

# *Turn Off Your TV!*

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2. The Making of a Fascist Society.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>3. The Making of a Fascist Society (continued).....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>4. The Clockwork Orange Society.....</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>5. The Programming of America by Television.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>6. Television's Killing of God.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>7. Here Now the News....</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>8. Here Now the News....(continued).....</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>9. The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion.....</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>10. The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion (continued).....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>11. The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion (continued).....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>12. MTV Is the Church of Satan.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>13. There Was Disney.....</b>	<b>112</b>

# Turn Off Your TV: Part 1

by L. Wolfe

Hey buddy, I'm talking to you. Yes, you, the guy sitting in front of the television. Turn down the sound a bit, so that you can hear what I am saying.

Now, try to concentrate on what I am going to say. I want to talk to you about your favorite pastime. No, it's not baseball or football, although it does have something to do with your interest in spectator sports. I'm talking about what you were just doing: watching television.

Do you have any idea about how much time you spend in front of the television set? According to the latest studies, the average American now spends between five and six hours a day watching television. Let's put that in perspective: that is more time than you spend doing anything else but sleeping or working, if you are lucky enough to still have a job. That's more time than you spend eating, more time than you spend with your wife alone, more time than with the kids.

It's even worse with your children. According to these same studies, young children below school age watch more than eight hours each day. School age children watch a little under eight hours a day. In 1980, the average 20-year-old had watched the equivalent of 14 months of television in his or her brief lifetime. *That's 14 months, 24 hours a day.* More recent figures show that the numbers have climbed: the 20-year-old has spent closer to two full years of his or her life in front of the television set.

At the same time, the researchers have noted a disturbing phenomena. It seems that we Americans are getting progressively more *stupid*. They note a decline in reading and comprehension levels in all age groups tested. Americans read less and understand what they read less than they did 10 years ago, less than they have at any time since research began to study such things. As for writing skills, Americans are, in general, unable to write more than a few simple sentences. We are among the least literate people on this planet, and we're getting worse.

It's the change—the constant trendline downward—that interests these researchers. More than one study has correlated this increasing stupidity of our population to the amount of television they watch. Interestingly, the studies found that it doesn't matter what people watch, whether it's "The Simpsons" or "McNeil/Lehrer," or "Murphy Brown" or "Nightline": the more television you watch, the *less literate*, the *more stupid* you are.

The growth in television watching had surprised some of the researchers. Back a decade ago, they were predicting that television watching would level off and might actually decline. It had reached an absolute saturation point. They were right for so-called network television; figures show a steady dropoff of viewership. But that drop is more than made up for by the growth of cable television, with its smorgasbord of channels, one for almost every perversion. Especially in urban and suburban areas, Americans are hard-wired to more than 100 different channels that provide them with all news, like CNN, all movies, all comedy, all sports, all weather, all financial news and a liberal dose of straight pornography.

The researchers had also failed to predict the market penetration of first beta and then VHS video recorders; they made it possible to watch one thing and record another for later viewing. They also offered access to movies not available on networks or even cable channels as well as home videos, recorded on your own little camcorder. The proliferation of home video equipment has involved families in video-related activities which are not even considered in the cumulative totals for time Americans spend watching television.

You might not actually realize how much you are watching television. But think for a moment. When you come home, you turn the television on, if it isn't on already. You read the paper with it on, half glancing at what is on the screen, catching a bit of the news, or the plot of a show. You eat with it on, maybe in the background, listening for a score or something that happens to a character in a show you follow. When something you are interested in, a show or basketball game, is on, the set becomes the center of attention. So your attention to what is on may vary in intensity, but there is almost no point when you are home, and inside, and have the set completely off. Isn't that right?

The studies did not break down the periods of time people watched television, according to the intensity of their viewing. But the point is still made: you compulsively turn the television on and spend a good portion of your waking hours glued to the tube. And the studies also showed that many people can't sleep without the television turned on!

## Brainwashing

Now, I'm sure you have heard that watching too much television is bad for your health. They put stories like that on the evening news. Bad for your eyes to stare at the screen, they say. Especially bad if you sit too close.

Well, I want to make another point. We've already shown that you are addicted to the tube, watching it between six and eight hour a day. But it is an addiction that *brainwashes* you.

There are two kinds of brainwashing. The one that's called *hard* brainwashing is the type you're most familiar with. You've got a pretty good image of it from some of those old Korean war movies. They take some guy, an American patriot, drag him into a room, torture him, pump him full of drugs, and after a struggle, get him to renounce his country and his beliefs. He usually undergoes a personality change, signified by an ever-present smile and blank stare.

This brainwashing is called *hard* because its methods are overt. The controlled environment is obvious to the victim; so is the terror. The victim is overwhelmed by a seemingly omnipotent external force, and a feeling of intense isolation is induced. The victim's moral strength is sapped, and slowly he embraces his torturers. It is man's moral strength that informs and orders his power of reason; without it, the mind becomes little more than a recording machine waiting for imprints.

No one is saying that you have been a victim of *hard* brainwashing. But you have been brainwashed, just as effectively as those people in the movies. The blank stare? Did you ever look at what you look like while watching television? If the angle is right, you might catch your own reflection in the screen. Jaw slightly open, lips relaxed into a smile. The blank stare of a television zombie.

This is *soft* brainwashing, even more effective because its victims go about their lives unaware of what is being done to them.

Television, with its reach into nearly every American home, creates the basis for the mass brainwashing of citizens, like you. It works on a principle of *tension and release*. Create tension, in a controlled environment, increasing the level of stress. Then provide a series of choices that provide release from the tension. As long as the victim believes that the choices presented are the *only* choices available, even if they are at first glance unacceptable, he will nevertheless, ultimately seek release by choosing one of these unacceptable choices.

Under these circumstances, in a brainwashing, controlled environment, such choice-making is not a “rational” experience. It does not involve the use of man’s creative mental powers; instead man is conditioned, like an animal, to respond to the tension, by seeking release.

The key to the success of this brainwashing process is the regulation of both the tension and the perceived choices. As long as both are controlled, then the range of outcomes is also controlled. The victim is induced to walk down one of several pathways acceptable for his controllers.

The brainwashers call the tension-filled environment *social turbulence*. The last decades have been full of such *social turbulence*--economic collapse, regional wars, population disasters, ecological and biological catastrophes. *Social turbulence* creates crises in perceptions, causing people to lose their bearings. Adrift and confused, people seek release from the tension, following paths that appear to lead to a simpler, less tension-filled life. There is no time in such a process for rational consideration of complicated problems.

Television is the key vehicle for presenting both the tension and the choices. It brings you the images of the tension, and serves up simple answers. Television, in its world of semi-reality, of illusion, of escape from reality, *is itself the single most important release from our tension-wracked existence*. Eight hours a day, every day, through its programming, you are being programmed.

