

Cultural Communism

The Vivisection of America

The Communists Lost the Cold War—But They're Winning the Culture War.  
Now It's Time to Expose Them and Fight Back!

<http://www.americanfreepress.net/>

# Communism Isn't Dead, It's Just Been Renamed

The only way to describe what's happening to us is to understand the nihilistic movement named Cultural Communism.

By F.C. Blahut

The rise of political correctness has coincided with the fall of Western cultural norms. Few recognize the connection between the two trends. The connection is called Cultural Communism.

What we here in the United States and in Christian Europe are actually witnessing is the planned destruction of Western civilization. It is no accident.

In 1917, when the Bolsheviks came to power in Russia, their attack was economic and political. Only after they had seized power did they turn to destroying the Christian-based culture of the West.

With the political correctness movement we see the reverse—an attack on the Christian culture so that the communists can take over. And cultural bolshevism is winning while Christian leaders wring their hands.

In a recent speech to a meeting of the World Council of Churches, Anglican Archbishop Dr. George Carey of Canterbury said: “For much of this century, the Western church, especially in Europe, has accepted decline as the inevitable result of secularism.”

True; but he failed to identify the driving force behind the slide. Nature abhors a vacuum. When one culture dies, it is replaced by another until nothing is left of

the former. And when Western Christian culture is destroyed, it will be replaced by chaos, anarchy and violence as a norm. All this without any casualties on the side of the conspirators.

Cultural Communism encompasses all of the modernist changes that have invaded America including—but not limited to—multiculturalism, feminism, racial and gender quotas, school busing based on race and so forth.

How far we have sunk into the morass of this Cultural Communism in less than 50 years is easily identifiable—and frightening.

As essayist William S. Lind says: “If a man from America of the 1950s were suddenly introduced into America in the 1990s, he would hardly recognize it as the same country. He would be in immediate danger of getting mugged, carjacked or worse, because he would not have learned to live in constant fear.”

Again, this is not by accident. Every step in the decline of Western culture has been planned for years. It started in Germany in the early years of this century. Germany was the original target of the communists. When Hitler took over, they came here.

What started as an ideological plan was institutionalized at the Frankfurt School. Goals were set, designs implemented and the move—seen by the plotters as inevitable once it got started—toward Cultural Communism began.

One of the main targets of Cultural Communism is Christianity. Some leaders, such as the archbishop of Canterbury quoted above, witness the decline as a natural force. They unwittingly help the communists. Others see the planned destruction without specifically identifying the enemy or suggesting practical ways of resisting.

For instance, in a letter to The Washington Post (Dec. 13, 1998), Rev. Stanley W. De Boe, director of the Center for Jewish and Christian Values in Washington, quotes Jack Shaheen, CBS News' Middle East consultant, “Almost all Hollywood

stories about Arabs are about bad ones.”

Then he makes the salient point: “Just as troubling is the problem of religious stereotyping in films. Substitute the word ‘Christian’ in the sentence above, and it’s just as valid.”

Right. Hollywood, the self-proclaimed setter of cultural standards and norms, sees Christianity as the enemy. Boe’s further comments are apropos:

Post reporter Sharon Waxman missed an opportunity to address the issue in her Nov. 6 front page article about protests over [the movie] *The Siege*, when she asked readers to imagine Hollywood producing a movie with “. . . a nefarious rabbi . . .” Such movies “would certainly spark an outcry,” she conceded, but “would Hollywood choose to portray them in the first place?”

Of course not. He says, correctly:

Most characters with strong religious beliefs tend to be lampooned, demonized or exposed as hypocrites. Heroes, on the other hand, often have no religious convictions. The message, whether intentional or not [emphasis ours], is that traditional religious beliefs should be considered dangerous.

And there is a key part of the problem—the inability of leaders to admit that these incessant attacks on our culture are part of a plan—a conspiracy.

## **MEA CULPA**

The Frankfurt School, mentioned above, moved to the United States in the 1930s when the National Socialists threw them out. It moved back to Germany after World War II to help subjugate the defeated nation culturally. Its success in convincing Germans that their very culture is evil and must be replaced while they sit in sackcloth and ashes, endlessly crying “mea culpa,” is evidenced most clearly in the “anti-hate” laws of that benighted country.

German culture has been seriously damaged, even as the younger generation questions the doctrine of “eternal guilt.” Will American culture be next?

Lind says:

[Cultural communism's] political correctness looms over American society like a colossus. It has taken over both political parties . . . and is enforced by many laws and government regulations. It almost totally controls the most powerful element in our culture, the entertainment industry. It dominates both public and higher education . . . It has even captured the higher clergy in many Christian churches. Anyone in the Establishment who departs from its dictates swiftly ceases to be a member of the Establishment.

The hour grows late. We must identify the enemy and fight him, even when that means punishment by the powers-that-be. We must call this attack what it is—a deliberate effort to destroy all that made us the most powerful country in the world in order to turn us into the field workers of the coming Global Plantation.

## The Significance of Cultural Communism

The real meaning of Cultural Communism is much more than a doctrine or a methodology to subvert a society. It is the antithesis of human life itself on this planet. Should the artificial and wholly unnatural tenets of Cultural Communism triumph, the human race would be so vitiated that it could no longer cope with the normal challenges that have faced humanity since the beginning.

Marxists believe that every cultural group, no matter what race, is riddled with faults. Nonetheless, each and every cultural group is the result of uncounted eons of development during which it has weathered every conceivable challenge to its survival. If it has been unable to do so, it has ceased to exist as a cultural group.

The historical path to its present status of each cultural group has with out exception resulted in achievements in art, religion, philosophy, morals, physical comfort etc. which are indigenous and autochthonous and therefore unique among all other cultures.

