

## CHAPTER 6

# Breakthrough

Ever since college, I had experienced flashes of the Democrat-Media Complex. Then I saw it unmasked. But I didn't know exactly where that Democrat-Media Complex had been formed and why it had taken hold.

After all, I spent most of my life in a world where the Soviet Union had been destroyed. When the Berlin Wall fell in 1989, we felt that we had finally defeated global Marxism. Ronald Reagan and the United States had taken down the single largest repository of communism on the planet, and we'd done it without firing a direct shot. The whole world could see that communism didn't work—its failure was on display for the entire globe to look at and say, *So much for that.*

. At least that was what we thought.

When you look at the history of the Soviet Union, what you see is the conversion of hundreds of millions to a corrupt and insidious worldview via the overpowering propaganda of communism. Yes, they used force. But they also used every means at their disposal

to control the culture, the everyday lives, the very *thoughts* of their citizens.

When I was at Tulane, I saw the same cultural forces at work: the forces of the thought police, of the cultural fascisti. People in positions of power who decided what was okay to think and what to write, what words meant and who was allowed to say them. Tribunals without oversight, kids thrown out of college for uttering the wrong sentiments. Looking back, I thank God every day that I partied to excess at Tulane, because it kept me from buying into that worldview, from learning that language. If I hadn't been busy having fun, I could have become a professor, gotten tenure, and taught that cultural Marxism, propagated it for a living. I could have reinforced and propagated the Complex because it would have reinforced my position.

Later, I saw that the cultural Marxism of Tulane wasn't restricted to Tulane—it was everywhere, from the mainstream media to Hollywood to the educational system to the government. And when I began researching the origins of that pervasive cultural Marxism, I realized that this wasn't a result of America's suddenly and spontaneously embracing a rebellious counterculture in the 1960s—it started long before that.

It started from the beginning.

The Founders of our country were realistic men who understood human nature, who recognized that people weren't infinitely changeable, that they had certain traits born into them. In *The Federalist* #51, James Madison famously said that men were not angels—that they were ambitious but rational, and that we therefore needed to construct a system of government that pitted ambition against ambition. John Adams knew government had to be

limited, since "it is weakness rather than wickedness which renders men unfit to be trusted with unlimited power." Thomas Jefferson agreed.

The Founders understood human nature because they were part of the great Western tradition of philosophy and literature and history. They valued their heritage, because it sprang from basic knowledge about what human beings are. That was why the Founders were so ardent about instilling in future generations moral teaching, virtuous teaching—men were not naturally good and needed moral education.

Adam Smith's capitalism, of course, was based on the same principles, not the pure greed and selfishness Michael Moore or Barack Obama would have us believe. Smith knew that capitalism—the exchange of the products of one's best efforts for the products of someone else's best efforts—required people to act with virtue.

To sum up, the Founders' view was this: human nature is variable and requires training in virtue; no government should be given too much power, or the people comprising that government will use the power in the worst ways possible; individual freedom, when used within the boundaries of morality, is the highest good. The Constitution was written as a living testimony to this view.

The Founders' realistic view of human nature and call for limited government and individual liberty found its opponent in the philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau and, later, Karl Marx. Rousseau thought that people were naturally good and were corrupted only by the development of the surrounding society (he himself was not naturally good, fathering five children out of wedlock and abandoning them all to orphanages). He also thought that modern society, created as it was to protect property rights and life, had destroyed the natural communism that prevailed before the advent of society.

To people like Rousseau, the solution to the evils of the current society was the creation of a new “social contract,” one based on the “general will.” The “general will” didn’t need any checks and balances, because it embodied the entire will of the people. And if individuals argued with the general will, they lost.

Karl Marx’s ideas picked up where Rousseau’s left off. Unlike the Founders or even Rousseau, he didn’t care much about human nature—for him, human nature didn’t really exist. In fact, he went further: human nature was produced by surrounding society. If human nature was to be changed, it could be changed only by destroying the surrounding society.

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel provided the “dialectic theory” that backed Marx’s utopianism. He believed that conflicts made the world a better place—that, basically, might made right. The struggle between two opposing ideological or philosophical forces—thesis and antithesis—would eventually end in a “synthesis” of the two sides, and that “synthesis” would be better than what had come before. Sort of like a guy (thesis) having a fight with his wife (antithesis) and then their having great makeup sex, and the product being a baby (synthesis). Only sometimes, thesis would rape antithesis in order to get to synthesis, or vice versa.

Marx married his own philosophy to Hegel in something vague and confusing called “dialectic materialism.” The idea was basically that capitalism carried the seeds of its own destruction—capitalism (thesis) would be faced with the wealth gap that capitalism creates (antithesis), and that wealth gap would be solved by socialism/communism (synthesis).

This is what Marx meant in his famous statement in *The Communist Manifesto*: “The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.” In the final conflict, the workers would win and a communist synthesis would be established. Happy day!

This all sounds confusing and would make anyone with common sense stop and say, “Wait a minute—explain that one slowly, and tell me why it isn’t intellectual babble.” Unfortunately, there’s only one problem: important people in America believed it.

Let me continue with this brief history lesson.

President Teddy Roosevelt is on Mount Rushmore. Even though Teddy was a Republican, he was no conservative—he was a “Progressive.” Progressivism was a strain in American thought that merged the Hegelian dialectic with Marxism, backed by a rosy Rousseau-ian view of humanity and the general will—basically, it was soft Marxism without the class struggle.

There was only one problem, of course—here in America, we have something they didn’t have in Germany or even Britain: a Constitution that protects individual liberty. But that didn’t stop Teddy. Progressivism, you see, was active. And that was the thing about Teddy—he always had to keep himself busy and powerful. Like an early-twentieth-century Barack Obama, Teddy slammed those who disagreed with him, characterizing typical American self-reliance as selfishness. Collectivism was the new cool.