If you doubt me, think about one important choice that you have made recently that was not in some way influenced by something that you have seen on television. I bet you can’t think of one. That’s how controlled you are.

## Who’s Doing It

But don’t take my word for it. Ten years ago we spoke to a man from a think tank called the Futures Group in Connecticut. Hal Becker had spent more than 20 years of his life manipulating the minds of the leaders of our society. Listen to what he said:

“I know the secret of making the average American believe anything I want him to. Just let me control television. Americans are wired into their television sets. Over the last 30 years, they have come to look at their television sets and the images on the screen as reality. You put something on television and it becomes reality. If the world outside the television set contradicts the images, people start changing the world to make it more like the images and sounds of their television.

Because its influence is so great, so pervasive, it has become part of our lives. You lose your sense of what is being done to you, but your mind is being shaped and moulded.”

“Your mind is being shaped and molded.” If that doesn’t sound like brainwashing, I don’t know what is. Becker speaks with the elan of a network of brainwashers who have been programming your lives, especially since the advent of television as a “mass medium” in the late 1940s and early 1950s. This network numbers several tens of thousands worldwide.

Occasionally one appears on the nightly news to tell you what *you* are thinking, by reporting the latest “opinion polls.” But for the most part, they work behind the scenes, speaking to themselves and writing papers for their own internal distribution.

And though they work for many diverse groups, these brainwashers are united by a common world view and common method. It is the world view of a small elite, whose financial and political power rests in institutions that pass this power on from generation to generation. They view the common folk like yourself as little better than beasts of burden to be controlled and manipulated by a semi-feudal international oligarchy, whose wealth, power and bloodlines entitle them to rule.

One of the oligarchy’s institutions for manipulation of populations is located in a suburb of London called Tavistock. The Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, which also has a branch in Sussex, England, is the “mother” for much of this extended network, of which Becker is a member. They are the specialists in *both* hard and soft brainwashing.

The Tavistock Institute is the psychological warfare arm of the British Royal household. The oligarchs behind Tavistock, and similar outfits in the United States and elsewhere, are determined that you should be a television addict, sucking up a daily dose of brainwashing from the “tube;” that is how they control you.

Like his fellow brainwashers, Becker prides himself in knowing the minds of his victims. He calls them “saps.” Man, he told an interviewer, should be called “homo the sap.”

“Soft” brainwashing by television works through power of suggestion. Television watching creates a state of drugged-like oblivion to outside reality. The mind, its perceptions dulled by habituated viewing, is ready to accept any new illusion of reality as presented on the tube. The mind, in its drugged-like stupor of television watching, is prepared to accept that the images that television *suggests* as reality *are* reality. It will then struggle to form fit a contradictory reality into television image, just as Becker claims.

Another Tavistock brainwasher, Fred Emery, who studied television for 25 years, confirms this. The television signal itself, he found, puts the viewer in this state of drugged-like oblivion. Emery writes: “Television as a media consists of a constant visual signal of 50 half-frames per second. Our hypotheses regarding this essential nature of the medium itself are:

“1) The constant visual stimulus fixates the viewer and causes the habituation of response. The prefrontal and association areas of the cortex are effectively dominated by the signal, the screen.

“2) The left cortical hemisphere—the center of visual and analytical calculating processes—is effectively reduced in its functioning to tracking changing images on the screen.

“3) Therefore, provided, the viewer keeps looking, he is unlikely to reflect on what he is doing and what he is viewing. That is, he will be aware, but unaware of his awareness....

“In other words, television can be seen partly as the technological analogue of the hypnotist.”

The key to making the brainwashing work is the *repetition of suggestion* over time. With people watching the tube for 6 to 8 hours a day, there is plenty of time for such repeated suggestion.

## Some Examples

Let’s look at an example to make things a bit clearer. Think back about 20 years ago. Think about what you thought about certain issues of the day. Think about those same issues today; notice how you seemed to change *your* mind about them, to become more tolerant of things you opposed vehemently before. It’s your television watching that changed your mind, or to use Becker’s terms, “shaped your perceptions.”

Twenty years ago, most people thought that the lunacy that is now called environmentalism, the idea that animals and plants should be protected on an equal basis with human life, was screwy. It went against the basic concept of Christian civilization that man is a higher species than and distinct from the animals, and that it is man, by virtue of his being made in the image of the living God, whose life is sacred. That was 20 years ago. But now, many people, maybe even you, seem to think otherwise; there are even laws that say so.

This contrary, anti-human view of man being no more than equal to animals and plants was inserted into our consciousness by the suggestion of television. Environmental lunacy was scripted into network television shows, into televised movies, and into the news. It started slowly, but picked up steam. Environmental spokesmen were increasingly seen in the favorable glow of television. Those who opposed this view were shown in an unfavorable way. It was done over time, with repetition. If you weren’t completely won over, you were made tolerant of the views of environmental lunatics whose statements were morally and scientifically unsound.

Let’s take a more recent example:

the war against Iraq. That was a war made for television. In fact, it was a war *organized* through television. Think back a year: How were Americans prepared for the eventual slaughter of Iraqi women and children? Images on the screen: Saddam Hussein, on one side, Hitler on the other. The images repeated in newscasts, backed up by scenes of alleged atrocities in Kuwait. Then the war itself: the video-game like images of “smart” weapons killing Iraqi targets.

Finally, the American military commander-in-chief Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf, conducting a final press briefing that was consciously orchestrated to resemble the winning Superbowl coach describing his victory.

Those were the images that overwhelmed our population. Only now, months later, do we find out that the images had nothing to do with reality.

The Iraqi “atrocities” in Kuwait and elsewhere were exaggerated. Our “smart” weapons like the famous Patriot anti-missile system didn’t really work. Oh, and the casualty figures: it seems that we

murdered far more women and children than we did soldiers. Hardly a “glorious victory.” But while it might have made a difference if people knew this while the war was being planned or in progress, polls show that Americans no longer find the war or any stories about it “interesting.”

Looking at the question more broadly, where did your children get most of their values, if not from what they saw on television? Parents might counteract the influence of the infernal box, but they could not overcome it. How could they, if they themselves have been brainwashed by the same box and if their children spend more time with it than them? Studies show that most of television programming is geared to a less than 5<sup>th</sup> grade comprehension level; parents, like you, are themselves being remade in the infantile images of the television screen. All of society becomes more infantile, more easily controllable.

