

made it “fair comment” to libel LaRouche and his associates in the most false manner imaginable—an indispensable element in building up “public opinion” against him and his movement.

This period saw the addition of an obvious new component to the government-led assault against LaRouche and his associates. This was the involvement of the Soviet Union and its representatives in the nationally coordinated legal assault against LaRouche. A chronicling of this assault—including hundreds of FBI visits to contributors, hundreds of instances of bank interference, thousands of slanderous newspaper articles, and more than a dozen grand jury investigations—would fill a warehouse with documentation.

It is this assault, which anonymous government officials freely admitted was intended to shut down financially organizations associated with LaRouche, that the federal government now blatantly seeks to rule out of the defense.

The moral fitness to survive

Since the onset of the federal investigation against LaRouche in October 1984, thousands of individuals from the United States and other countries have come forward to condemn the government’s politically motivated assault. This support has helped prevent the overwhelming power of the state from destroying a private individual and the self-financed popular movement associated with his ideas. The cost of the defense has been enough to crush anyone—costing at least \$5 million in direct legal costs over the past four years. And now the government, with its seemingly unlimited funds, is pressing ahead once more.

For every individual who has come forward to defend LaRouche, however, there have undoubtedly been 10 or more who have buckled under to the pressure of “popular opinion,” or the direct police power of the FBI. The American people as a whole have demonstrated themselves to be gullible sheep, who will not fight the power of repression, at least under current conditions. More reprehensible yet, have been those in positions of local, state, and national authority who have quietly worked with LaRouche’s associates and appreciated his ideas, but refused to come forward in defense of his political rights.

Lyndon LaRouche is the pre-eminent anti-Establishment spokesman in the United States, a man who has dared to campaign for a revival of the ideas of the American Revolution in a period when they have been all but buried, and to name the names of those who have carried out dirty deals to destroy both the United States, and Western civilization as a whole.

Will enough people come to understand in time, that the successful destruction of LaRouche and his movement would be the nail in the coffin to constitutional law in the United States? The answer to that question will indeed decide whether or not the American population has the moral fitness to survive.

The ‘authoritarian personality’: an anti-Western hoax

by Michael Minnicino

The idea of “authoritarian personality,” like so many concepts in sociology, is a fraud constructed to discredit republicanism, particularly its American form, and to protect Marxism. If we are to believe the people who coined the term and first wrote on the subject, the authoritarian personality is anyone who thinks that scientific and technological progress can and should occur under capitalism.

To use the words of the concept’s chief proponent, Dr. Max Horkheimer, the dividing line between the authoritarian and the non-authoritarian is “the first chapters of Genesis.” If you have the arrogance to accept the Old Testament’s mandate to have mastery over nature, then you have stepped over the philosophical threshold that justifies man’s mastery over other men. Thus, according to Horkheimer, the ultimate roots of fascism lie in the Holy Bible.

It is not that Dr. Horkheimer’s fears were derived from his deep concern for the human rights of the individual. At the very same time that he was writing of the dangers of authoritarianism, Horkheimer went on record opposing one of the campaign planks of 1948 independent presidential candidate Henry Wallace. Wallace had proposed that the federal government provide all American schoolchildren with a pint of milk a day. Such a proposal was dangerous, said Horkheimer, because it would turn the mind of the electorate toward the “needs of body satisfaction,” and away from more important issues; a well-fed child meant parents less enraged with the current political system, and less inclined to make a revolution.

The vicious Dr. Horkheimer was the director of the Institute for Social Research (ISR), also known as the “Frankfurt School,” and the school of “Critical Theory.” Under him, the institute created the concept of “authoritarian personality,” and made it—and the fraudulent methodology behind it—acceptable in the scholarly world. This academic fraud was but one part of the institute’s avowed goal: to undermine Judeo-Christian culture, and make Western civilization susceptible to being overthrown. This purpose was explicit since the ISR’s founding meeting in 1922, held under the direction of Communist International official Georg Lukacs.

The Frankfurt School, as we shall see, is the Soviet secret service's most important cultural warfare operation against the West.

The attack on reason

The first studies on the "authoritarian personality" were begun by the ISR in 1936. The institute was then in exile from Hitler's Germany, and its personnel had scattered to France, to the headquarters of the International Labor Organization in Geneva, and to Columbia University in New York City. In that year, manuscripts were prepared for an edition to be titled *Studien über Autorität und Familie (Studies on Authority and the Family)*. The huge document rested upon three theoretical essays; one was by Horkheimer; the other were by two ISR members better known to recent generations—Herbert Marcuse and Erich Fromm.