Those who stand for Progressivism, said Teddy, “stand for the forward movement . . . for the uplift and betterment, who have faith in the people.” Ends, not means, matter: “We of today who stand for the Progressive movement here in the United States are not wedded to any particular kind of machinery, save solely as means to the end desired. Our aim is to secure the real and not the nominal rule of the people.”<sup>1</sup> That’s scary stuff—the business of government is all about means, which is why the Constitution is mostly a document-describing how things get done, not what things should get done. Once a president starts ignoring means to get to ends, we’ve got a serious constitutional problem on our hands.

Teddy was a serious constitutional problem. His Progressivism

had practical consequences. In his 1910 speech "The New Nationalism," he compared wealth inequalities with the Civil War and said that individual rights had to take a backseat to the common interest.<sup>2</sup>

In that same speech, Teddy went over the Niagara Falls of Progressive ideology in a wooden barrel—he actually said that people couldn't be permitted to make money unless it was of benefit to the community for them to do so. "We grudge no man a fortune in civil life if it is honorably obtained and well used. It is not even enough that it should have been gained without doing damage to the community. We should permit it to be gained only so long as the gaining represents benefit to the community," he said. This was Marx in action. With a president behind Marx, his ideals were now competing on equal footing with the Founding Fathers'.

Teddy's Progressivism had its most dramatic effects in shaping a new view of the Constitution. He summed up his thoughts about the Constitution in one line: "To hell with the Constitution when the people want coal!"<sup>3</sup>

Teddy's ideological heir didn't make it to the White House until 1912. His name was Woodrow Wilson.

Wilson was the proto-egghead, a political science professor and Princeton dean who frowned upon democracy. Our American egalitarianism was beginning to be replaced by elites who knew better than the masses. Wilson had imbibed the best of European philosophy (namely, Hegel and his heirs) while studying at Johns Hopkins University, which was the first American university to mirror the German university model. Unsurprisingly, he rejected the idea of government by the people, and he rejected the old-fashioned notion that founding principles of free enterprise and private property should be protected by checks and balances on the growth of government. Government, he said, was a living

thing, and it needed the freedom to do its magical work. Because government had stuff to do, the Constitution was a waste of time for Wilson. It held the people back. "Justly revered as our great constitution is, it could be stripped off and thrown aside like a garment, and the nation would still stand forth clothed in the living vestment of flesh and sinew, warm with the heart-blood of one people, ready to recreate constitutions and laws."<sup>4</sup>

Mostly, the Constitution was standing in the way of the grand Hegelian synthesis of government power in the name of socialism. Wilson felt that true democracy and socialism were not just compatible—they were indistinguishable. All individual rights were subject to the rights of the state: "*Men as communities are supreme over men as individuals.*"<sup>5</sup>

Both Roosevelt and Wilson were far less concerned about the rights of individuals or the value of republicanism; it was the job of Great Leaders to hand down good governance. They thought that great decisions should be made on high by men of high thought, and that the dirty process of democracy just blocked any chance at true change. This philosophy paved the way for FDR, and it echoes all the way down to Obama.

Fortunately for America, after World War I, Wilson was extremely unpopular, and Wilson's exit led off a decade of constitutional retrenchment.

But in Europe, dirty business was afoot.

Despite the fact that Marxism made headway in terms of policy in the United States and other Western European countries in the early part of the twentieth century, orthodox Marxists had a major problem by the end of the 1910s: the actual worldwide Marxist revolution really hadn't ignited. Not only hadn't it happened, workers

had spent the better part of five years murdering each other en masse in World War I. Marx's dialectical prophecy had been proved false.

But just because Marx's dialectic materialism had been proved false, and just because soon the new Soviet Union would be slaughtering its own citizens at record rates, didn't mean that the Marxist intellectuals were going to give up on worldwide revolution.

That was where Antonio Gramsci and Gyorgy Lukacs came in.

Gramsci was an Italian socialist who saw tearing down society as the necessary precondition for the eventual victory of global Marxism. Marxism simply hadn't won because men were weak. And men were weak because they were the products of a capitalist society. "Man is above all else mind, consciousness," Gramsci wrote in 1916. "That is, he is a product of history, not of nature. There is no other way of explaining why socialism has not come into existence already."<sup>6</sup>

Lukacs built on Gramsci, deciding that Marx's dialectic materialism wasn't really a prophetic tool for predicting the future—it was a tool for tearing down society itself. Simply destroying the status quo in the minds of the people would bring Marxism.

Lukacs's view was so influential that for a time, he actually became deputy commissar of culture in Hungary, where he proceeded to push a radical sex-ed program encouraging free love and rejection of Judeo-Christian morality. In that role, he tried to live out his ideology of destruction: "I saw the revolutionary destruction of society as the one and only solution. . . . A worldwide overturning of values cannot take place without the annihilation of the old values and the creation of new ones by the revolutionaries."<sup>7</sup> Fortunately, the people of Hungary weren't nuts, so they dumped him.

That left Lukacs unemployed. But not for long.



Felix Weil was a young radical from Frankfurt, Germany, and a devotee of Marx. He, like Lukacs, saw the problems of implementing socialism—namely, that nobody really liked it very much. But like most of today's leftie college students who live off their parents' money while preaching the downfall of the capitalist system, he was rich. So he used his granddaddy's money to fund the Institute for Social Research, which was really a precursor to John Podesta's "Center for American Progress"—funded by Hungarian-born George Soros.