As Emery explains: *“We are proposing that television as a simple constant and repetitive and ambiguous visual stimulus, gradually closes down the central nervous system of man.”*

Becker holds a similar view of the effect of television on American’s ability to think: *“Americans don’t really think—they have opinions and feelings. Television creates the opinion and then validates it.”*

Nowhere is this clearer than with politics. Television tells Americans what to think about politicians, restricting choices to those acceptable to the oligarchs whose financial power controls networks and major cable channels. It tells people what has been said and what is “important.” Everything else is filtered out. You are told who can win and who can’t. And few people have the urge to look behind the images in the screen, to seek content and truth in ideas and look for a high quality of leadership.

Such an important matter as choosing a president becomes the same as choosing a box of laundry detergent: a set of possibilities, whose limits are determined, by the images on the screen. You are given the appearance of freedom of choice, but that you have neither freedom nor real choice. That is how the brainwashing works.

“Are they brainwashed by the tube,” said Becker to the interviewer. “It is really more than that. I think that people have lost the ability to relate the images of their own lives without television intervening to tell them what it means. That is what we really mean when we say that we have a wired society.”

## **Turn It Off!**

That was ten years ago. It has gotten far worse since then. In coming issues, we will show you the brainwashers’ vision of a hell on earth and how television is being used to get us there; we will discuss television programming, revealing how it has helped produce what is called a “paradigm” shift in values, creating an immoral society; we will explain how the news is presented and how its presentation has been used to destroy the English language; we will discuss the mass entertainment media, showing who controls it and how; we will also deal with America’s addiction to spectator sports and show how that too has helped make you passive and stupid; and finally, we will show where we are headed, if we can’t break our addiction to the tube.

Democratic presidential candidate Lyndon LaRouche has said that America needs a year of “cold turkey” from television if we are to survive as a nation. So, after what I just told you, what do say, buddy? Do you want to stay stupid and let your country go to hell in a basket? Why don’t you just walk over to

the set and turn it off. That's right, completely off. Go on, you can do it. Now isn't that better? Don't you feel a little better already? You've just taken the first step in deprogramming yourself. It wasn't that hard, was it? Until we speak again, try to keep it off. Now that will be a bit harder.



## Turn Off Your TV: Part 2

### The Making of a Fascist Society

by L. Wolfe

So, how are you doing? I hope you still have that television set turned off. If you don't, you'd better get up and turn it off now, before we go any further: You'll need to be able to concentrate on what I am telling you.

Most Americans think they have a pretty good idea of what fascism is all about. They've seen the pictures, in the movies and on television, of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. The marching jackbooted troops. The huge rallies, with all the flags. The speeches by Hitler, to the cheering approval of enormous crowds of people, who raise their arms in salute at the beckoning of their Fuhrer. Also the pictures of the Nazi thugs breaking windows, the Gestapo and SS troops beating someone, maybe a Jew. Then there are the other images: the scenes after the death camps were opened to Allied troops, the piles of bodies, the bones, the hair, the huge mounds of eyeglasses—and the ovens.

A generation of Americans went to war to defeat that horror; many gave their lives so that such inhumanity might never walk this Earth again. We Americans would never tolerate what happened in Nazi Germany, you say; we'd never let Hitler get that far, and we'd never look the other way in indifference while millions of our fellow men were slaughtered. No sir, not us.

Not us? Think back to a little more than a year ago. Think back to those great parades of troops and equipment celebrating the “glorious” victory of our troops in Operation Desert Storm. There were millions of people, throughout the nation, cheering raising their arms and voices in salute. And there were a hundred million more people watching the celebration on television sets throughout the land. In fact, if you think back, these celebrations, especially the huge ones in New York and Washington, were *organized* by television, with local and national newscasts providing “advance” advertising for the “largest patriotic celebrations in history,” as they were called.

And it was the television set that told you *what* you were celebrating, or why Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf was as great a hero as George Washington or Ulysses S. Grant. This had been preceded by similar “patriotic” coverage on the war itself, before, during, and after the hostilities. You never questioned any of it, and you chose to participate in the celebration, either directly or indirectly.

Only now do you find that you were celebrating the *slaughter* of more than 100,000 innocent civilians—women and children, in large part, and the maiming of tens of thousands more innocents. The approximate one month of hostilities was one of the most savage and intense slaughters of innocents in the history of warfare. And for whom did we fight? Our “victory” placed a despotic ruler, a brutal and fabulously rich ruling family, back on their feudal throne. This is what you celebrated.

There were no Nazi thugs to terrorize you into going along with it all. You became part of a mob, a fascist mob organized by television.

*You and your fellow citizens, brainwashed by television, already live in and tolerate a fascist society.*

Let's state our point another way: *The advent and mass dissemination of television technology has rendered the Nazi model for a fascist society obsolete; it has provided a better, more subtle, and more powerful means of social control than the organized terror of the Nazi state.*

To understand why this is so, we must take a look at that Nazi state, and the fascist society it organized.

## The Fascist Concept of Man

The Nazi state was created by the same oligarchical financial and political interests who today control what we call the mass media and television. Forget about whatever stories you've seen on television about how Hitler came to power: his path to power was cleared by the same oligarchs who employ the brainwashers that program you through television. Over a period of years, following the First World War, Germany was brutalized by the economic policy of this international elite. Hitler's Nazis were funded and promoted as a political option, and then steered into power in 1932-33.

Once in power, the Nazis maintained their hold through the use of terror as part of mass brainwashing. In many ways it were proper to view the Nazi period as an *experiment* in methods of mass brainwashing and social control. At the root of this experiment was the desire to create a New World Order based on reversing a fundamental premise of Judeo-Christian civilization: that man is created as a higher and distinct species from animals, created in the image of the living God and by divine grace, imparted the divine spark of reason. This is what makes man human—his divinely given power of reason. This view of man, the view of the Renaissance, holds that all men are created *equal* in the eyes of the Creator. Society, organized according to such principles, must enable man to seek the Truth as his highest goal, and thereby *perfect* his existence and that of future generations, in accordance with Natural Law.

Such a worldview cannot allow for the existence of an oligarchy who views itself, by birthright and worldly power, as more equal than other men. Such oligarchs, and creatures like their coterie of brainwashers, hold a contrary worldview: Man is an animal, a degraded beast, whose worst impulses must be repressed by the state. Laws are created to *control* these human animals and to allow for the continued existence of the social order. Men, in turn, make a *social contract* to allow themselves to be governed by such laws, which are mutable, since they are government by neither Natural Law nor truth. This is the view of the so-called Enlightenment, and in its extreme form, the fascist state.

The question of the concept of man—as a creative, reasoning human being made in the image of the living God, or as a degraded beast, an animal—defines all other cultural questions. It is the moral—or immoral—underpinning of all societies. For mass brainwashing to work, it must attack the Renaissance view of man, for no person with such a self-conception can be brainwashed. Large numbers of people must be induced to give up beliefs that are the heritage of Judeo-Christian civilization; to do that, religious institutions, such as the Christian Churches, which defend the sanctity of human life, must be undermined and ultimately destroyed.