For instance, the artistic products of the Aryan races have been produced by creative geniuses such as Shakespeare, Goethe, Rembrandt, Michel Angelo, Tchaikowski and many thousands of others. In the field of science there have been Copernicus, Watt, Guglielmo Marconi, the Wright Brothers and William Shockley, to name a very few.

Our Western culture and civilization today is the product of these geniuses. These creators have spontaneously arisen from the soil of the West without the aid of Marxist theoreticians or governments. Their individual gifts to the world in general have been positive and constructive and account for the progress of the world today.

The Marxist intellectuals who wish to tear down the Western culture would rip the mind, heart and soul from it and try to substitute an artificial concoction with no relation to the nature of man which would result only in anarchy. This would reduce the level of life for westerners to a status below that of any western group since recorded history.

The only comparison we can think of is the cultural regression suffered by the American colonists. Leaving the highly structured society of Europe in the Eighteenth Century, these immigrants came to an untamed continent and found a hostile environment that their forebearers had escaped from since the prehistoric völkerwanderung of the Teutonic and Celtic tribes. Their quality of living suffered a great reversal.

After the veneer of civilization had dropped away, they found that all they had left was their Christian religion and their traditional values and mores, including an instinctive prejudice favoring strong families— all viciously hated by Cultural Communists. Without these basic elements, however, the American continent would have remained what it is was, in Western terms nothing but a vast wasteland populated by Stone Age Indians.

Indeed, hate is the primary motivation of Cultural Communism—hatred of the West and everything it stands for. The “alienation” these Neanderthals decry is very real to them because they themselves are alienated from a West that is alien and hostile to their own sick intellectual ghetto of sex-obsessed and parasitic Freudian Talmudist.

Should they succeed in their subversion, humanity would be reduced to a level lower than animals and thus destroyed, and this globe would again spin through the endless ages devoid of human life. And this is

### **The Significance of Cultural Communism**

## Foundations Play Part in Culture Distortion

The ongoing debate over Cultural Communism in America was the topic of discussion on the Feb. 7, 1999 broadcast of the weekly call-in talk forum, **Radio Free America**, with host Tom Valentine. The guest was Dr. E. Michael Jones, an academic who has been studying the process of culture distortion for many years. He is the editor of the magazine *Culture Wars*, which is available from 206 Marquette Avenue, South Bend, Indiana 46617.

RFA: What is *Culture Wars*? And how did you become interested in the subject of what *The Spotlight* referred to as “Cultural Communism”?

*Culture Wars* is a magazine that comes out every month and it tries to explain the parameters of the struggle that we’re involved in right now. I got involved in doing a biography of Cardinal Krol of Philadelphia. As part of that research they let me into the archives and there were 200 boxes of documents that few researchers had ever seen before. What I began to realize was that this was a history of the 1960s.

I ended up writing a book called **John Cardinal Krol and the Cultural Revolution**, which was basically about the 1960s. I saw it as a battle between the Enlightenment and the Catholic Church over who was going to control the settings of the culture.

The culture is like a computer. You determine various settings and when you turn it on, the settings determine how it comes up and what comes up on the screen. What happened during the 1960s was that there were some very powerful people who decided that they wanted to change the settings of our culture and that’s pretty much what they did.

That’s what my book was about and that’s what led me to realize that this was just the beginning—we’re still involved in that battle and we’ve been consistently losing it for about 30 years.

RFA: Make Love, Not War! That was a slogan of the 1960s.

It’s more important to know who the people were who were behind the slogans rather than to know who the people were who were shouting the slogans.

Many people have long known that the Rockefeller Foundation, among other big foundations, has played a part in shaping American culture.

One of the really significant events in our history was the Reece Committee investigation in 1954. Rep. B. Carroll Reece (R-Tenn.) headed a congressional committee looking into the role the big foundations were playing in public life, and his committee came to the conclusion that these foundations were undermining the democratic institutions of the United States. I think he was right.



One of the big stories that came out of that commission was the Rockefeller funding of Alfred Kinsey of Indiana University at Bloomington. Kinsey was the author of the two Kinsey reports, and the Rockefellers were basically paying the bills for this. They are the ones who gave us this fraudulent survey that was used to undermine the laws and the mores of this country.

That's what I mean by changing the cultural settings. They are still bandying about that 10 percent figure from the Kinsey report that says that 10 percent of the population is homosexual. That's a Kinsey figure and it's completely bogus.

RFA: Sex is probably one of the biggest foundations of a culture.

I think that's precisely what they understood. They understood that the people who control the sexual morals of the country control the country. It was a very profound insight and it's true. So they set about to change those settings, if you want to call it that, so they could take control of the culture. I think in the Clinton administration we see the final fruit of that strategy.

One of the major revolutionaries in this regard was Wilhelm Reich, who again came over from Germany, escaping from Hitler. He began his career as a psychiatrist and quickly became a communist and was, by the time he reached Berlin in 1930, both a communist and a psychiatrist.

Reich would work with the working class in Berlin, trying to revolutionize them, and he wasn't having a lot of success. Neither were the communists having much success, in spite of the fact that they thought that they had a revolutionary situation on hand.

But Reich, being a psychiatrist, started talking about sex, and he realized it was a much more successful organizing tool: to talk about sex than to talk about the latest reports from the fourth congress of the Third Internationale.

So he started going around and started undermining the morals of the workers. He talked about this in his book, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*. He mentioned something that I thought was a profound insight. He said, essentially, that "We, as communists, used to debate people about the existence of God and after a while, I came to a conclusion that this was a waste of time. You aren't going to debate people away from the existence of God. But what we found was that if you get people involved in deviant sexual behavior, the whole idea of God just disappears automatically."