To staff this new institute, which quickly became known as the Frankfurt School, Weil brought in, along with Lukacs, a Marxist philosopher named Max Horkheimer. Lukacs didn't last long, but Horkheimer did. At the Frankfurt School, he coined a term that would embody the whole corrupt philosophy of his fellow travelers' mission to destroy society and culture using the Marxist dialectic: critical theory.

Critical theory was exactly the material we were taught at Tulane. It was, quite literally, a theory of criticizing everyone and everything everywhere. It was an attempt to tear down the social fabric by using all the social sciences (sociology, psychology, economics, political science, etc.); it was an infinite and unending criticism of the status quo, adolescent rebellion against all established social rules and norms.

Critical theory, says Horkheimer, is "suspicious of the very categories of better, useful, appropriate, productive, and valuable, as those are understood in the present order."<sup>8</sup> So if you liked ice cream better than cake, or thought a hammer might be more useful than a screwdriver in a particular situation, you were speaking on behalf of the status quo. The real idea behind all of this was to make society totally unworkable by making everything basically meaningless. Critical theory does not create; it only destroys, as

Horkheimer himself openly stated, "Above all . . . critical theory has no material accomplishments to show for itself."<sup>9</sup> No wonder my thought upon graduating was that getting a job was selling out.

When Horkheimer took over the institute in 1930, he filled it up with fellow devotees of critical theory like Theodor Adorno, Erich Fromm, and Herbert Marcuse. Each agreed with the central idea of critical theory, namely that all of society had to be criticized ad nauseam, all social institutions leveled, all traditional concepts decimated. Marcuse later summed it up well: "One can rightfully speak of a cultural revolution, since the protest is directed toward the whole cultural establishment, including the morality of existing society. . . . What we must undertake is a type of diffuse and dispersed disintegration of the system."<sup>10</sup>

Again, where am I going with all of this philosophical jabberwocky? Well, all of these boring and bleating philosophers might have faded into oblivion as so many Marxist theorists have, but the rise of Adolf Hitler prevented that. With Hitler's rise, they had to flee (virtually all of them—Horkheimer, Marcuse, Adorno, Fromm—were of Jewish descent). And they had no place to go.

Except the United States.

The United States' tradition of freedom and liberty, its openness to outside ideas, and our highest value, freedom of speech, ended up making all America vulnerable to those who would exploit those ideals. We welcomed the Frankfurt School. We accepted them with open arms. They took full advantage. They walked right into our cultural institutions, and as they started to put in place their leadership, their language, and their lexicon, too many chose to ignore them. And the most dangerous thing you can do with a driven leftist intellectual clique is to ignore it.

.. We always feel that our incredible traditions of freedom and liberty will convert those who show up on our shores, that they will appreciate the way of life we have created—isn't that why they wanted to come here in the first place? We can't imagine anyone coming here, experiencing the true wonder that is living in this country, and wanting to destroy that. But that's exactly what the Frankfurt School wanted to do.

These were not happy people looking for a new lease on life. When they moved to California, they simply couldn't deal with the change of scenery—there was cognitive dissonance. Horkheimer and Adorno and depressive allies like Bertolt Brecht moved into a house in Santa Monica on Twenty-sixth Street, coincidentally, the epicenter of my childhood. They had moved to heaven on earth from Nazi Germany and apparently could not handle the fun, the sun, and the roaring-good times. Ingratitude is not strong enough a word to describe these hideous malcontents.

If only they had had IKEA furniture, this would have made for a fantastic season of *The Real World*.

Brecht and his ilk were the Kurt Cobains of their day: massively depressed, nihilistic people who wore full suits in eighty-degree weather while living in a house by the beach. As Adam Cohen wrote in the *New York Times*, these were “dyspeptic critics of American culture. Several landed in Southern California where they were disturbed by the consumer culture and the gospel of relentless cheeriness. Depressive by nature, they focused on the disappointments and venality that surrounded them and how unnecessary it all was. It could be paradise, Theodor Adorno complained, but it was only California.”<sup>11</sup>

Adorno was wrong. It was paradise. To the rest of the world,

110  
RICHARD S. IRVING

America's vision was a vision of paradise. And these Marxists were here to try to destroy the best lifestyle man had ever created.

If I could go back in a time machine, I would go back to kick these malcontents in their shins.

Members of the Frankfurt School had some American allies—men who had accepted the Roosevelt/Wilson synthesis of Hegel and Marx, and who were now looking for the next step. The Frankfurt School had been sending mailers out to prominent fellow-traveler sociologists in the United States for some years and creating connections with them.

Meanwhile, Columbia University's Sociology department was dying. They needed new blood, and they liked what they saw in the Frankfurt School.

All the Frankfurt School had to do was to get into the country, and they'd take their place in the hallowed halls of American academia. Fortunately for them, there was an organization called the Institute of International Education, specifically devoted to helping fleeing scholars from Germany. The man who held the post of assistant secretary of the Emergency Committee in Aid of Displaced Foreign Scholars was one Edward R. Murrow, who helped ship in many of the Frankfurt School's greatest minds. Later, Senator Joe McCarthy would try to pillory Murrow in revenge for Murrow's coverage of the McCarthy hearings by citing Murrow's involvement with the Institute of International Education, but by then McCarthy was finished.

In any case, once in the country, the Frankfurt School was almost immediately accepted at Columbia University. It was a marriage made in hell.

With their tentacles affixed to the institutions of American

higher education, the Frankfurt School philosophy began eking its way into every crevice of American culture. Horkheimer's "critical theory" became a staple of Philosophy, History, and English courses across the country. Horkheimer himself took his show on the road, from Columbia to Los Angeles to the University of Chicago.