This explains the peculiar fascination of all brainwashers with Gnostic heresy, Satanism, or what they call “the varieties of religious experience.”

Such concepts as the sanctity and dignity of human life and the perfectability of man, and the principle of progress of human knowledge, the ideas of the Renaissance, have been transmitted from generation to generation. They are deeply imbedded in the human personality, and are the invariant axioms of our culture. To remove them, requires the equivalent of psychological shock therapy. When they are removed, we remove what makes man human, what separates him from the beast: *We have made man bestial.*

## Freudian Mass Brainwashing

The Nazi experiment was aimed at doing that. How did it work? Well now we'll say something that might shock some people: Nazi Germany was an experiment in *Freudian mass psychology*.

That is not to say that Sigmund Freud, the inventor of psychoanalysis, was himself a Nazi; he wasn't a practicing one. But he *shared* the belief of the Nazis and their sponsors that man was an animal, first and foremost. In several locations, Freud makes the case that it is the primitive, animal characteristics of man that are at the center of his emotional life. His life is a conflict between an animal seeking *pleasure* and gratification, and a reality that says that this cannot always be so; thought emerges as the individual tries to balance between the pleasure and reality principles.

Freud saw his work as continuation of that of Charles Darwin, who had "removed man from his throne at the center of the universe," and placed him squarely in the animal kingdom. Darwin saw nothing unique in man, nothing that gave him right to dominion over the Earth, other than sheer power to dominate other species. All that made man what he truly was, was not the work of a God, but of profane, clashing, and blind forces, claimed Darwin; Freud emphatically agreed with the work of "the great Darwin."

This belief that man is nothing more than a degraded beast is at the core of the Freudian system. It is fundamental to Freud's ordering of mental states that he must deny the perfectibility of man, that there can be no absolute truths: man can never overcome his flaws. Psychoanalysis doesn't cure so much as it "enlightens," makes an individual aware of his flaws and neuroses, to learn to live with them, and therefore cope with their debilitating symptomatic effects.

For Freud, man is in a constant state of war with himself, with an infantile "it" (the id) at war with "a little me" or "I" (the ego); this "I" is only slightly less animalistic than the total animal, the "it." Society exerts control over this degraded beast, this animal, through the "over I," mis-referred to in English as the "superego." The "over I," which Freud identifies as moral conscience, bids only that the "it" and the "I" control themselves in the form of a social contract with the rest of society.

Freud states that the "over I" often gets in the way of the legitimate needs of the "I" and the "it." It therefore becomes the source of neurosis, through repression of especially the sexual needs of the "id" and the "I." What Freud calls the moral conscience of society is a source of pain, not pleasure, for the individual.

The sources of human creativity, what distinguishes man from the animal, for Freud comes from *sublimated* sexual drives of the "it" and the "I": The most creative people are either practicing or latent homosexuals. This absurd theory Freud attempted to "prove" in his famous essay on Leonardo da Vinci,

generalizing later to say that all people who follow what they perceive to be moral conscience, are driven toward neurosis. There is no paradise beyond an earthly paradise, Freud says, and all who believe otherwise suffer from a delusional fantasy.

Freud's hatred of all religion, in particular the Roman Catholic Church, is central to his system. Religion is the great illusion that his psychology must strive to remove from man, since religion tells man that he is more than a beast and that he lives for higher purpose than the socially regulated seeking of pleasure.

Man is not made in the image of the living God, says Freud; man has made God in *his* image, for the purpose of easing the pain of his existence. Deriding the great thinkers of the past, he says their defense of religious doctrine is infantile folly:

“We shall tell ourselves that it were very nice if there were a God who created the world and was a benevolent Providence, and if there were a moral order to the universe and an afterlife; but it is a striking fact that this is exactly as we are bound to wish it to be. And it were more remarkable still if our wretched, ignorant and downtrodden ancestors had succeeded in solving these difficult riddles of the universe....

“...[[Yet] you defend the religious illusion with all your might. If it becomes discredited—and indeed the threat to it is great enough—then your world collapses. There is nothing left for you but despair of everything, of civilization, of the future of mankind. From that bondage, I am, we are free. Since we are prepared to renounce a good part of our infantile wishes, we can bear it if a few of our expectations turn out to be illusions” (*The Future of an Illusion*).

The Freudian system is thus a perfect tool for brainwashing, since it negates the moral underpinnings of our civilization, telling us that they are infantile illusion. Without that moral underpinning, man has no moorings and is susceptible to the brainwashers' “suggestion.” All Freudian psychology is a form of brainwashing to one extent or another, because to agree with its premises, one must agree that man is a beast who must deny the existence of universal law and God, the Creator.

Freudian psychology, as preached by either Freud and his followers, or by neo-Freudians like Carl Jung, became the rage in the 1920s. It was promoted in the popular culture through the mass media of its day, newspaper and magazine articles. Its morally insane system of “id,” “ego,” and “superego” became part of the popular culture, as did its belief that creativity stems from sexual drives.

## Mass Psychology

In 1921, before the Nazis had themselves been promoted into a mass phenomenon, Freud published one of the seminal works in his system, *Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the I*. Like the works of Fred Emery quoted earlier, and other brainwashers, this work is at once an analysis of a social phenomenon, and at the same time a “cookbook” on how, through mass psychology, to create such a phenomenon—in this case a mass fascist movement.

Freud uses as a starting point the work of the French psychologist Gustav LeBon, his infamous *The Psychology of the Crowd*. It is LeBon's main thesis that as part of a mass or crowd, man regresses to a *primitive* mental state. A person who may be otherwise highly cultured and moral is capable of acting

like a barbarian, is prone to acts of unspeakable violence and inhumanity, and loses his critical faculties in a large mass of people.

People in a crowd lose their inhibitions and moral standards, and become highly emotional, says LeBon. This emotionalism, this irrationality, lends itself to the power of *suggestion*, through which the behavior of an individual can be determined by his perceptions and the actions of others around him.

LeBon describes this as a return to man's primitive nature. Like Freud, at the center of his belief is the assertion that man is merely a higher animal, whose animal traits are controlled by social norms and the structure of society. Place this animal in a mass of similar animals, and his human identity is crushed: He ceases to think as a human and becomes caught up in instinctive animal-like activity. Man, says LeBon, has returned to his animal roots.

But while he has become at once more primitive, more animal-like and infantile, mass man, the man in the crowd, also has a heightened sense of power, while his individual responsibility for action—a key factor in all moral judgment—diminishes.

