent it...

...If anything comes close to being a **manifesto defining that agenda** it is **Kurt Lewin’s** posthumous paper (1947), Frontiers in Group Dynamics.²¹ His title directs us to the key to the euphoria of the 1940s. There was the belief that the social sciences had at last gotten a firm, though incomplete, knowledge of the dynamics of **small groups** and possessed ways of **putting that knowledge into practice**. This created a bridge between psychology and psychiatry, as sciences of individual behavior, and sociology and anthropology. It was the basis for the social sciences to working democratic (socialistic/communistic) ways with groups, organizations and communities to create conditions conducive to individual mental health and personal growth, while providing positive **feedback** for the **quality of group life**. For those who believed that science should serve human ends this was a revolutionary improvement on the psychoanalytical couch and **promised to be less bloody than**

²¹ Human Relations and Curriculum Change contains the essence of Lewin’s Frontiers in Group Dynamics, and that is, how to apply this brainwashing process.

revolutionary confrontation.

Lewin was speaking for many of his contemporaries when he wrote in his paper, "This development indeed may prove to be as **revolutionary** as the atomic bomb." (Trist, Emery, & Murray 678-679)

One could honestly say that the blood that has been shed for our freedom during the various wars has been for naught. As our brave men fight even now, they are fighting for an America that no longer exists. Our worst enemy lies within. These termites have eaten away the foundation of our nation unawares. Today, America is almost ready to succumb to the planned New World Socialist Order where real freedom will be a thing of the past, and the masses will love it so. Remember, Hitler came to power by legal means using this very process. But the ultimate crime here, from a Christian's point of view, is not the loss of freedom, it is the millions of eternal souls that are being sacrificed for this new tower of Babel and its "new god." For if they control your environment, they control your experiences. If they control your experiences, they determine your conscience. If they determine your conscience, they control your mind. If they control your mind, they control your *soul*...And that's what it's all about!

And fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell. (Holy Bible, Matthew 10:28)

WORKS CITED

- Allport, Gordon and Gertrud Weiss Lewin, editors. Lewin's Papers on Group Dynamics. Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1948.
- Benne, Kenneth D. and Bozidar Muntyan, editors. Human Relations in Curriculum Change. Dreyden Press, 1951.
- Benne, Kenneth D., Leland P. Bradford, Jack R. Gibb, and Ronald O. Lippitt, editors. The Laboratory Method of Changing and Learning: Theory and Application. Science and Behavior Books, Inc., 1975.
- Bennis, Warren, Kenneth Benne, Robert Chin, and Kenneth Corey (editors). The Planning of Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961, Third Edition 1976.
- Bonner, Stephen Eric. Of Critical Theory And Its Theorists. Blackwell Publishing, Oxford UK & Cambridge USA, 1994.
- Forsyth, Donelson R. Social Psychology. Virginia Commonwealth University, 1987.
- Hammond, Guyton B. Conscience And Its Recovery: From the Frankfurt School to Feminism. University Press of Virginia, 1993.
- Held, David. Introduction to Critical Theory: Horkheimer to Habermas. University of California Press, 1980.
- Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research. 1923-1950. Little, Brown and Company, 1973.
- Kisser, Cynthia. "The Road to Heaven's Gate," Wall Street Journal. April 1, 1997. Kleiner, Art. The Age of Heretics. Currency/Doubleday, 1996.
- McConnell, James V. Understanding Human Behavior. University of Michigan; Holt Rinehart, and Winston, 1980.
- Miles, Matthew B. Learning To Work In Groups: A Program Guide For Educational Leaders. Teachers College Press, 1959, 1971 Edition.
- Murphy, Bruce Allen. The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection: The Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices. Anchor Press/Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1983.
- Phi Delta Kappan. January 1993.
- Richardson, George P. Feedback Thought in Social Science and Systems Theory. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

- Robbins, Stephen. Organizational Behavior. Concordia University, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1979.
- Rogers, Carl. Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups. Harrow Books, Harper and Row, Publishers, 1970.
- Schein, Edgar. "Management Development, Human Relations Training, and the Process of Influence," in Issues In Training. National Training Laboratories/National Education Association, 1962.
- Taylor, George (editor). Lectures on Ideology and Utopia (a series of lectures first delivered at the University of Chicago) in 1975 by Paul Ricoeur), Columbia University Press, 1986.
- Trist, Eric and Hugh Murray, editors. The Social Engagement of Social Science. Vol. 1. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1990.
- Trist, Eric, Fred Emery, and Hugh Murray, editors. The Social Engagement of Social Science: A Tavistock Anthology. Vol. III. University of Pennsylvania Press, 1997.
- Weiner, Norbert. The Human Use of Human Beings: Cybernetics and Society. Doubleday Anchor Books, 1950, 1954 Edition.