Meanwhile, Erich Fromm, one of the Frankfurt School's main thinkers, was pushing cultural Marxism through psychology by blaming Western tradition for the rise of Nazism and the rejection of Marxism.<sup>12</sup>

This was a fiction, of course, convenient rewriting of science to meet a political agenda. Marxism is just as totalitarian as Nazism, so it would make sense that those who love communism quickly fell in love with Nazism in Germany, and those who resisted communism would resist Nazism. But Fromm had a convenient answer to protect the Marxists: Marxists had not gone Nazi; resisters to Marxism had gone Nazi! How did Fromm know this? Because those who submit to Marxism love freedom, while those who fight Marxism are secretly repressed. Soldiers are authoritarian because they take orders. Small businessmen are authoritarian in their unconscious desire to submit to "economic laws."<sup>13</sup> Leftists today still call their opponents Nazis on the basis of this flawed and inane psychoanalysis.

Early on, Fromm embraced the ideas of Frankfurt School fellow Wilhelm Reich, who felt that psychological problems largely stemmed from sexual repression, and said that sexual liberation from societal mores could cure large numbers of people. Reich (whose psychoanalysis included disrobing his patients and then touching them) helped place the foundations of modern feminism, arguing that "the repression of the sexual needs creates a general weakening of intellect and emotional functioning; in particular,

it makes people lack independence, will-power and critical faculties." Marriage, he wrote, ruins lives: "Marital misery, to the extent to which it does not exhaust itself in the marital conflicts, is poured out over the children."<sup>14</sup>

Fromm also expanded on the parenting ideas of Lukacs and John Dewey, who rejected parental authority, telling parents to stand by and let their children reinvent the wheel through experience. Fromm's philosophy was imbibed by a young socialist student named Benjamin Spock, who would go on to shape a generation of parents with his child-rearing book *The Common Sense Book of Baby and Child Care*, which helped launch the self-esteem movement.<sup>15</sup>

At the same time, Frankfurt School scholar Theodor Adorno was sliding Marxism into the American consciousness by attacking popular trends in the world of art. First teaching at Columbia and then later at Princeton, he argued that television and movies were problematic because they appealed to the masses—but television and the movies weren't catering to the public tastes, they were shaping them, Adorno argued. Popular art and culture had destroyed true art, which is always used for revolutionary purposes, he said.<sup>16</sup> All popular art therefore had to be criticized as a symptom of the capitalist system. All art had to be torn down. Performance art and modern art found their philosophical foundation in Adorno. The long line stretching from *Piss Christ* to Karen Finley smearing herself with feces to Susan Sarandon celebrating being hit with transsexual projectile vomit all had its roots with Adorno.

This nihilistic influence in art, reinforcing the destruction of cultural norms, means that many grown adults have never experienced an epoch in which the transcendent and the innately beautiful have been celebrated as the artistic ideal. And it all started because a Rat Pack of Nazi-fleeing depressives couldn't appreciate

leaving the world's most oppressive place for the world's most spectacularly free and beautiful place.

Santa Monica. Google it. It takes a sincerely deranged soul to want to deconstruct the good life and the optimistic citizenry in order to create mass intellectual and spiritual misery. But that's exactly what they did. And as they constructed their philosophical dystopia, all the pieces of the modern leftist puzzle began falling into place.

But all of these major contributors to the Frankfurt School of thought paled in comparison to Herbert Marcuse, the founder of the "New Left." Marcuse was a former student of future Nazi philosopher Martin Heidegger, the father of "deconstruction," a process by which every thought or writing from the past had to be examined and torn down as an outgrowth of its social milieu. Heidegger wasn't shy about his intentions; he longed for the moment "when the spiritual strength of the West fails and its joints crack, when the moribund semblance of culture caves in and drags all forces into confusion and lets them suffocate in madness."<sup>17</sup>

Marcuse joined the Frankfurt School in 1933 and quickly became a leader of the movement. After he moved to the United States and became a citizen, he was hired by FDR's Office of War Information to create anti-Nazi propaganda, despite his Marxism. He also worked in the Office of Strategic Services (the pre-CIA OSS), and the State Department, where he worked to prevent the United States from pushing Germany away from democratic socialism. He taught at Columbia, then Harvard, then Brandeis, and then finally at the University of California in San Diego.

He really hit his stride in 1955, however, with the publication of *Eros and Civilization*. The book essentially made Wilhelm Reich's case that sexual liberation was the best counter to the psychological ills of society. Marcuse preferred a society of "polymorphous

perversity,"<sup>18</sup> which is just what it sounds like—people having sex every which way, with whatever.

It wasn't so much the freshness of Marcuse's message that made the difference (it wasn't a fresh message) as his timing—the kids brought up with Fromm and Freud and Spock were coming of age. The misplaced guilt of the Greatest Generation brought forth a new generation free to embrace Marcuse. While similar philosophies of sex had failed in the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, by the 1950s the men and women who had suffered through the Great Depression and fought in World War II were determined to raise privileged kids who would never have to actually fight for their country or work for their food. The result was a group of kids ready and able to participate in the sexual revolution promised by the Frankfurt School. Marcuse excused sexual promiscuity as the fulfillment of the need for the people to rise up against Western civilization and to free themselves of the sexual repression it created. Not a hard sell for teenagers.

It was no wonder that in a very real sense, his followers believed they were doing something special when they made love, not war (a slogan attributed to Marcuse himself)—they were using their sexual energy to bind the world together rather than destroy it, as sexual repression would do. While Marcuse may not have been the most important intellectual force behind the Frankfurt School, he was its most devious and effective marketer. The advertising adage "Sex sells" was applied to selling a generation on the idea that their parents' values and ideals were repressive and evil. (Where geographically did Marcuse come to this nihilistic understanding? The picturesque cliffs of La Jolla, overlooking the Pacific Ocean.)