Sound familiar? LeBon is describing the behavior of all masses of people organized around emotionalism and infantile activities, such as the crowds at large spectator sporting events, at large rock concerts, at mass demonstrations. It is the psychology of the unthinking *mob*. The masters of people like LeBon, the people who control the brainwashers that program television, have for centuries known that masses in mobs are easily manipulated. From the days of ancient Rome, to the mobs of the French Revolution and the Terror, the oligarchs have used *agents provocateurs* and money to have such mobs do their bidding.

LeBon says that individuals in a mass seem to behave as if they are in a state of hypnosis. But that is where his observations stop. Freud takes it a step further: The most effectively controlled masses are those which are led, by a leader. It is the leader who places the mass under an effective hypnotic spell.

Masses of people, Freud says, can be deliberately induced to give up their moral conscience—the values that underpin all moral judgment. Deep within man's unconscious, is his animal nature. Those urges are repressed by his conscience, which is in turn molded by society. Freud calls this the "I ideal" (the ego ideal), which he later develops into the concept of the "over I" (the superego). The mass itself creates the preconditions for the silencing of the voice of individual conscience; that voice silenced, all that violates the standards of conscience, all the evil in man, can appear, without restraint.

Freud is wrong that man is first and foremost an animal and that all that society does is to repress his instinctual animal behavior. He has laid the basis for a regressive, evil psychology, that can make man *more* of an animal—and hence more easily manipulated by a small ruling elite of oligarchs.

"In my innermost depth, I am really convinced that my dear fellow human beings—with few exceptions—are rabble," Freud wrote to a colleague in 1929.

If you deny, as Freud does, that man's true identity lies not in his individual mortal self, but in the moral acts of that individual, through his powers of creative reason, that live beyond his life on Earth, then you take away man's soul; then man is *reduced* to the animal-like, to be controlled by the power and repressive actions of an oligarchical-controlled state.

“It is just as impossible to do without control of the masses by a minority as it is to dispense with coercion in the work of civilization,” Freud writes in his 1927 attack on religion, *The Future of an Illusion*. “For the masses are lazy and unintelligent.”

Freud, before Hitler and his sponsors published *Mein Kampf*, described the concept of the “Führerprinzip,” the leadership principle around which the Nazi state was organized. In his *Mass Psychology*, Freud argues that any mass, be it a nation, or a randomly created group, must have a leader, someone who gives it its *I ideal* or values. The leader *becomes* the individual member’s common *I ideal* and takes over all his critical faculties, just as the hypnotized individual surrenders his self-determination to the hypnotizer. It is the leader, says Freud, who provides the common bond for a mass of people; their common attachment to the leader enables each member to identify with the other, giving form and direction to the mass.

Freud says that the leader holds an attachment to his followers through what he calls the *aim inhibited libido*--a sexual attraction that is repressed or desexualized. For this to function, however, the leader must remain aloof, with no emotional attachments to anybody, so as create an almost god-like or mystical quality.

The leader must appear to be above the mass, yet part of it; “he loves no one but himself or other people in so far as they can serve his needs,” writes Freud. In that way, the leader “loves everyone.”

Man is most like an animal when he is young. The infantile mind, while still different from the animal in its creative capacities, thinks more instinctively, is more reactive, is more prone to suggestion. Freud’s “Führer” becomes a vehicle to make the masses more infantile; they are thus more easily controlled and manipulated. *They are rendered defenseless against mass brainwashing.*

Think about what we have described about the leader. Now think about what you know about the Nazi state and its Führer. Even the movie images have told you that Hitler organized his followers and the mass of Germans *almost exactly as Freud had described*, with results Freud “predicted.”

Was the Führer a Freudian? It is known that Hitler read LeBon; it cannot be established that he read Freud, especially *Mass Psychology*. But it is clear that those who put Hitler in power and those who steered his movement read Freud, as did most of the ruling elite of the day: It was they who were promoting the Freudian craze and its propagation throughout the world.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 3

### The Making of a Fascist Society (continued)

by L. Wolfe

Some neo-Freudians did become overt supporters of the Nazis. Of them all, the most important was the Swiss psychoanalyst Carl Jung, who had broken with Freud over the latter's refusal to see value in gnostic mysticism and what he called Freud's fixation on the sexual drive, the libido, as the root of all neuroses. Ultimately, Jung came to see in Hitler and the Hitlerian state the proof of his theories.

And, more, Jung saw in Hitler the apotheosis of Jung's own search for a kind of pagan "communion" with the Beyond, a search that began in 1915, with Jung's colossal nervous breakdown.

There is a strong connection between Jung's psychoanalytic theories, which form one of the conceptual bases of "New Age" ideology today, and his Nazism—or, more precisely, his fascination with Hitler. For Jung was obsessed by the notion that the deepest reality, the greatest truth, lay buried in the unconscious, mystical, psychotic aspects of Man's mind, as opposed to the outward, rational, scientific (Judeo-Christian) view of the world.

That was the basis for Jung's decades-long pilgrimage through himself, beginning with his nervous collapse, to find stranger and more distant "truths."

And that was the basis for his attitude toward Hitler: Hitler was the prototype of Jungian man, who surrendered his reason to his unconscious, who welcomed divine madness as Jung himself advised.

Thus, in 1934, Jung was writing of the "formidable phenomenon of National Socialism," which the world beheld "wide-eyed with astonishment." Hitler, he wrote, had "literally set all Germany on its feet." He saw this as the rebirth of the ancient Germanic god Wotan, celebrating his resurrection in an age when "the Christian God had proved too weak to save Christendom from fratricidal slaughter.

"As an autonomous archetype Wotan produces effects in the collective life of a people and thereby reveals his own nature," Jung raved in trying to explain the "formidable phenomenon" of Hitlerism. This god of wind and rain had transformed Germany, this wind that "bestoweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh nor whither it goeth... [it] seizes everything in its path and overthrows all that is not firmly rooted. When the wind blows, it shakes everything without or within."

Earlier, in an essay written in 1932 (but only printed in 1934), Jung had celebrated the "leader [Führer] personality" as against the "ever-secondary, lazy masses, who cannot take the least move in the absence of a demagogue." When he printed the essay in 1934, he specified in a footnote: "Since this sentence was first written, Germany, too, has found its Führer."

In 1933, about three months after Hitler came to power, Jung, a Swiss national, became a minor official of the Nazi state. Shortly after Hitler was named chancellor of Germany, Ernst Kretschmer had

resigned as president of the German General Society for Psychotherapy. His successor was Jung, and Jung's second in command at the society was Dr. M.H. Goering, cousin to Hermann Goering.

Was Jung simply taking the post (as he later claimed) in order to save the delicate plant of psychotherapy from utter extinction by the Nazis? Hardly. His first editorial in *Zentralblatt*, the journal of the society, declared, "In the interest of science, we can no longer ignore the palpable differences, long known to persons of insight, between the Germanic and Jewish psychologies.