So we have here the strategy for cultural revolution, and it involves deviant sexual behavior: sex outside of marriage. That was his profound insight and that was the insight that got implemented in the United States during this period of cultural revolution of the 1960s.

During this past year we were told that "if it's a lie about sex" it doesn't matter if you lie.

We are seeing a replacement of our original Constitution with a new constitution: a state religion—the worship of Dionysius, the Greek God of sexual excess. That’s our new state religion. We have a Constitution and laws on paper, but whenever some powerful figure is involved with those laws involving something with sex, then sex will always trump our Constitution. That means that sex is the real Constitution.

Another example is the abortion clinics. According to our Constitution, you have a right to assemble, but if you assemble in front of an abortion clinic [to protest], that right gets erased.

Every American woman has the “right” under the law today to have an abortion, but that same woman doesn’t have the right to protect her child from having forced vaccinations [which can be harmful to that child]. Sex education is all part of this cultural war.

As it is practiced, what sex education does is get young people involved with bad habits at an early age. The habits are forms of control. The bad habits that people have can be controlled by people who manipulate the media.

As a psychiatrist, Wilhelm Reich had to know that children go through stages and that if you give sex education to a child at a time when he is not physically and emotionally prepared, you can throw that person off in a number of ways.

Reich was very interested in sex education for young people, not only because of his own compulsions, but because I think he understood the political implications of it.

You can see the political implications of it everywhere you turn in our society today.

At the beginning of this century, there were people who wanted to homogenize this country as a means of bringing it under control. The first thing you have to do is discredit authority. The standard authority in most peoples’ lives, particularly at the beginning of this century, was religion, usually through a particular ethnic group. That’s the way most of the country was organized. World War I provided these people the opportunity to destroy identification with ethnic background and the identification with religion.

Religion is where most people get their morals. Sexuality and sexual behavior is a function of the morals that you get from religion. So what you want to do is to loosen peoples’ allegiance to these things and the first step in this was to liberalize divorce, then came contraception, then came abortion, then came homosexuality and feminism.

All of these are ways to turn commands from God into matters of opinion. Once something becomes a “matter of opinion,” the people who control the media tell you what opinions to hold. That’s basically the structure that we’re talking about throughout this century: the use of sexuality—intrusion into sexuality—as a means of control.

RFA: That’s an interesting way of putting it: “turning a command from God into a matter of opinion.”

The irony here is that at the same time Wilhelm Reich was exploiting sexual perversion as a way of political organization, the Russians in the Soviet Union were trying to get themselves out of the mess that sexual liberation had caused over there. Reich went to the Soviet Union in 1930 and he asked the doctors, "What is your position on masturbation?" and they gave answers like Catholic priests, since they saw the wreckage that sexual liberation had caused within the Soviet Union during the 1920s. They saw that it was threatening the social order and they tried to pull back from it.

They had to develop a different strategy for their own country than they did for the rest of the world because they saw what Reich and those people were proposing was subversive. It is intrinsically subversive to any country in the world because, as I said, the sexual constitution is the most important part of a culture. The Soviets found that what Reich was promoting was subversive and they couldn't allow it in their own country.

## Reverberations of Hegel, Freud Are Here in Twentieth Century America

Tracing the family tree of Cultural Communism turns up a group of unbalanced malcontents with one thing in common: A commitment to destroy Western civilization.

By F.C. Blahut

When former President Bill Clinton told a group of black journalists that America “can live without having a dominant European culture. . . . We want to become a multiracial, multiethnic society,” he wasn’t talking off the top of his head. He clearly repeated this theme in his State of the Union address.

Clinton was simply joining a chorus of socialist-cum-revolutionaries who have been attacking Western culture and the Christian values system associated with it since early in this century.

The list contains well-known names. But it also contains the names of heroes of the intellectual left, unknown to the general public.

For instance, any high school student (even from an American public high school) would undoubtedly recognize the names of Karl Marx, V.I. Lenin and maybe even Georg W.F. Hegel.

But far more influential in today’s attack of Cultural Communism (CC) on Western values are Antonio Gramsci and his sycophant, Herbert Marcuse.

Marcuse was born in Germany in 1898 and came to America in time to help foment the radical 1960s.

NOT JANE OR HUEY

It wasn’t “Hanoi Jane” Fonda, her ex-husband Tom Hayden or even Huey Newton and the Black Panthers who invented the ideas and slogans that came to be identified with the “drop out” generation. It was Marcuse, drawing on Hegel, Marx and Sigmund Freud, who introduced the theory of “the great refusal,” meaning that individuals should reject and subvert the existing social order as repressive and conformist without waiting for a revolution.

Like a number of his fellow Cultural Communists, Marcuse left Germany one step ahead of the Gestapo to bring his “enlightenment” to America. He taught philosophy at various U.S. universities until his death in 1979.

Gramsci was a leading light of Italian revolutionary politics following World War I when the Soviet Bolsheviks hoped to take over all of Western Europe with planned “revolutions of the proletariat.” Those violent revolutions didn’t happen, but the ideologues of the left flourished.

Gramsci wrote for the socialist papers *Avanti* and *L’Ordine Nuovo* (“The New Order”; sound familiar?) which he co-founded in 1919. He helped found the Italian Communist Party in 1921 and became its leader in 1924.

Gramsci also worked for the Comintern in Moscow, Vienna and Italy from 1922 to 1926.

A member of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, he was arrested when the Fascists took power in 1926 and died after being released in 1937.