Marcuse carried his "critical theory" in another destructive direction as well: while repeating the Marxist trope that the workers of the world would eventually unite—he saw the third world's



“anti-colonial” movements as evidence that Marx was right—he recognized that in the United States there would be no such uprising by the working class. He therefore needed a different set of interest groups to tear down capitalism using his critical theory. And he found those groups in the racial, ethnic, and sexual groups that hated the old order. These victimized interest groups rightly opposed all the beauties of Western civilization “with all the defiance, and the hatred, and the joy of rebellious victims, defining their own humanity against the definitions of the masters.”<sup>19</sup>

Marcuse’s mission was to dismantle American society by using diversity and “multiculturalism” as crowbars with which to pry the structure apart, piece by piece. He wanted to set blacks in opposition to whites, set all “victim groups” in opposition to the society at large. Marcuse’s theory of victim groups as the new proletariat, combined with Horkheimer’s critical theory, found an outlet in academia, where it became the basis for the post-structural movement—Gender Studies, LGBT/“Queer” Studies, African-American Studies, Chicano Studies, etc. All of these “Blank Studies” brazenly describe their mission as tearing down traditional Judeo-Christian values and the accepted traditions of Western culture, and placing in their stead a moral relativism that equates all cultures and all philosophies—except for Western civilization, culture, and philosophy, which are “exploitative” and “bad.”

Marcuse was widely accepted in the 1960s by the student movement—so much so that students in Paris during the 1968 uprising marched with banners reading “Marx, Mao, and Marcuse.”

But he still wasn’t winning in America. Marcuse had a big, big problem: America’s founding ideology is still far sexier than that of

the Marxists, who insist on a tyrannical state of equality rather than freedom with personal responsibility. Even if Marcuse was promising unending sex, drugs, and rock and roll, most Americans were more interested in living in liberty with their families, in a society that values virtue and hard work rather than promiscuity and decadence.

So Marcuse had to find a way to defy the opposition. He found it in what he termed “repressive tolerance.” In 1965, Marcuse wrote an essay by that name in which he argued that tolerance was good only if nondominating ideas were allowed to flourish—and that nondominating ideas could flourish only if dominating ideas were shut down. “[T]he realization of the objective of tolerance,” he wrote, “would call for intolerance toward prevailing policies, attitudes, opinions, and the extension of tolerance to policies, attitudes, and opinions which are outlawed or suppressed.” America was experiencing a “repressive tolerance” under which dissenting viewpoints were stifled; what it needed was “partisan tolerance.”<sup>20</sup>

In other words, if you disagreed with Marcuse, you should be forcefully shut up, according to Marcuse. This made political debate very convenient for him and his allies. This totalitarianism is now standard practice on college campuses, in the media, and in Hollywood—the very places that the Frankfurt School sought to control.

The First Amendment—the same instrument that allowed the Frankfurt School to land on our shores and express their pernicious ideas in freedom—was now curtailed by those who had benefitted from it. Marcuse called for a tyranny of the minority, since the tyranny of the majority could not be overcome without a total shutdown.

There’s another name for Marcuse’s “partisan tolerance”: Political Correctness.

In fact, the term “political correctness” came from one of Marcuse’s buddies: Mao Tse-tung. Mao used the term to differentiate

between those who had “scientifically correct” views and those who did not; those who did were termed “politically correct.” In 1963, just two years before Marcuse’s “repressive tolerance,” Mao came out with an essay entitled “Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?”<sup>21</sup> In that essay, he argued that the Marxist society determines correct ideas, and all incorrect ideas must be put out of their misery. Mao thought it. Marcuse thought it. And his ideological heirs thought it and still think it. Hello, neighbor!

And so Marxism came stealthily to our shores, squatted here, planted its roots, and grew like a weed—all before we even noticed it. It happened at the university level and at the governmental level and at the media level. We didn’t notice because we couldn’t read the rhetorical garbage these jokers were spewing, and we didn’t think it was important—“Our Constitution survived a revolution and a Civil War and two World Wars. Why should we worry about a few German eggheads?” Especially since America was economically thriving under such “oppression.”

The foundations of the Complex had been built. But we still couldn’t see the Complex itself—the Complex was hidden under paragraphs of obscure text and in college curricula at places like Tulane University, under the unlikely auspices of “American Studies.” Talk about a wolf in sheep’s clothing. It all seemed so benign, and we figured that if college students went off and had sex and did drugs and engaged in teenage rebellious decadence, oh well, they’d eventually come back to the Constitution, just the way their parents had.

We slept while the other side armed, and while we snoozed they secretly stole away our defensive weaponry—our allegiance to the Constitution and to freedom of speech and opinion.

It was only when they fired the first shots over our bow that we noticed we were unarmed, and that they had weaponized the cloudy bacteria of their philosophy into full-bore ideological anthrax, ready to deploy on a moment's notice.

The line was becoming clear. Marx and Hegel had paved the way for the Progressives, who in turn had paved the way for the Frankfurt School, who had then attacked the American way of life by pushing "cultural Marxism" through "critical theory." The Frankfurt School thinkers had come up with the rationale for radical environmentalism, artistic communism, psychological deconstruction of their opponents, and multiculturalism. Most of all, they had come up with the concept of "repressive tolerance," aka political correctness.

They had penetrated the academies—my American Studies program at Tulane had far more Adorno and Gramsci and Horkheimer and Marcuse than Twain or Jefferson or Lincoln. There was some trickle-down intellectualism going on—all the college students who worked through these programs and took swigs from the Frankfurt School bottle labeled "Drink Me" shrank mentally and ended up as parts of the Complex. But that didn't explain how American society as a whole was taken over by this stuff. I just couldn't understand it: how did Frankfurt School philosophy, which is obviously complicated, highfalutin stuff, become a mass psychosis? How did it trick so many millions of people?