Contemporary readers may be shocked to find that almost every concept and catch-phrase of the 1960s—that wild era when youth were counseled to trust no one over 30—can be found verbatim in this 50-year-old document.

Here, for the first time, Marcuse laid out his famous ideas about "hedonism" and "liberation": Freedom can never truly exist under capitalism, for the latter imposes "technological rationality" which "mechanizes and standardizes the world," and inevitably decays to an authoritarian society. Thus, all capitalist states tend to fascism because of their adherence to technological progress. Popular rage at the alienation caused by technology occasionally breaks out, but this is mere rebellion tempered by reason; the only path to true liberation, concludes Marcuse, is hedonistic revolution, "the unpurified, unrationalized release" of sexuality.

Marcuse is complemented by the essay by psychoanalyst Erich Fromm. Psychically, technological progress is the movement away from maternalism to paternalism. As it develops, capitalism becomes increasingly paternalistic and oppressive; when society breaks down, as under an economic crisis, the "father" suddenly disappears, and the terrified citizenry clamors for a harsh, new father in the form of a fascist leader.

Fromm's solution is a revolutionary return to matriarchism. What he means by this, is the submergence of the individual in a primitive socialism which he likens to Virgin worship by the early medieval Church.

This theory is lifted, as Fromm admits, from the work of the Swiss J. J. Bachofen (1815-87), who was Karl Marx's classmate at the University of Berlin lectures of law professor Karl von Savigny. Bachofen transposed von Savigny's psychotic theories of the racial determination of law to what would be later called "anthropology."

In his most famous work, *Mutterrecht (Maternal Law)*, Bachofen posited that the most important cultural products of a race are expressed as symbols and myths, "the products of a cultural period in which life had not yet broken away from the harmony of nature, [they] share with nature the

unconscious lawfulness which is always lacking in the works of free reflection." To recapture this lost harmony with nature necessitates a rejection of "patriarchal" rationalism, in favor of knowledge based only on racial imagination. Bachofen concludes that this would best be served by a revival of the Magna Mater/Great Mother cult of the Roman Empire.

Although Bachofen directly influenced the United States only very late (the first English translation of his *Mutterrecht* was produced in the 1960s), his impact on European thinkers during the second half of the 19th century was immense.

Jakob Burckhardt, Bachofen's co-national and childhood friend, applied the latter's theories to the history of the Italian Renaissance, and came up with the bizarre analysis that the development of Christian Humanism was actually a blow to culture, because it advanced reason over imagination. (In 1986, Lyndon LaRouche was attacked by the Moonie-owned *Washington Times* because he accepted the title; "Renaissance man"; the columnist used Burckhardt to "prove" that support for the ideas of the Renaissance demonstrated totalitarian tendencies.)

Powerful sponsors

The unproven (and unprovable) cult nonsense represented by the original 1936 studies by the Frankfurt School, might well have remained obscure, had not the school secured powerful sponsors. Negotiations were held with Columbia University President Nicholas Murray Butler at the instigation of historian Charles Beard, anthropologist witch Margaret Mead, and Stalinist sociologist Robert Lynd (all of whom had published in the institute's journal). With funds arranged from sources like the Rockefeller Brothers Fund and the Emergency Committee for Displaced European Scholars (headed by Edward R. Murrow, before he became a newscaster), the institute was offered a semi-permanent home at Columbia.

In 1942, the institute received a joint contract from the American Jewish Committee and the Jewish Labor Committee to expand their work on authoritarianism, with particular reference to the rise of Nazism. Briefly, the institute officially became the Research Division of the AJC, before its members redeployed into key positions in the research departments of the OSS, the Office of Naval Intelligence, the Office for War Information, and the State Department.

Work commenced on a five-volume project that continued publication into 1949. One volume was a psychoanalytic study of anti-Semitism by Marie Jahoda and Nathan Ackerman, both of whom would later become board members of the Tavistock Institute of London, a British Intelligence think tank responsible for, among other things, the MK-Ultra project to foster the use of hallucinogenic drugs in the West. Another was a subjective account of anti-Semitism in Germany by Paul Massing, a member of the institute who had spent time in a Nazi concentration camp. Both Massing and his wife were Soviet agents, by their own later admission.

The centerpiece of the series was *The Authoritarian Per-*

sonality, by Teodoro Adorno and Else Frenkel-Brunswick. For the wider American audience, Adorno and Frenkel significantly downplayed the cultism of the previous version. To give the illusion of "objective science," the extravagant theories of 1936 were reduced to questionnaire items which constituted several "scales." The first was the "AS-scale," which purported to measure the anti-Semitism of the respondent; an "E-scale" measured ethnocentrism; the "PEC-scale" stood for "political and economic conservatism." All three of these scales could be correlated to the "F-scale," which alleged to determine who had the predilection to turn fascist under certain conditions.