### EXTREMELY INFLUENTIAL

Most Americans may never have heard of him, but every intellectual leftist and Cultural Communist has (or knows someone who has) copies of Gramsci’s *Prison Notebooks* and *Letters From Prison*. These writings deal with wide-ranging cultural and political issues and (according to *Groliers Multi media Encyclopedia* [1998]) “have been enormously influential among Italian intellectuals, both Marxist and non-Marxist.”

You can add to that the American elite intelligentsia, and the best-known U.S. colleges and universities.

The ideas that art must be ugly and children should have sex education beginning in kindergarten didn’t originate in the 1960s or even in the United States. They came from the diseased mind of a man named Gyorgy Lukacs. A Hungarian Marxist philosopher, literary critic and writer, he was considered one of the foremost Marxist theoreticians during the first half of the 20th century.

It was Lukacs who developed a link between art and social struggle. It was after moving to Vienna in the 1920s that he wrote his *History of Class Consciousness*, considered a key work of CC. His contemporary communists, however, shunned him as deviating from Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy.

Perhaps it was because he was fresh from the hierarchy of the Bela Kun government of Hungary, a communist regime that lasted only about a year. Lukacs came up with the idea of sex education. Kun was ousted and Lukacs fled the country.

Two other guiding lights of the CC movement were Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer. Adorno was a sociologist, philosopher and musicologist living in Ger many who wrote (along with Horkheimer) *The Dialectic of Enlightenment*.

Many of these CC intellectuals came to America to help establish the Institute of Social Research (ISR)—or at least a version of it—here. This is the same outfit that was known as the Frankfurt School in Germany (*The Spotlight*, Jan. 4, 1999 and others).

Historian and essayist William Lind explains:

The effort to translate Marxism from economics into culture did not begin with the student rebellion of the 1960s. It goes back at least to the 1920s and the writings of the Italian communist Antonio Gramsci.

In 1923, in Germany, a group of Marxists founded an institute devoted to making the transition, the Institute of Social Research, which came to be known as the Frankfurt School. One of its founders, Gyorgy Lukacs, stated its purpose as answering the question, “Who shall save us from Western civilization?”

The Frankfurt School gained profound influence in American universities after many of its leading lights fled to the U.S. in the 1930s to escape National Socialism in Germany.

#### CC THINKING

The millionaire CC ideologue Felix Weil, a founder of the Frankfurt School, sponsored something called the First Marxist Work Week in Germany (sort of like a radical Labor Day). And in 1971, he wrote that he “wanted the institute to become known, and perhaps famous, due to its contributions to Marxism as a scientific discipline . . .”

Carl Grunberg, the first director of the ISR, concluded his opening address by stating his personal allegiance to Marxism as a scientific methodology.

Horkheimer became a director of the ISR and set out specifically to translate Marxism from economic terms to cultural terms.

Marcuse, mentioned above, was the force behind moving the Frankfurt School to America in the 1930s. He established it in New York City with help from Columbia University.

Following World War II, Horkheimer and his buddy Adorno returned to Frankfurt, but Marcuse stayed in the United States. The latter was at the University of California in San Diego in the 1960s when student radicalism became the rage. Soon, student radicals were spouting slogans cooked up by the Frankfurt School.

Adorno’s theories are responsible for “modern thinking” on art and music—i.e., art “must be alienating to be true to the state of alienation which exists under Western culture.”

Betty Friedan, a name well known in America for her thesis on feminism, didn’t come up with her radical ideas on her own. The less known Eric Fromm, a Freudian psychologist, believed strongly in matriarchy.

Fromm says women are forced into roles created by the oppressive Western culture. If we could get rid of masculinity, we would have a soft, happy, easy sort of Nirvana life in a matriarchal society.

That theme now underlies radical feminist thought.

And that's a short list of those whose thinking and writing resulted in what we know today as political correctness.

Now if you think that the basic ideas of Cultural Communism are nuts, remember that these ideas are expressed in turgid prose indecipherable to normal people and of interest only to a small intellectual clique whose basic motivation is pure hatred of all of the historic attainments of Western civilization.

That the ideas of the Frankfurt School have infiltrated into all levels of our culture is the reason for our national decline. Now that the sickness is identified as to its diseased source, it can be cured.

## Cultural Decay Targeted As Dire Threat to Future

Here are the comments of Charlton Heston, taken from his speech at Harvard Law School Feb. 16, 1999, on fighting the Culture War.

I remember my son when he was five, explaining to his kindergarten class what his father did for a living. “My Daddy,” he said, “pretends to be people.” There have been quite a few of them. Prophets from the Old and New Testaments, a couple of Christian saints, generals of various nationalities and different centuries, several kings, three American presidents, a French cardinal and two geniuses, including Michelangelo.

As I pondered our visit tonight it struck me: If my Creator gave me the gift to connect you with the hearts and minds of those great men, then I want to use that same gift now to re-connect you with your own sense of liberty, your own freedom of thought, your own compass for what is right.

Dedicating the memorial at Gettysburg, Abraham Lincoln said of America: “We are now engaged in a great Civil War, testing whether this nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure.”

Those words are true again. I believe that we are again engaged in a great civil war, a cultural war that’s about to hijack your birthright to think and say what resides in your heart. I fear you no longer trust the pulsing lifeblood of liberty inside you, the stuff that made this country rise from wilderness into the miracle that it is.

A cultural war is raging across our land, in which, with Orwellian fervor, certain acceptable thoughts and speech are mandated.

For example, I marched for civil rights with Dr. King in 1963—long before Hollywood found it fashionable. But when I told an audience last year that white pride is just as valid as black pride or red pride or anyone else’s pride, they called me a racist.

I’ve worked with brilliantly talented homosexuals all my life. But when I told an audience that gay rights should extend no further than your rights or my rights, I was called a homophobe.