And I had another question, too. Frankfurt School philosophy was all about criticizing from the outside. It was about tearing down society by taking it apart, piece by piece, razing it to the ground. That stuff doesn't go over very well in this country, because people here are generally happy—we don't see Disneyland as an emblem

of corporate greed or capitalistic exploitation, we see it as a fun place to take our kids, and if somebody tried to tear down Disneyland in the name of the collective, we'd have a shit fit. So how did this outsiders' philosophy penetrate our hearts and our minds? How did the Complex, which was a huge philosophical system designed to take America head-on, recede into the background so much that a few decades later, we can't even recognize that it exists?

Then I read Saul Alinsky's *Rules for Radicals*: if Marcuse was the Jesus of the New Left, then Alinsky was his Saint Paul, proselytizing and dumbing down Marcuse's message, making it practical, and convincing leaders to make it the official religion of the United States, even if that meant discarding the old secular religion of the United States, the Constitution.

*Rules for Radicals* might just as well be entitled *How to Take Over America from the Inside*. It's theory made flesh. Alinsky laid it out step-by-step, but we were too busy fighting the results to read his game plan.

Let's start by noting who Saul Alinsky was. Alinsky was an avowed communist dedicated to installing communism in America from the inside, using the most clever tactical means he could devise. He was born in 1909 in Chicago, and like his Frankfurt School counterparts, he quickly migrated toward Marx. He attended the University of Chicago and majored in Archaeology, but dumped that after he couldn't get a job. After working as a criminologist, he became a community organizer—yes, a community organizer—for the Congress of Industrial Organizations (CIO), a major union run by John L. Lewis, an anticommunist leftist who actually pushed for the election of Republican

Wendell Willkie in the 1940 election in the hopes that if Willkie were elected with CIO help, the CIO could win major concessions. From Lewis, whom Alinsky called "one of the most outstanding figures of our time,"<sup>22</sup> Alinsky learned hardnosed tactics. And he applied those hardnosed tactics to his own Marxism.

One of the crucial lessons he learned was that he had to work from the inside. Whereas New Left leaders like Marcuse preferred to bash the system from the outside and alienate all those who were part of it, Alinsky knew that it was more important to pose as an insider to achieve his aims.

It worked brilliantly. *Time* magazine bought into Alinsky's act in a 1970 profile: "It is not too much to argue that American democracy is being altered by Alinsky's ideas. In an age of dissolving political labels, he is a radical—but not in the usual sense, and he is certainly a long way removed from New Left extremists." This, of course, was not true—not in the slightest. His own beliefs were intensely close to those of Marcuse and the Frankfurt School—it was only his practicality and pragmatism that distinguished him and made him infinitely more effective.

Alinsky took on the trappings of American constitutionalism in order to insinuate himself insidiously into the American consciousness. He scorned flag-burning as counterproductive. He talked about the Founders on a regular basis. He even posed as a conservative when it suited his purposes. *Time* sums up the popular view of Alinsky, a view he cultivated with minute forethought: "Alinsky claims to be doing nothing more un-American than following the precepts of the Founding Fathers. In the Federalist papers, James Madison warned against allowing any class or faction to acquire too much power. In his own way, Alinsky is trying to redress the balance of power within contemporary America. If the desire to preserve basic American principles makes one a conservative, then

he indeed qualifies. . . . He surely offers proof—if any is needed—that significant change can be accomplished within the American system.”<sup>23</sup> This about a man who constantly cited communism as his governing philosophy! It is no wonder Alinsky was so effective.

Alinsky summarized his strategy for instituting Marxist change in his 1971 book, *Rules for Radicals: A Pragmatic Primer for Realistic Radicals*. It's actually an excellent book, clear where Marcuse is foggy, irreverent where Adorno is stagnant, dirty and funny where Horkheimer is abstruse and boring.

The book's dedication page explains in a nutshell what was so dangerous about Alinsky—he mixed a dash of religious fervor, a sprinkle of American founding talk, and a heavy dose of “kiss my ass” into a concoction that was relatively easy and fun to swallow. The first page has an epigraph from Rabbi Hillel, one from Thomas Paine, and finally, Alinsky's “kiss my ass” epigraph: “Lest we forget at least an over-the-shoulder acknowledgment to the very first radical: from all our legends, mythology, and history (and who is to know where mythology leaves off and history begins—or which is which), the very first radical known to man who rebelled against the establishment and did it so effectively that he at least won his own kingdom—Lucifer.”<sup>24</sup> Only a true egoist would cite himself in his epigraph, but that was what made Alinsky so unique—his brazen disregard for tradition, sewn together with the dressings of majority society.

Alinsky immediately makes clear where he stands on politics: he's a Marxist, and a pragmatic Marxist at that. Alinsky's role, as a pragmatic communist, is to succeed where his “fellow radicals” had failed. He despises those impractical Marxists who “panic and run, rationalizing that the system is going to collapse anyway of its

own rot and corruption,” those who go “hippie or yippie, taking drugs, trying communes, anything to escape,” those who “went berserk . . . the Weathermen and their like.” He laughs at the college students who embrace Marcuse-ian philosophy while doing nothing, those who spend their time cribbing from the communist puppetmasters and wear Che T-shirts.<sup>25</sup>

He also knows that America’s openness provides communists the opportunity to destroy American values, which makes working from the outside a waste of time. Militant outsider-ism is counter-productive. Alinsky, first and foremost, knows that to win, communists must communicate in the language of the people. They must embrace the people, not scorn them. They must embrace the world as it is, not as they wish it were. “As an organizer,” Alinsky writes in Donald Rumsfeld-like language, “I start from where the world is, as it is, not as I would like it to be. . . . That means working inside the system.”<sup>26</sup>

The people, Alinsky thinks, are like happy sheep. In order to steer them in the politically correct direction, they first must be made unhappy, and that unhappiness will result in passivity, then finally in discontent, and then, in the end, revolution. Incrementalism, as Frankfurt School’s Antonio Gramsci taught, is the name of the game. And the only way to begin opening the door to the revolution is to make people unhappy with the status quo. Revolutionaries aren’t supposed to afflict the comfortable and comfort the afflicted—they’re supposed to afflict everybody, making them long for a mass overturning of the system as a whole. After calling for the destruction of the system John Adams helped create, Alinsky, with his typical aplomb, actually quotes John Adams to back him up. (Adams must have been spinning wildly in his grave as Alinsky dug out his dog-eared Adams quote book.)