There are two obvious absurdities here. The first is the method itself. The study claimed that fascism can be resolved to, in the words of the authors, "an ideal anthropological type." That is: a combination of breeding and life experience (all reducible to yes/no questions) determines who is a crypto-fascist just waiting for the social "trigger" that will turn him into a full-blown, blackshirt-wearing Nazi.

This is identical to the old saw that the "American Black type" carries the predilection to dance well, and be good at sports. Herein, the racist roots of the Frankfurt School in Bachofen and von Savigny are, perhaps, most clear. However, this aspect of the study was not attacked by the scholarly community, and, in fact, as sociological historian Alvin Gouldner reports, this method, with its claim that constructs like "alienation" could be "scientifically" measured, became the dominant methodology in postwar sociology.

The second problem was the study's blatant pro-communist bias. Here, at least, some contemporary critics demurred: Why is it the "F-scale"? Are fascists the only kind of authoritarians? Why not a "C-scale" to measure communist predilection, or a more neutral "A-Scale"? Further, it was objected, the authors couldn't even get the PEC scale data to correlate with the F-scale, even though it was clearly weighted to do so.

Adorno answered, that since the authoritarian was an "ideal type," there was no need for statistical correlations; the PEC scale was valid, he maintained, because the desire to maintain the status quo under a clearly degenerating capitalism was itself suspect. The issue of communist authoritarianism was easily side-stepped in a period when the Soviet Union was our ally, and the horrors of Nazism were becoming known in detail; under any circumstances, the Frankfurt School said, authoritarianism under socialism could only be an aberration, since true fascism was an extreme form of capitalism. Thus, socialist mistakes must always be forgiven; as Marcuse would write later: "Liberating tolerance would mean intolerance against movements from the Right, and toleration of movements from the Left."

The final analysis was given by director Horkheimer. In an essay from the wartime period, Horkheimer admits that, for the Frankfurt School, the ultimate authoritarian is any non-socialist who demands *reason*: "The fundamental con-

cepts of civilization are in a process of rapid decay. . . . The decisive among them was that of reason. . . . The atomized and disintegrating men of today . . . have abandoned the ego in which all prudence and all stupidity of historical reason, as well as its compliance with domination, was sustained. The progress of reason that leads to its self-destruction has come to an end."

This is the "authoritarian personality." Only a liberal who believes that "everyone has a right to their own opinion," and distrusts everyone who attempts to be governed by reason, would *not* fit the Frankfurt School's definition.

The central problem with the attempt to transpose Bolshevism to the West, said Lukacs, is that Western Civilization's cultural matrix is based on reason, and on the domination of nature (technological progress).

But, the creation of such pliant liberals is exactly what the Frankfurt School was set up to do.

'Just a student meeting'

The founding meeting of the Institute for Social Research took place in the German region of Thuringia, in the summer of 1922. The exact date and place are unclear, as no records were kept. Hede Massing, a repentant Communist spy, refers to it in her confessional memoirs only as a "Marxist student meeting." The list of attendees suggests something more than that.

● The Communist International (Comintern) was represented by **Georg Lukacs**, the Deputy Commissar of Culture and Education for the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic of 1919; Lukacs's Comintern code-name was "Number One." He was accompanied by **Bela Fogarasi**, his assistant in the Hungarian Revolution, and member of the Hungarian secret police.

● **Karl Korsch**, professor of social studies at Frankfurt University and trade union expert for the German Communist Party (KPD), was probably recruited to the British secret service during a long stay in England in 1912. Korsch was later kicked out of the KPD, and finally made his way to America, where he became an influential non-party intellectual.

● **Richard Sorge** had just been made assistant director of Korsch's department at Frankfurt. This position was a

cover, arranged by the KPD; Sorge's real job was to head the KPD's secret intelligence section in the Frankfurt area. In 1929, Sorge transferred to Red Army Intelligence, and was assigned to the Far East, where he set up the Soviet Union's espionage network in Japan. The Japanese Imperial Army executed him as a spy in 1945.

● **Karl August Wittfogel** was a teaching assistant at the Frankfurt Social Studies Department. When the Nazis came to power, he was immediately sent to a concentration camp, but was soon released, when his friend Prof. Karl Haushofer, the ghost-writer of Hitler's *Mein Kampf*, intervened with the Führer. Wittfogel was brought to the United States with Rockefeller brothers funds, and became head of the Institute for Pacific Relations, where he cooperated with Sorge's Soviet networks in the Far East.