I served in World War II against the Axis powers. But during a speech, when I drew an analogy between singling out innocent Jews and singling out innocent gun owners, I was called anti-Semitic.

Everyone I know knows I would never raise a closed fist against my country. But when I asked an audience to oppose this cultural persecution, I was compared to Timothy McVeigh.



From Time magazine to friends and colleagues, they're essentially saying, "Chuck, how dare you speak your mind. You are using language not authorized for public consumption!"

But I am not afraid. If Americans believed in political correctness, we'd still be King George's boys—subjects bound to the British crown.

In his book, *The End of Sanity*, Martin Gross writes that "blatantly irrational behavior is rapidly being established as the norm in almost every area of human endeavor. There seem to be new customs, new rules, new anti-intellectual theories regularly foisted on us from every direction. Underneath, the nation is roiling. Americans know something without a name is undermining the nation, turning the mind mushy when it comes to separating truth from falsehood and right from wrong. And they don't like it."

Let me read a few examples. At Antioch College in Ohio, young men seeking intimacy with a coed must get verbal permission at each step of the process from kissing to petting to final copulation—all clearly spelled out in a printed college directive.

In New Jersey, despite the death of several patients nationwide who had been infected by dentists who had concealed their [being infected with] AIDS, the state commissioner announced that health providers who are HIV-positive need not—need not—tell their patients that they are infected.

In San Francisco, city fathers passed an ordinance protecting the rights of transvestites to cross-dress on the job, and for transsexuals to have separate toilet facilities while undergoing sex change surgery.

In New York City, kids who don't speak a word of Spanish have been placed in bilingual classes to learn their "three R's" in Spanish solely because their last names sound Hispanic.

What does all of this mean? It means that telling us what to think has evolved into telling us what to say, so telling us what to do can't be far behind. Before you claim to be a champion of free thought, tell me: Why did political correctness originate on America's campuses? And why do you continue to tolerate it? Why do you, who are supposed to debate ideas, surrender to their suppression?

Let's be honest. Who here thinks your professors can say what they really believe? It scares me to death, and should scare you too, that the superstition of political correctness rules the halls of reason.

I submit that you, and your counterparts across the land, are the most socially conformed and politically silenced generation since Concord Bridge.

And as long as you validate that, and abide it, you are—by your grandfathers' standards—cowards. Here's another example. Right now at more than one major

university, Second Amendment scholars and researchers are being told to shut up about their findings or they'll lose their jobs. Why? Because their research findings would undermine big-city mayors' pending lawsuits that seek to extort hundreds of millions of dollars from firearm manufacturers.

I don't care what you think about guns. But if you are not shocked at that, I am shocked at you. Who will guard the raw material of unfettered ideas, if not you? Who will defend the core value of academia, if you supposed soldiers of free thought and expression lay down your arms and plead, "Don't shoot me."

If you talk about race, it does not make you a racist. If you see distinctions between the genders, it does not make you a sexist. If you think critically about a denomination, it does not make you anti-religion. If you accept but don't celebrate homosexuality, it does not make you a homophobe.

Don't let America's universities continue to serve as incubators for this rampant epidemic of new McCarthyism. But what can you do? How can anyone prevail against such pervasive social subjugation?

The answer? You simply disobey. Peaceably, yes. Respectfully, of course. Nonviolently, absolutely. But when told how to think or what to say or how to behave, we don't. We disobey social protocol that stifles and stigmatizes personal freedom.

I learned the awesome power of disobedience from Dr. King, who learned it from Gandhi, and Thoreau, and Jesus, and every other great man who led those in the right against those with the might.

Disobedience is in our DNA. We feel innate kinship with that disobedient spirit that tossed tea into Boston Harbor, that sent Thoreau to jail, that refused to sit in the back of the bus, that protested a war in Vietnam.

In that same spirit, I am asking you to disavow cultural correctness with massive disobedience of rogue authority, social directives and onerous law that weaken personal freedom.

But be careful, it hurts. Disobedience demands that you put yourself at risk. Dr. King stood on lots of balconies. You must be willing to be humiliated, to endure the modern-day equivalent of the police dogs at Montgomery and the water cannons at Selma. You must be willing to experience discomfort. I'm not complaining, but my own decades of social activism have taken their toll on me.

## Subversion of Western Traditions Traced to Alien Marxist Clique in Germany

What historian William Lind calls a “rather obscure and difficult German philosophy” is the foundation for what he says is “Cultural Marxism”—a deviation from the better-known standard Bolshevik philosophy of revolution. According to Lind, “Cultural Marxism” is what we know today as “political correctness.” Lind discussed this fascinating (and little-known) intellectual phenomenon on the Dec. 13, 2000, broadcast of **Radio Free America**, with host Tom Valentine. An edited transcript of Lind’s visit with Valentine follows. The host’s questions are in boldface type. Lind’s responses are in regular text.

**RFA:** You’ve determined through your study that what we know as “political correctness” is not something that just happened. It was planned.

There’s actually extensive academic literature on the subject. In fact, there’s vast academic literature, both in English and in German. But there is nothing for the popular market. So, most people who are not academic specialists are unaware of it.

**RFA:** How did you come across this?

I ran into the writings of a few other people, particularly Raymond Raehn, who has been doing work on this for some time. I found references in some books and, as I said, there are plenty of things in English on this subject, and one thing led to another. My background is as a historian. I did my graduate work at Princeton in intellectual history, so this was a fairly natural route for me to explore.

**RFA:** Is it fair to say that while we always thought that Marxists were interested in economics, we were mistaken in thinking that they had ignored culture? Has there been a deliberate Marxist effort to destroy the folkways, mores and traditions that were holding Western society together?