Alinsky’s clever merging of fake founding philosophy with his



own Marxism led him to internal contradictions that would have sunk a lesser ego. While championing “freedom,” for example, he hated the idea of individual freedom the Founders loved—he wanted “communal freedom,” which is to say tyranny led by the government. “The greatest enemy of individual freedom is the individual himself,” he wrote.<sup>27</sup> This is typically Rousseau-ian messaging—community trumps the individual, and in fact, individualism can only exist within the body politic. In other words, workers of the world unite—from within the system. And he united his ideas under the rubric of “change.” Yes, “change.”<sup>28</sup> He also liked “hope,” because his personal philosophy “is anchored in optimism.”<sup>29</sup> Sound familiar?

Alinsky says he’s not looking for a Marxist revolution, but he is looking to provide a manual for the “Have-Nots” against the “Haves.”<sup>30</sup> That sounds an awful lot like Marxism to me.

All of this is great rhetoric, but how would Alinsky actually build his forces? How would he find his minions?

By finding the raw materials. He tells us straight out what he’s looking for in a “community organizer.”

First off, he looks for *flexibility*.<sup>31</sup> That means moving from method to method, argument to argument, fighting like a guerilla rather than like a coordinated army. Don’t worry about methodological consistency, says Alinsky—just do what you have to in order to win. Alinsky believes that the ends justify the means as a general rule. He believes that fearing corruption of your internal values only leads to paralysis, and that the only way to truly win is to abandon yourself wholly to your ends. As Stalin would have put it, you have to break a few eggs to make an omelet. Alinsky liked omelets.

This obviously runs directly counter to the notions of Judeo-Christian morality, which ardently state that right ends cannot justify wrong means. That is why American society has such a tough time handling Alinsky's acolytes: he didn't play by their rules, and they couldn't play by his rules. Alinsky simply didn't care about Judeo-Christian morality—he was a total moral relativist who declared, without batting an eye, "One man's positive is another man's negative."<sup>32</sup> He actually made the argument that Nazi resisters weren't objectively moral—to the Nazis. Winners write history, says Alinsky, so you'd better be the winner. That holds particularly true in war, where "the end justifies almost any means"—and Alinsky views all politics (and actually, all life) as war. If you have the option of using moral means, by all means use them, says Alinsky—if not, screw 'em. As he said in his usual colorful language, the alternative to corrupt victory is to "go home [defeated] with my ethical hymen intact."<sup>33</sup> And he was no virgin.

His bottom line is plain and unvarnished: Kick ass and then pretend you were doing the moral thing. Lie, cheat, and steal for victory. If you have to lie to win, then lie and win, then lie about your lie. If you have to win with brutality, then be brutal and win, and then rewrite history about your brutality. Always cloak your goals in widely agreed-upon American terms that people buy into. Things like the Declaration of Independence or the "common welfare" provision of the Constitution. Sure, you may be standing for none of those things. But that doesn't matter—victory is what matters: It's the Chicago way.

Second, Alinsky looks for *confidence*. Weak-willed people never win, and those who doubt themselves are weak-willed.<sup>34</sup> It takes confidence to go after your opposition with a chainsaw. Those who have self-confidence will not shy away from conflict, which is an essential feature of progress, he says (channeling Hegel).

Third, Alinsky espouses the value of *experience*. Education as a community organizer means embracing Rousseau-like experiential learning, since history doesn't repeat itself—all history is changeable and changing. This is also an excellent rationalization for young people to ignore the wisdom of the past—this time; just like every time, things are different.

Fourth, Alinsky suggests certain personal qualities in organizers. Here are some of the most important.

*Sincerity*: the good community organizer must be absolutely honest and sincere. This is good advice for any politician, but it is excellent advice for someone trying to work with populations different from his/her own.

*Curiosity and irreverence*: the organizer must be curious, because everything needs to be questioned. Values must be questioned. Morals must be questioned. This is basically critical theory in practice. Alinsky's focus on irreverence is particularly important: "To the questioner nothing is sacred." Again, this is critical theory in its most basic practical form.

*A sense of humor*: This is probably the most important quality Alinsky mentions. Humor is a weapon to be deployed as often as possible—it is almost impossible to defend against. It is the weapon the Frankfurt School lacked—their seriousness made them boring and inaccessible. Alinsky is no such thing. He is hilarious, and that hilarity breeds the sort of social change only a Jon Stewart or a Stephen Colbert could bring about rather than a Noam Chomsky.

When it comes to humor, Alinsky has no problem going lowest common denominator, which is what makes him so effective. It's one thing to pun like Shakespeare when you're in polite company, but social change isn't effected in polite company—it's effected in the streets, with the people. And people love base humor. In the book, Alinsky makes jokes about sex and farting, both in order to

shock and to cross cultural boundaries—after all, everybody poops. Conservatives are afraid to talk in these terms, and that’s one reason why they lose young people in particular.

