

same nightmare — in large measure because of the influence of our popular media.

“It is enough to switch on the TV set, to go to the movies, to open a best-seller, ... to listen to the ubiquitous music,” complained Zinovyev in the July 24, 1999 issue of France’s *Le Figaro*, “and you’ll find them propagating the cult of sex, violence and money. Noble slogans about tolerance and respect for others are concealing those three pillars of totalitarian democracy.”

The Devious Dialectic

To be most effective, the peddlers of cultural corruption must work in tandem with change agents who employ sophisticated tactics of psychological manipulation in the service of collectivism. Dean Gotcher of the Institute for Authority Research has spent much of his life studying the ways in which change agents infiltrate and subvert communities in order to undermine established values.

According to Gotcher, one of the most successful ploys used by those cultural revolutionaries is the “dialectic process,” in which diverse groups of people, in a facilitated environment, are led to submerge their disagreements through a series of compromises leading to a “consensus.” This can be carried out in discussion groups, classrooms, management seminars, or in many other settings.

“The objective of the facilitator is to break down barriers and normal restrictions,” observes Gotcher. “The facilitator (sometimes called the change agent) uses the ‘consensus process’ [to] stifle sensible protests. This actually results in ‘induced paralysis’ of the objectors [those who seek to defend conventional social mores and customs].”

“Objectors to the process of ‘consensus’ are made to feel like they are ‘rocking the boat,’” Gotcher continues. “Those who object to the changes are encouraged to alter their standards so that ‘they can get along with others.’ The reason given to get rid of normal standards often is the claim that others are being ‘offended.’” Beguiled or brow-beaten into sacrificing principles for the sake of social amity, those being fed through the

machinery of the “dialectic process” are carefully led through subtle but significant compromises intended ultimately “to remake human nature.”

“Mama Bulls”?

In a typical dialectical exercise (such as a management seminar), the opening sortie in this assault is something apparently inconsequential, such as an “ice-breaker” routine involving a silly game. One example cited by Gotcher was a supposedly innocuous game involving “a papa bull, a mama bull, and a baby bull.” Of course, a “mama bull” cannot exist. But for the purposes of the ice-breaker routine, participants are required to pretend that such a creature does exist, in order to form smooth and amicable relationships with each other.

As Gotcher points out, dialecticians use such “harmless” shared deceptions to lay a crucial predicate: The assumption that there are no absolutes, that reality itself is subjective, and that what really matters is conforming to the consensus, the will of the collective. Exercises of this sort, he warns, are being employed in corporate, professional, health care, educational and management training, as well as in “outcome-based” educational programs.

“Whether promoted by organizations such as the NEA [National Education Association], the local Chamber of Commerce, the United Nations, [the] United Nations Education, Science, and Culture Organization (UNESCO), or through grant programs such as Goals 2000 and School to Work, this process is having a direct effect upon all our lives,” observes Gotcher. The purpose is to prepare the public mind for the onset of the total state, which would by definition be completely emancipated from all moral and legal restraints.

The process described by Gotcher works best in relatively small, intimate settings. But the public at large is also being run through the “dialectic process” through the instrumentality of prime-time television.

Gotcher’s example of a mythical “mama bull” has a real-life counterpart in the case of the so-called married couple that took the \$1 million prize

in CBS television’s *Amazing Race*. The couple in question, who won the round-the-world competition staged in the program, are two homosexual men. The decision to refer to them as “married” was approved at the network’s loftiest corporate echelon. After this gesture provoked a smattering of criticism, a CBS executive rebuked the objectors: “They’re gay and they’re married. What’s the problem?”

The problem, of course, is that men cannot be married to each other any more than a bull can be a mama. But just like the small group in the ice-breaker exercise described by Gotcher, the vast national audience for *Amazing Race* was required to be party to the collective falsehood of homosexual “marriage.” And it’s hardly a coincidence that this took place at a time when serious efforts were underway — in Vermont, California, Massachusetts and at the U.S. Supreme Court — to lay the groundwork for officially recognizing homosexual “marriage.”

[Continuous undermining of moral relationships are now visibly fixed in TV propaganda.]

Assault on the Middle Class

Television emerged as a mass medium in the 1950s and quickly came to occupy a key role in an orchestrated campaign to eradicate conventional middle-class morals and culture.

In his monumental 1966 study *Tragedy and Hope*, the late Georgetown University historian Carroll Quigley observed: “The period since 1950 has seen the beginnings of a revolutionary change in American politics. This change is not so closely related to changes in American economic life as it is to the transformation in social life.... What has been happening has been a disintegration [outlook reformatting] of the middle class....”