What happened was that prior to 1914, Marxist theory said that if there were a general European war, the proletariat throughout Europe would rise up in revolution, overthrow the bourgeois and the aristocratic governments and inaugurate communism throughout Europe.

Well, when war came in 1914, none of that happened. On the contrary, the working class of every country patriotically marched off to be slaughtered in the millions. Marxists, of course, knew that the theory couldn’t be wrong, so what happened?

In 1919, after the war, two Marxist theorists got to work on this problem: Antonio Gramsci in Italy and Gyorgy Lukacs in Hungary. Lukacs was considered the most brilliant Marxist theorist since Marx himself. What Lukacs and Gramsci concluded was that the working class would never be able to see its true Marxist class interest until it

was freed from the blinders put on it by Western culture and the Christian religion. Lukacs specifically says: “Who will free us from Western civilization?”

In 1919, when Hungary got a Bolshevik government under Bela Kun (a home-grown Bolshevik government not imposed by Russia), Lukacs became deputy commissar for culture. One of the first things he did was put sex education into the Hungarian schools. So this stuff has all been around a lot longer than people think. It doesn't start with the 1960s and the hippies.

The Bolshevik government only lasted a few months in Hungary, in part because the workers were appalled by the “cultural terrorism” (which is what Lukacs called it) that Lukacs instilled in an attempt to undermine traditional Western culture. When Romania invaded Hungary, the Hungarian workers would not fight for the Bela Kun government because of this.

But Lukacs continued to think and write along these lines. In 1923, a young German millionaire named Felix Weil sponsored something called the First Marxist Work Week in Germany, the object of which was to try to overcome a number of divisions within the Marxist camp. Lukacs was one of the key participants, and his papers on culture and Marxism formed a considerable basis for what was discussed during that week.

That week, in turn, established an agenda for a think tank that was also established in 1923. Think tanks go back a lot longer than people realize. One was established at Frankfurt University in Frankfurt, Germany, in 1923 called the Institute for Social Research. This institute, particularly after 1930 when a young fellow named Max Horkheimer became director, set out specifically to translate Marxism from economic into cultural terms. That Cultural Marxism is what we now call “political correctness.”

RFA: Marx said that religion was the opiate of the masses and that's why communists became atheists. Was it Christianity or all religions that he was after?

It was all religions. Something more fundamental was going on here. Marxism, of course, had no need for God since it said that everything was determined by the ownership of the means of production, and that this was the basis for everything else (including the culture). Marx described this simply as “superstructure.” But these Marxists like Lukacs and those of the Frankfurt School are heretics.

They are very much Marxists and open about their Marxism, but from Moscow's standpoint they are heretics since they say things like, “No, the culture actually is an independent and very important variable.” In 1930, Horkheimer said that the proletariat working class will not be the basis for the coming revolution because the proletariat was becoming the middle class. He didn't answer as to what will replace the revolutionary class.

That's actually answered by another member of the Frankfurt School, Herbert Marcuse, in the 1950s. Marcuse is the most important of the members of the Frankfurt School for Americans, also comprised of Germans, Marxists and Jews.

In 1933, when the Nazis came to power in Germany, they fled for obvious reasons. In 1934, the Institute was re-established in New York City with help from Columbia University. So this whole crew of culturally Marxist intellectuals—what we call “the Frankfurt School”—came to New York City.

They stayed in this country until the late 1940s when the key figures (particularly Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno) returned to Frankfurt.

Meanwhile, a young German graduate student named Herbert Marcuse had joined the Institute in 1932 and came to America. Marcuse's thought is developed largely through the influence of the other members of the Frankfurt School in the 1930s and 1940s. But when they returned to Germany, he stayed here. In the 1960s he became the guru to the New Left.

When the student rebellion on America's campuses broke out, Marcuse was a professor at the University of California in San Diego. He went to the campuses and talked to the radicals. In effect, he injected the intellectual work of the Frankfurt School and the cultural Marxism that they developed into the student rebellion and the New Left in the 1960s. For example, it was Marcuse who coined the phrase, “Make love, not war.”

RFA: Was this also the beginning of what is known as “feminism?”

Actually, feminism goes back a long way. Engels, Marx's compatriot, wrote on feminism. But much of modern feminism draws heavily from the Frankfurt School because Marcuse's answer to the question that Horkheimer posed in the 1930s as to who will be the basis for the revolution (if not the proletariat), was that it would be a coalition of feminist women, blacks, homosexuals, students and other marginalized elements in the society.

Marcuse was particularly aware, as was the Frankfurt School generally, of the importance of women in this respect, because if women leave their traditional roles, then the old culture is not transmitted to the next generation and since the object is to kill that old culture, the role of women—feminist women—in this coalition is central.

The trail of feminism, as I said, leads all the way back to Engels, the compatriot of Marx. The Frankfurt School, and particularly Marcuse, understood very clearly that women are the carriers of the culture in any society. The most important job in any society is left to the woman and that is the transmission of the culture to the next generation. So if you could recruit women into an effort to destroy that culture, you have struck the culture a deadly blow. That's what feminism has done.

Feminism expressly joins with the Frankfurt School and feminism's own origins, in many cases, are simply the Frankfurt School. Feminism joins with the Frankfurt School in saying that Western culture is automatically alienating and repressive of women.

RFA: So was the Frankfurt School saying essentially that all white males were evil?

Cultural Marxism translates a lot of the traditional Marxist framework into cultural terms. Whereas the old economic Marxism said that workers and peasants are automatically good and capitalists and aristocrats are automatically evil (regardless of what an individual does), so the new cultural Marxism says that blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals, feminists, etc., are automatically good and white males are automatically evil and, by the way, non-feminist women don't exist.