As it stands, the Frankfurt School–taught left is fighting the political battle on both the political and the cultural battlefields. Conservatives are fighting it only on the political battlefield. That means that art, humor, song, theater, television, film, dance are all devices used every day in order to influence the hearts and minds of the American people. Conservatives have to pray that their kids will eventually discover George Will’s column to knock some sense into them.

Once he’s got his organizers, his soldiers for the battlefield, Alinsky lays out his tactics. He’s not just Machiavelli—he’s Sun Tzu. Here are his rules for tactical warfare, quoted verbatim in italics:

1. *Power is not only what you have, but what the enemy thinks you have.* Deception is useful, and giving the other side incomplete information is just as useful. If it was good enough for Gideon, it’s good enough for Alinsky.
2. *Never go outside the experience of your people.* You can’t preach abortion to Catholic priests or pork to Jews. Work with the material you have, or you’ll confuse your own forces.
3. *Wherever possible go outside of the experience of the enemy.* If they can’t handle you because they’ve never handled anything like you, you’ll win.
4. *Make the enemy live up to their own book of rules.* Alinsky writes, “You can kill them with this, for they can no more obey their own rules than the Christian church can live up to Christianity.” *Hypocrisy* is obviously the key word here, and it’s the left’s favorite

charge for the simple reason that the vast majority of people with standards are “hypocrites” at some point in their lives.

5. *Ridicule is man's most potent weapon.* Just ask Gerald Ford (Chevy Chase), George W. Bush (Will Ferrell), or Sarah Palin (Tina Fey).

6. *A good tactic is one that your people enjoy.* You're not going to win if your people are bored out of their minds.

7. *A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag.*

8. *Keep the pressure on.*

9. *The threat is usually more terrifying than the thing itself.* Don't be scared of the opposition—even if they level their most feared weapon at you, it probably won't be that bad. Meanwhile, level threats whenever possible, because that will scare the opposition.

10. *The major premise for tactics is the development of operations that will maintain a constant pressure upon the opposition.* Pressure causes reactions, and you can work off of the reaction of your target.

11. *If you push a negative hard and deep enough it will break through into its counterside.* Find the enemy's most cherished belief, then exploit it against your target. Alinsky uses the example of passive resistance in India—by exploiting the British pride in their civility, Gandhi defeated them. It goes without saying that the Frankfurt School used precisely this tactic in twisting their First Amendment freedoms against the First Amendment in the United States.

12. *The price of a successful attack is a constructive alternative.* Make sure you have a plan once you've achieved your goals.

13. *Pick the target, freeze it, personalize, and polarize it.* This is the most important and famous of Alinsky's rules. You have to pick a target, then freeze it and prevent it from shifting

blame elsewhere, then personalize it by making sure that it is something specific and identifiable rather than general, and finally, polarize it by demonizing it. It does you no good to talk about the pros and cons of your target—you must show the target as entirely evil, and yourself as entirely good. This is commonly known as the politics of personal destruction. (See Palin, Sarah.)

Finally, Alinsky provides a simple reminder: *the real action is in the enemy's reaction*. You must provoke your enemy into reacting so that you can work off of the reaction. If you do a good enough job, you can force them to make a mistake. When they do, you must be ready to exploit it.

It's worth exploring one of Alinsky's case studies in order to see these rules in action. In 1964, he moved to Rochester, New York, in the aftermath of race riots and targeted Eastman Kodak, the largest company in town by far. He quickly implemented rules 13 (target, freeze, personalize, and polarize) and 5 (mockery is the best strategy). The media interviewed him when he stepped off the plane in Rochester, asking him what he thought of the town. "It is a huge southern plantation transplanted north," Alinsky said.

This got him the reaction he was looking for from the opposition, which gave him more targets to attack. W. Allen Wallis, president of the University of Rochester and director at Eastman Kodak, went after Alinsky. Alinsky responded by comparing Wallis to George Wallace of Alabama.<sup>35</sup> Did it matter if the charge was true? Of course not. But it was effective.

Putting into action the rest of his rules—using the law as a tool to make the establishment obey its own rules, moving outside the experience of the enemy, letting your soldiers enjoy the experience, etc.—Alinsky suggested another tactic in Rochester, a flamboyant

and outrageous tactic sure to get a response simply because of its pure outrageousness. He suggested that blacks buy tickets to the Rochester symphony orchestra, eat beans beforehand, then fart over and over again to disturb the upper-class white folks.<sup>36</sup>

This is brilliant. Farting for a cause is about as smart as you can get, because there's no way to defend against it—it's not illegal to fart, it's completely offensive and makes people uncomfortable, and even as black folks are passing gas in a chamber music concert, they get to claim the moral high ground and pillory their enemies as racists.

Alinsky is infuriatingly awesome—he's smart where his compatriots are "intellectual," and always reaches his intended audience, something professors often fail to do. He knows what he wants and how to get it, and he makes it easy for anyone to follow his pattern. The trickle-down intellectualism of Marcuse and Horkheimer might have worked on a college level, where students substituted professors for parents as authority figures and felt liberated by their new, less stodgy, "be yourself" quasi-parents, but it took the brilliance of an Alinsky to bring the Marcuse Marxist creed to the common man by fooling him into thinking it was purely American. It took Alinsky's thug tactics to enervate the happy, healthy American middle class and get them to accept major changes to the status quo, and to mobilize the racial and sexual identity groups that Marcuse needed to substitute for the generally complacent middle class. It took Alinsky to shut up the opposition using the methodologies of political correctness, to frighten people into submission and create an informal anti-First Amendment regime where if you speak out, you become a personal target. It took Alinsky to put the Complex totally into effect. Every successful interest group and social movement in the United States since the 1960s has used Frankfurt School ideology and Alinsky rules.

It's tragic it has taken conservatives so long to realize it.