While economic factors certainly played an important role in this disintegration, continued Quigley, the most important development was the destruction of “the middle-class outlook ... not by adult middle-class persons abandoning it, but by

>>>

a failure or inability of parents to pass it on to their children." This was partially due to radical changes in the American educational system undertaken for the purpose of using the schools to subvert middle-class morality. But just as important was "the context within which the educational system has operated," noted Quigley — specifically, the popular culture and entertainment media.

"The chief external factor in the destruction of the middle-class outlook has been the relentless attack upon it in literature and drama throughout most of the twentieth century," Quigley wrote. "In fact, it is difficult to find works that defended this outlook or even assumed it to be true, as was frequent in the nineteenth century." The anti-middle-class outlook, which was rapidly absorbed by television, exalted "violence, sexual laxity, social irresponsibility and perversion ... human weakness in relation to alcohol, narcotics, or sex, or domestic and business relationships conducted along completely nonbourgeois lines."

[The above highlights the depth and breadth of change-agent 'Hegelian Dialectic' activity throughout the 'western' world and is quoted from:]

<http://www.thenewamerican.com/tna/2003/11-17-2003/index.htm>

Vol. 19, No. 23 November 17, 2003 Deception & War

Some follow-up on this in Leaflet 6.

* * *

For support of the above read MindWeb articles and books, key words in the "Site Search" facility may help you find related items. This series of "Discussion leaflets" concentrates on critical social issues.

One advantage of printed material is that it can be kept handy for reference – or to pass to others for comment or discussion. A more important advantage will become visible as you read the first 6 leaflets on site.

Regards; A. Gourley.
www.themindweb.com

www.TheMindWeb.com

Discussion Leaflet **5.**

TV or not TV

In 1975, F E & M Emery (researching at the Australian National Uni.) showed how TV viewing turned people into zombies. Experiments, in which brainwave-measuring equipment was used to measure the activity of various areas of the brain before, during and after watching TV, showed the part of the brain that makes critical assessment and sorting of information "shuts down" during and for some hours following viewing. (Globalism Brainwash P64).

This reveals the deadly invasive nature of TV as compared with any previous ability for use of entertainment in community indoctrination. It dulls the natural defense mechanism of the brain and leaves it open to sedition beyond the natural persuasion of repeated lies. That so little public coverage was given to this revelation is a damning indication that this facility was already in use.

Combine that with the following to understand the rapid increase in childish adult behavior – growing mindless lawlessness – dependence on simplistic government and the truly life/death nature of this secret war.

The following may well annoy those who accept, without question, the socialist values indoctrinated as humanism. Most don't even realize that we now live under a Globalist regime of dictatorship or notice the growth of their own lack of concern for right and wrong. In fact few see that communism is just a crude form of capitalism. Both represent a master-race concept where people become a commodity to be bought, sold, used or disposed of.

Points are already made in MindWeb literature to show how this mass indoctrination program has led to collapse of morality in business and public relationships. Or collapse of caring and respect for others in what, in public, is incessantly promoted as a caring, mutually respectful culture. Caring is a catchword of this Globalist deceit!

It justifies or disguises all deceit from gradualism to the two-faced dialectic that promotes consensus as a substitute for honesty and responsibility.

So take a big breath: The following essay, by W. N. Grigg, states so well this vital understanding:

TV or Not TV? Not!

By William Norman Grigg

"TV programming is designed to shepherd viewers into compromising their values. To preserve freedom, Americans should severely limit or entirely eliminate their TV viewing.

"In the typical American home, the television set occupies the center of the living room, as if it were the household deity. People immersed in TV's caricature of reality indulge in a delusional sense of intimacy with people they do not know — and who usually don't exist — at the expense of relationships with the most consequential people in their lives: their parents, children and neighbors.

Passive consumers of television also submit to the powers of people skilled in the use of fantasy as a means of re-calibrating public attitudes and values, not just about family life and sexual morality, but also about any other moral question of consequence.

"Of all the arts," commented founding Soviet dictator Vladimir Lenin, "cinema is the most important." Lenin's regime pioneered the use of cinematic propaganda as a means of building the total state, and Lenin's heirs from Hitler to Kim Jong-Il have used his techniques.

In his precautionary tale "1984" George Orwell anticipated the use of television as an instrument of totalitarian social engineering: Every hapless subject of Big Brother's regime was required to commune with the omnipresent "telescreen," ...

Most Americans would disagree that our society has much if anything in common with the dismal despotism portrayed by Orwell. But Russian anti-Communist Alexander Zinovyev, a world-renowned author who actually lived under such a regime, sees America descending into the

>>>