Psychology, more than any other science, contains a personal factor, ignorance of which falsifies the results of theory and practice."

The next year, in 1934 in *Zentralblatt*, he published a programmatic denunciation of "subversive" Semitism. To the Aryan unconscious (the collective, or racial, unconscious of the German people, as he phrased it), Jung attributed "the potential energy and creative seeds of a future still awaiting fulfillment, .. [of] the still youthful Germanic peoples."

All this was written in the first two years of the Nazi regime. Perhaps Jung had not yet understood the nature of the beast, of the regime he served?

Not true. In 1938, fully five years after Hitler's accession to power, Jung was able to write with wild enthusiasm of Hitler as a "visionary," an historical phenomenon belonging to the type of the "truly inspired shaman or medicine man," the loudspeaker of the German soul, whose power was "magical rather than political," a "spiritual vessel."

In his interview with American newspaperman H.R. Knickerbocker in October 1938, a month after Hitler had extorted from the West the Munich Pact, Jung said that "Hitler belongs in the category of the truly mystic medicine man.... The outstanding characteristic of his physiognomy is its dreamy look. I was especially struck by that when I saw pictures taken of him in the Czechoslovakian crisis; there was in his eyes the look of a seer.... He is the loudspeaker which magnifies the inaudible whispers of the German soul until they can be heard by the German's conscious ear. He is the first man to tell every German what he has been thinking and feeling all along in his unconscious about German fate, especially since the defeat in the World War, and the one characteristic which colors every German soul is the typically German inferiority complex, the complex of the younger brother, of the one who is always a bit late to the feast. Hitler's power is not political, it is magic."

Hitler's secret was that he allowed himself to be moved by his own unconscious, said Jung. He was like a man who listens intently to whispered suggestions from a mysterious voice and "then acts upon them. In our case, even if occasionally our unconscious does reach us through dreams, we have too much rationality, too much cerebrum, to obey it—but Hitler listens and obeys. The true leader is always led." This, of course, is the significance of Hitler's own, oft-quoted remark, "I go the way Providence dictates with the confidence of a sleepwalker."

Jung predicted to Knickerbocker that England and France would not honor their Munich guarantees to the Czechs, since no nation keeps its word. Then why, Knickerbocker asked, expect Hitler to keep his word? Hitler was different, Jung insisted. "Because Hitler is the nation." This was exactly what Nazi Deputy Fuehrer Rudolf Hess used to scream at the Nazi Nuremberg rallies.



And still, after the war began, Jung remained an enthusiast. As France surrendered to Germany in June 1940—the date, the summer solstice, did not pass unnoticed by Jung and other Nazi mystics—Jung cried ecstatically, “It is the dawning of the Age of Aquarius!”

Even much later in the war, when Jung had come to realize that his future required him to dissociate himself from Hitler’s particular brand of magic, Jung was still certain that Hitler represented Germany in the profoundest possible, mythic and mystical way. In answer to queries from American agents as to whether Hitler could be overthrown internal to Germany, Jung shook his head impatiently. Never could Hitler be overthrown by other Germans; he was Germany. He was the “collective [racial] unconscious of the German people.”

## Mass Media

The Nazis and their organized supporters represented only a *minority* of the German population, even when in power. What about the rest of the people, whom our television documentaries called the “good Germans,” who acquiesced to the Hitler state? How were they made to go along?

That was accomplished through mass terrorization, through both the actual use of jackboot terror and the *implied threat* to use it. It is very possible that the same powers which placed Hitler in power could have done so, by a “putsch,” without a popular election victory. I say that they *chose* not to do it that way, because the psychological considerations required for the Hitler state to take hold demanded that the initial choice of the Nazis appear to be a free one. This heightened the anxiety of the “good Germans,” since they appeared to have brought the terrible state of affairs on themselves. As many Freudians and neo-Freudians who have analyzed the Nazi experiment have remarked, this led the majority of Germans to doubt their own judgment, making them more susceptible to brainwashing.

The structure of the Nazi Party and the Fuehrer state provided organized vehicles for Freudian mass brainwashing. But the principle vehicle was *mass media*. In fact, the Nazis more or less invented *mass media*—the means for the universal or near universal dissemination of “information” simultaneously, in this case controlled through the state.

There were three basic institutions of mass media.

The *print media*, which featured the coordinated control of information disseminated through the press; all information was created and passed through the Information Ministry, under Josef Goebbels. The coverage was orchestrated so as not to appear to be identical, with various papers given particular aspects of a story. But the point is that all the news was managed from the top, including even foreign coverage of German events. Nearly every German could be reached with the message desired in this fashion.

*Film* became a universal mass medium as well, with cinemas established in every town, with feature films that carried brainwashing images of Nazi culture. Such films were often carefully crafted to have the greatest psychological effect, with the Leni Riefenstahl epics such as *Triumph of Will* being the most notorious. Those films and newsreels carefully produced, allowed audiences to become participants in the mass experience of rallies and other events. They provided a bond, as we have described, between the leader and masses and the individual in the mass and his neighbor in other parts of Germany: They

provided a universal brainwashing experience, and were consciously produced to create such a desired effect. Audiences in cinemas routinely joined in Nazi anthems and salutes, at the instigation of the images on the screen. In addition, the films provided the *feinbild* or the pictures of the enemies against which the Nazis were to deploy their mobs. As more than one brainwasher has commented, the Germans were the first to be subjected to the overt use of film for propaganda and the experiment was an enormous “success.”

But the most universal of the mass media was *radio*. As soon as they came to power, the Nazis ordered the production and mass dissemination of cheap radio receivers. By the end of their first year in power, nearly every German household had one; in addition, loudspeakers, hooked to radio receivers and amplifiers, were installed in town squares and other locations throughout Germany.

For the first time in history, an event could be heard by nearly every person in a single country, as it was happening. This is the mass audience that foreshadows our television experience. The concept behind it was the same as we have described in discussing Freud’s *Mass Psychology*: individuals participating in the mass phenomena are susceptible to suggestion, to losing their moral conscience—they become overwhelmed by the mass experience.

Coming across the radio, into millions of homes and thousands of plazas is the voice of one man, the Fuehrer. That fact—that all or nearly all Germans were hearing his voice at the same moment—gave an enhanced power to the message; it created an air of “all powerfulness.” Many commentators have remarked about the hypnotic quality of Hitler’s voice, how it seemed to mesmerize his audience, whether live or on radio or seen in the film. The neo-Freudians would remark that it was not only the quality of the voice, but the sense on the part of the listener of being part of a mass experience, that contributed to this effect.