This mindset is so easy to see everywhere in our society.

The key in the intellectual work in the Frankfurt School in the 1930s to creating Cultural Marxism was to cross Marx with Sigmund Freud. One of the things they got out of Freud and out of psychology generally was the use of the psychological conditioning techniques. For example, the sensitivity training that many colleges and employers are forcing students and employees to undergo. It is not an intellectual argument—it is psychological conditioning.

In crossing Marx with Freud, the Frankfurt School came up with a thesis that says that, just as under capitalism, the working class is automatically oppressed. So under Western culture, blacks, homosexuals, women—everybody but white males—are automatically the objects of oppression.

The whole oppression concept is right at the heart of the political correctness that we see all around us. What this is really pointing to is that political correctness is not just a joke. People use the term as if it is something funny.

Political correctness is an ideology and in this century we should certainly have learned how dangerous all ideologies are. It is specifically a Marxist ideology in its origins. Again, it is heretical Marxism.

I wouldn't call it "cultural bolshevism" because the people who put this together specifically reject the Bolshevik model, which is seizing political power through a coup or revolution and then using that to remake the rest of society.

They said: No, you can't do that in Western countries. Instead, you have to engage in what Gramsci called a "long march through the institutions" where first you take the cultural institutions, the schools, the churches, the entertainment industry, the media and then you only take political power at the end, after you have captured all of the others.

And this, of course, is happening all around us right now. Even in our churches political correctness is a major influence in many of our mainline denominations.

So this is very much an ideology and it is becoming the official state ideology in this country. This is the first time in our history that America is becoming an ideological state, a country with an official ideology enforced by the power of the state. That's what so-called "hate crime" laws are about. That's what affirmative action laws are about. These are all the use of government power to enforce the ideology of political correctness, or more accurately, cultural Marxism.

RFA: In the writings that you studied, did you find that the proponents actually talked about this plan?

Oh yes, very much so. The time in which they were doing much of their work, they were very pessimistic because fascism was on the rise at that point. But the theory that they were developing was a general, broad-scale theory for the destruction of the culture. One of the most important tools they developed in the 1930s was what they called "critical theory."

The term is a bit of a play on words. If someone says this term, you want to know what the theory is. The answer is that the theory is to criticize.

The theory is to criticize every institution, every traditional belief in Western culture (family, religion, education), and to criticize them in the most destructive way possible and to do so unremittingly. That we see all around us today.

Modern art is a good example of this. You see it in music as well. It's not just in education etc.

And that's not accidental. Theodore Adorno, who is probably the most intellectually creative of the members of the Frankfurt School, started off as a music critic and a promoter of Schoenberg, who developed the 12-tone system which is explicitly a rejection of the whole harmonic basis of Western music.

Adorno's theory, which you see exemplified in a great deal of modern art and architecture, is that in an age of repression and alienation (which, by their definition, is inherent in Western culture), all art must express these things.

So music and paintings must be unpleasant. Architecture and all of the arts must be alienating to be true to the state of alienation which "exists" under Western culture.

RFA: I always felt that modern art was horrible and shouldn't be classified as "art."

You're right, but they are intended to be horrible. They are designed to be alienating, and that is all part of the thesis. Part of the difficulty in reading Adorno is that he carries that rule through to his own prose, which makes it very difficult to follow, because (under the theory) even prose style should be deliberately bad in order to express the alienation of living under Western culture.

RFA: There's a psychoanalyst who has been an expert witness in courts opposing sex education in the schools. His argument is that children have natural, traditional phases that they go through and that if you put sex education in the schools at the wrong age, you will destroy their personalities and adversely affect them. He was pointing to the destruction of society.

Exactly. Now remember that Herbert Marcuse of the Frankfurt School understood that, ultimately, you would not bring down Western culture with philosophical writings about 12-tone music. You are going to bring it down through "sex, drugs and rock-and-roll."

Marcuse wrote that what we need is a polymorphous perversity, creating a society caught in endless adolescence. [Marcuse's theory] became one of the key readings of the New Left in the 1960s.

He is the one who coined the concept of "repressive tolerance"—the notion that the tolerance of a wide variety of viewpoints (what we call "freedom") is, in fact, a form of repression. He defines "liberating tolerance" as specifically tolerance for all movements from the left and intolerance for all movements from the right.

So you see the very basic concepts of things like freedom and toleration are being redefined in sort of a newspeak fashion here and you see this on campuses today.

And you see it dramatically. In effect, left-wing students are allowed to engage in any outrage—book burning or what have you—but the slightest protest from students on the right are hauled up before some star chamber college judicial system and threatened with expulsion. This traces back to the writings of Marcuse.

The work done by Adorno, in particular, in the 1930s and 1940s was very important. These were called "studies in prejudice." You'll notice today that the politically correct immediately dismiss any attempt to talk about reality in, for example, immigration policy. That's "prejudice." And this is part of the legacy of the Frankfurt School.

What they specifically did was to define as "prejudice" anything that was critical of Cultural Marxism. They did it largely drawing on Freudian theory and defining what they called an "authoritarian personality."

Adorno published a very influential book with that title in 1950. The book said that anyone who wants to uphold the old traditional standards has an authoritarian personality that's fascist in nature. If you listen to these people, the Nazis are going to come back.

Isn't it hilarious that today every time you hear the left talking, they are talking about the Nazis when the Nazis have been gone for half a century. This also traces back to the Frankfurt School.

So all of these pieces are coming together as "political correctness": the notion that white males are responsible for everything that's wrong; that our history is oppression of these



various sainted victim groups; that anyone who dares question this is psychologically unbalanced.