● **Julian Gumperz** had just started the Ph.D. program at the Social Studies Department; he attended with his girlfriend, **Hede Eisler**, who was still married to graduate sociologist and KPD editor **Gerhart Eisler**.

Gumperz was the founder of a magazine, *Der Gegner*, in the orbit of the KPD. The party sent him to Moscow in 1923, where he was recruited officially to the Red secret service. He later gave *Der Gegner* to **Franz Jung**, a friend of Lukacs from before World War I; Jung was a member of a self-described "cult of Astarte," based on the theories of none other than J.J. Bachofen. Jung made it the official journal of the Young German Order, a Pan-European group allied to the Gregor Strasser wing of the Nazi Party. Jung broke with the Nazis in 1933, because the Nazis had turned anti-Soviet. *Der Gegner's* staff went underground, and most of them became the nucleus of the Rote Kapelle (Red Orchestra), the Soviets' most important spy network in Nazi Germany.

Gerhart Eisler came from an important Communist family. His parents were close friends of Alexander Parvus, the Venetian spymaster who funded Lenin's rise to power in Russia; his sister Ruth was on the secretariat of the KPD; he himself became the Comintern's plenipotentiary representative to North America. Brother Hans Eisler also came to America, but to Hollywood, where he became a composer of movie scores; after the war, he collaborated with the same Teodoro Adorno on a textbook for the composition of movie music—it is still used today. Hans was deported in 1949, and went to Communist East Germany, for which he composed the national anthem.

The fickle Hede left both Hans and Julian, and married Paul Massing, another Frankfurt sociology Ph.D. They came to America in 1935, where they acted as Comintern couriers, and as the organizers of the Noel Field-Alger Hiss espionage network in Washington.

Nobody here, but us sociologists!

The Dostoevsky project

Based upon case histories of the individuals involved, and subsequent developments, we can credibly reconstruct

that first meeting. It was dominated by Lukacs, the highest ranking official there. Perhaps he started with the statement with which he started a then-recent book: "Who will save us from Western Civilization?"

Lukacs outlined how his own revolution in Hungary had lasted only 133 days; the recently crushed Bavarian Soviet in Germany had not survived much longer. The only healthy revolution was the one in Russia. This, said Lukacs, was due to the cultural differences between Russia and the West. The Bolsheviks were able to appeal to the "messianism" of the peasant-dominated Russian population, and unleashed an almost uncontrollable "daemonism" which led to the overthrow of the Czar. The Bolshevik Revolution was essentially a religious phenomenon—an "unrelenting and rigorous" religious cultism, like the most irrational forms of medieval Christianity.

The central problem with the attempt to transpose Bolshevism to the West, said Lukacs, is that Western Civilization's cultural matrix is based on reason, and on the domination of nature (technological progress). The West does not believe that the world "has been abandoned by God," and thus people react to adversity with hope, rather than unmitigated rage.

If Bolshevism were to succeed in the West, then the assembled social scientists must commit themselves to shift the West away from Judeo-Christian culture. They must study the artifacts of culture, and understand how to discredit those which foster cultural optimism, and how to create those which foster *Kulturpessimismus*—"cultural pessimism," a phrase that the Frankfurt School used totemistically over the next 50 years.

Lukacs then outlined what in recently discovered notes he called, "The Dostoevsky Project." Western man's sense of mastery over Nature must be replaced with the understanding that he has "not a personal destiny, but the destiny of a community," in a world "abandoned by God." "The model of the new man [in the West] is Alyosha Karamazov," Lukacs asserted, referring to the character in Fyodor Dostoevsky's novel *The Brothers Karamazov*, who gives up all sense of self to become a Russian Orthodox mystic. Alyosha loses all potency by entering "the sphere of pure soul-reality in which man exists as man, neither as social being, nor as . . . isolated, unique, pure. . . . Dostoevsky's utopia [is] a state of the world in which men may know and love each other, in which culture and civilization will not be an obstacle to the development of men. The spontaneous, wild, and blind revolt of Dostoevsky's characters occurs in the name of a golden age."

Lukacs's theory carried, that day in 1922, and for the next 50 years the Frankfurt School manufactured forms of culture—they called their enterprise a "culture industry"—to undermine Western civilization and the power of reason itself, on behalf of the Comintern and its successors. The concept of the "authoritarian personality" is just one of those subversive contributions.

To be continued.