## Careful Orchestration

Hitler’s speeches were some of the first mass media events in history. They were as carefully prepared and orchestrated as any modern television event; they are comparable to the kind of preparation and buildup, given a media extravaganza such as the Superbowl. In fact, one might say that such people who prepared such mass media events learned their lessons from the Nazis, as we shall later explain.

The speeches were preceded by widespread advertising in the print media and radio, with a buildup of anticipation and excitement. As the moment of the speech approached, the announcers described the frenzy and excitement of the crowd. Hitler’s entrance into the hall was carefully described, also to build tension and excitement. When the speech began, Hitler usually spoke in low and mellow tones, easing his audience into his message. His sentences were simple and usually short. Words were carefully chosen, so as not to be beyond the simplest of listeners. His tone and excitement in voice rose as the speech progressed, eventually shouting his message to his audience. It ended with the crowd roaring its approval, all of which was broadcast without comment. As the Fuehrer left the hall, the commentator would carefully describe the scene, with the emphasis on what the crowd was doing.

But it did not come naturally for Hitler. He carefully rehearsed everything, down to the most minute gestures and eye movements, using photographs to modify his style for maximum effect. Like a television

star, he went over details of the staging of his entrances, the location of the podium, the lighting, etc. with his “stage managers” such as Goebbels.

When brainwashers spoke to Germans after the war, as part of efforts to “psychoanalyze” the Nazi experience, they found few remembered any specific content in Hitler’s speeches. Almost all could remember being part of the experience, if they were in attendance, and most remembered the excitement” in listening to them on the radio. The words “hypnotic” and “mesmerizing” were the most used to describe the Fuehrer’s voice. Even some people who professed to have disagreed with the Nazis grudgingly claimed that Hitler was a “a spellbinding speaker.”

The brainwashers concluded from all this that *mass media* events had caused people to *suspend their belief in reality*, that they had in fact been willing to accept uncritically things being said, which they might have rejected, if they had heard them in another context.

Ironically, the Nazis were working on the next level of mass media technology—television—when the war broke out. Had the war and its production demands not intervened, it is fairly certain that by no later than the mid-1940s every German would have had a television set!

The *mass media* hold of Hitler on the population continued through the end of the war; other Nazi leaders, Goebbels in particular, were said to have had a similar effect. But no one could overwhelm reality like the Fuehrer, or, rather, *the Fuehrer’s mass media events*. Only as the Nazi state collapsed in military defeat and chaos, did this process break down.

## A Society Driven Insane

This is a picture of a society, driven *deliberately insane*. It is all the more cruel for this was done to a great people, chosen as victims because they were great and the carriers of the traditions of the Renaissance through such giants as Bach, Mozart, Beethoven, Schiller, List, von Humboldt. An evil science, Freudian social psychology, was deployed against them, by a sick oligarchy.

During the war, Bruno Bettelheim, a neo-Freudian, published a psychological analysis of the Nazi period at the behest of the network of brainwashers associated with the Tavistock Institute. Himself a concentration camp inmate in 1938-39, Bettelheim describes how under extreme doubt and terror, the individual will regress to an increasingly more infantile state. In that condition, the inmates of the camps started to mirror the personalities and mannerisms of their oppressors, the SS guards. In a widely circulated version of that work, *The Informed Heart*, he indicates that life outside the concentration camps mirrored the psychological disintegration taking place inside: All German citizens were becoming more infantile, less able to act as reasoning adults.

“While the good child may be seen and not heard,” writes Bettelheim, “the ‘good German’ had to be unseen and also dumb .... It is one thing to behave like a child because one is a child: dependent, lacking in foresight and understanding, taken care of by bigger, older, and wiser adults, forced by them to behave, but occasionally able to defy them and get away with it.

Most important of all, feeling certain that in time, as one would reach adulthood oneself, all this would be righted. It is quite another thing to be an adult and have to force oneself to assume childish

behavior, and for all time to come....” “It was not just coercion by others into helpless dependency,” continues Bettelheim. “It was also the clean splitting of the personality.

Man’s anxiety, his wish to protect life, forced him to relinquish what was ultimately his best chance of survival: his ability to react and make appropriate decisions. But giving this up, he was no longer a man, but a child. Knowing that for survival, he should decide and act, and trying to survive by not reacting—these in their combination overpowered the individual to such a degree that he was eventually shorn of all self-respect and all feelings of independence.”

In this way the multi-level experiment in Freudian mass brainwashing worked its evil on the German population. In the end, the Nazis, themselves a group of gnostic psychotics, went predictably out of control and the experiment had to be destroyed; in the interim the Freudian mobs unleashed by the process had destroyed much of Europe. And when it was over, those who had imposed this horror in the world, attempted through mass media to blame their *victims* for the crimes committed. The Germans, whom the oligarchy through their Nazi tools, had tortured in mass brainwashing were told that they were *collectively guilty* for all that had happened. The oligarchy tried a handful of the psychotic Nazis, and in so doing put the whole German nation, one of the greatest peoples on the earth, wrongly in dock at Nuremberg. And while they intoned that it must “never happen again,” they and their brainwashers were already studying where the experiment had gone wrong. They were preparing to do far worse, using a newly developed tool—television—as their more advanced mass brainwashing mechanism to organize a new form of fascist state without the Nazi superstructure.

That’s all for now. We’ll pick up this thread of a fascist state without the Nazi superstructure in the next part of this series, and show you the kind of society that your brainwashers plan for you. But for the moment, I want you to think back to the two images with which we started this section: the Nazi state, and in particular, the Nazi rallies, with the frenzied crowds, cheering their Fuehrer, and the millions more listening, glued to their radios. Now reflect on what we have told you about this, how they were really carefully stage-managed *mass media events*.

Now think about the “Desert Storm” rallies, and the similarities between the two events: at their roots both are *organized, mass media brainwashing events*.

Do you realize that you have been manipulated? You don’t, do you? That is how well the more than 40-year brainwashing of the American population by television has worked.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 4

### The Clockwork Orange Society

by L. Wolfe

I'm back again. I won't even ask you this time whether the television set is turned off. By now, I hope, you realize that it is impossible to think about any important subject as long as it is on. But in case *someone else* has turned the set on, I'll give you a chance to either turn it off or to go to another room before we begin.

The people who had put the Nazis in power never gave up on the idea of mass psychological brainwashing as a means to maintain the power of the oligarchical elite. They only grudgingly acknowledged that the Nazi model of social control, with its requirement for total regimentation, could not have universal application. The question confronting the brainwashers at such places as the Tavistock Institute outside London was how to create a Nazi state in the United States without its now socially unacceptable state terror apparatus.