All of these trace to this rather theoretical work (and, in fact, somewhat difficult theoretical work) done by this small group known as the Institute for Social Research in the 1930s and 1940s.

The media today is very much promoting the concept of political correctness.

The most powerful force behind this today in our culture is clearly the entertainment industry. It gets it across not through preaching but through parables, by integrating this message constantly into television programs, the movies etc. Interestingly, one of the things that Adorno was involved with in the 1940s is something Princeton called “the radio project.” This was specifically a study of the use of mass media—at that time, radio—to try to get across certain psychological and cultural messages.

Adorno was very skeptical about this. He was somebody who was oriented very much to the high arts and he had great reservations about the effect the mass media could have on culture.

But another key figure in the Frankfurt School, Binyamin, saw it differently. Binyamin’s writings have become more and more influential over the past 20 years. From the beginning, he saw the vast potential of cultural markets, particularly movies (which were new in the ’20s and ’30s), as vehicles to remake culture along the lines they wanted.

RFA: What about sports?

I’ve never seen anything on sports by the Frankfurt School, but given that these are very typical German Jewish intellectuals, none of them probably had anything to do with sports in their lives. I would probably trace this back to the old Roman bread and circuses perhaps.

I would suggest that this political correctness is now in society in general and this will just happen in every area of our lives.

That was their objective. Their objective was essentially to invert the old culture in virtually every aspect of our lives. That was Gramsci’s notion of “the long march through the institutions.”

Where you clearly do see this in sports is in this notion that men’s and women’s sports must be equal. What they are trying to do is say that there is no difference between men and women, that the differences are purely a matter of social role.

Here, again, a key member of the Frankfurt School was Eric Fromm, a Freudian psychologist, who believed very strongly in matriarchy. He argued as early as the ’20s and ’30s that there are essential differences between men and women. He says these are

roles created by the oppressive Western culture. If we could get rid of these awful patriarchal Western males then we could have a soft, happy, easy sort of Nirvana life in a matriarchal society, a theme that now is a very important part of feminist thought.

The Frankfurt School's influence in this country remained very small, restricted to a select group of intellectuals, until Marcuse made the break-out in the 1960s. He was kind of a wet-behind-the-ears graduate student whose thinking was shaped by Horkheimer and Adorno.

But Marcuse is the one who managed to take this rather obscure and difficult German philosophy and put it in terms that the average campus member of the Students for a Democratic Society group in the 1960s could grasp.

He gave us a lot of the intellectual components of that period: the notion of "if it feels good, do it."

*Lind can be reached at: **The Free Congress Foundation, 717 Second Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002.***

## Can America Survive Political Correctness?

Sickening changes in society are to blame for teenage murder rampages, not gun laws.

By James P. Tucker Jr.

A moral decline in America has caused a rash of school shootings, not a lack of gun laws, according to experts. Today's teachers are unprepared to teach character in schools where God has been banished, according to a study by the Character in Education Project, based in Washington.

"Children don't naturally kill, it's a learned behavior," said Col. Dave Grossman, head of the Killogy Research Group in Jonesboro, Ark.

"Children learn to kill from violence in the home and, most pervasively, from violence as entertainment in television, movie and interactive video games," said Grossman, whose group specializes in these matters.

Their views, along with those of educators, clergymen and others over a period of several days since the latest massacre in Colorado, point to America's moral decay over the last four decades. What follows is their consensus.

Then: In the 1950s, children were rarely born out of wedlock. There were a few "loose" girls in schools, but most were proud of their virginity. Boys knew if they "got a girl in trouble," they faced marriage or a heavy financial obligation for at least 18 years.

Now: Children are having children, 70 percent of black babies and 25 percent of white babies are illegitimate. In many cases, the father cannot be identified without expensive genetic testing because there are so many candidates to choose from.

Then: When 95 percent of the children had birth certificates and fathers, they were supervised. Homework was checked, chores were done, parents and teachers discussed children's school progress.

Now: Many child mothers don't even know or care if the kid is in school. The children's children have no supervision or home training. They wander the streets and malls.

Then: Families sat down to at least the evening meal together, where events of the day were discussed. If a child was troubled, caring parents could discern it and help.

Now: Even in the middle and upper class families, many rarely share a meal together. Both parents work out of economic necessity in some families and sheer greed in others.

Then: Teenagers understood reality. Some families had early, small-screen black-and-white television sets, but their lives were not programmed around programs. Interactive

video games had not arrived. The film industry, for the most part, provided wholesome entertainment.

Now: Bored teenagers develop a blur between reality and fantasy. With so much violence in entertainment, with the same star dying in many episodes, some cannot cope with the reality that, when you kill someone, they are dead.

(A clergyman recalled that Florida case of a teenage boy who killed his mother some years ago. His lawyer argued that, because he spent hours every day staring at the idiot box, the boy thought his mother would come back from the dead—just like the slain cop who reappears in the next episode.)

Then: The children of the Great Depression understood hardship. One-quarter of all families had no income and there was no federal “safety net.” Yet violent crime was rare. Why? Because the poorest of families were in church on Sundays and parents reinforced moral instruction at home. People helped each other, sometimes sharing soup and milk.

Now: Even in affluent families, most do not attend church. Parents and children communicate very little. Many of the children’s friends and their parents are strangers to their own families. Parents are unaware of the evil influences over their children.

“We are reaching that stage of desensitization at which the inflicting of pain and suffering has become a source of entertainment,” said Grossman, a former psychology professor at West Point.

“We are learning to kill and we are learning to like it,” Grossman said.

The subject of gun laws never came up.