Americans returned home from fighting a war in which they had defeated a monstrous evil at great human sacrifice. Those involved in the war effort were thus focused on the *higher purpose* in life, the kind of moral outlook that leads an individual to be willing to sacrifice his life, if necessary, to make the world a better place to live in for someone who might come after him, while giving renewed meaning to achievements of past generations. The war effort led to a burst of *cultural optimism* in the population, that made it seem that we could do great things for all mankind.

Now, look around at this miserable nation of ours; it is hard to believe that it is the same place as 40 or 50 years ago. For most people, there is little or no purpose to life, except to survive to the next day. Our people have a deep-seated *cultural pessimism*, and are cynical about nearly everything.

Now, think hard: over the last 40 years, while our moral outlook has collapsed, what became a constant, ever-present part of your life. That's right, *television*, that box in your living room. That realization is necessary to understand what I am about to tell you.

### The New 'Leader'

The evil Sigmund Freud, in his work *Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the I*, said that an individual's moral inhibitions and outlook can be broken down as part of a mass or crowd. According to Freud, people in crowds or masses behave as if they are hypnotized: A person becomes more infantile, and hence more like an animal under such circumstances, and loses the power to reason critically. By using the power of mass suggestion, a new outlook, based on different ideals can then be substituted for values a person had previously held.

Freud says that each mass has a leader, who serves the function of hypnotist. It is to the leader that the individuals in the crowd surrender their ideals, and it is from the leader that they receive their new values. It is at the will and word of the leader, that the mass or mob can be deployed.

Freud claimed that the leader principle worked as a brainwashing tool because of some innate need of man to be led; this merely betrayed his own oligarchical outlook. He believed that man was merely a two-legged animal, whose basic animalism could be induced to come to the fore in mass situations.

Freud is wrong: Man is not an animal; however, he can, under conditions of mass psychosis, through brainwashing techniques of the type described, be made to *act as if he were an animal*. The key to mass brainwashing is to create the kinds of *organized, controlled environments* in which *tension* and *stress* can be applied to break down morally informed judgment, thereby making an individual more susceptible to *suggestion*. Such *controlled environments* are organized so as to appeal to base emotionalism, sensuality, and even eroticism--“feelings” that make man “one with animals”—and not to man’s higher reasoning capabilities which truly distinguish him from the beast. It is this fact, and not merely the size of an event, that makes the brainwashing possible.

For the brainwashers, what was required for a new system of mass social control was a means to organize a *mass appeal to emotionalism*; the more overpowering and all encompassing that appeal, the better. The more infantile the population could be made, the less their resistance to suggestion and manipulation.

In television, they found the tool to make that constant appeal to infantilism, organized on a mass basis. It had the potential to reach into *every* home, to reach *every* citizen with a set of messages and suggestions. It also had the ability through the control and dissemination of information, to create large *controlled environments* by creating your perceptions of events. *Television is the new “leader,” the technological equivalent of Hitler.*

Writing in 1972 with Eric Trist, formerly of the Wharton School and now of the University of Toronto and the leading Tavistock brainwasher in the United States, Fred Emery says:

“We are suggesting that television evokes a basic assumption of *dependency*. It must evoke (this) because it is essentially an emotional and irrational activity.... Television is the non-stop leader who provides nourishment and protection.”

Emery and Trist report that the population has never been told this about television and writing for a handful of fellow brainwashers they are now about to let this secret out:

“... the questioning and confrontation of television has been put aside in order to maintain its role as the *leader* in the dependent mode.”

They note that *all* television has a dissociative effect on mental capabilities, making people less able to think rationally. Harkening back to the studies of the Hitler experiment, they find that this confirms the thesis that “the leader should be ‘mad’ or a ‘genius,’ yet all the same people feel compelled to believe that he is a dependable leader.”

Emery and Trist, after looking at over 20 years of television brainwashing, comment; “In other words, television can be partly seen as a technological analyst of the hypnotist.”

The more you watch, the more susceptible you become to suggestions from your *leader*, the television. “... It turns you off [to] reality and time,” Emery and Trist write, commenting that

comprehension of time relationships and reality are required for an individual to take reasoned, and purposeful action.

In looking at the effects of habituated television watching, Emery and Trist cite studies proving that it does neurological damage: “*Our thesis is that television produces a quality and quantity of habituation that approximates the destruction of critical anatomical structures.*”

They report, however, that the damage is not irreversible. The neurological problems can be cleared up within a few days of halting the six to eight hours of daily viewing. The effects on the ability to reason and on moral value structures are far more difficult to “clear up”:

“Man can (therefore) be seduced from purposeful functioning in such a way that he is unable to become aware of his deficit.”

## Social Turbulence

Now, we are ready to look at what the brainwashers and the oligarchs who have deployed them have in store for you.

Many neo-Freudians have criticized Freud for presenting too biologically oriented a system. They say that Freud failed to understand how much of a role the *social environment* plays in shaping the personality of the individual. A new social psychology must place an emphasis on the role of tension-filled environments in shaping the personality or the “ego,” producing regression to more infantile, or “id-like” personalities.

According to the view of personality held by Tavistock’s Emery and Trist, the *social environment* is either *stable*, at which point, people are more or less able to “cope” with what is happening to them, or it is *turbulent*, at which point people either take actions to relieve the tension, or they adapt to accept the tension-filled environment. If the *turbulence* does not cease, or if it intensifies, then, at a certain point, people cease being able to adapt in a positive way. At that point, Emery and Trist say, people become *maladaptive*--they choose a response to tension that degrades their lives. They start to *repress reality*, denying its existence, and constructing increasingly more infantile fantasies that enable them to cope. All the while, their lives are becoming increasingly worse, when measured by value structures of a short time before; to avoid this contradiction, people, under conditions of *increasing social turbulence*, change their values, yielding to new *degraded* values, values that are less human and more animal-like.

Sound like a bunch of gobbledegook? Well in a certain sense it is: Morally reasoning individuals, cultured by 2,000 years of Christian civilization, do not think in such ways. They would reject barbaric choices, the so-called critical choices, where none are good. They would seek Truth, and by seeking Truth, find ways out of the brainwashers’ mind trap.

Forty years ago, our responses to problems, and our moral outlook were different. You would have probably rejected the kinds of critical choices you are offered today. But that was *before television*: Forty years of television have eroded your ability to make moral choices, have steered you into critical choices. You have followed your *leader*, television, down a path to Hell.

## Looking into Hell

Twenty years ago, the brainwashers, Emery and Trist, laid out some scenarios for the future based on a *permanent condition of social turbulence*. There might be brief periods of respite, but, according to them, the world would become increasingly more chaotic and violent.

In the hands of those with the power to make policy—to create the *social turbulence*--what they have written is a cookbook recipe for a desired “future.” It were proper to look at what they produced, back in 1972, as the psychological warfare underpinning, the mass brainwashing concept, behind the political doctrines of such institutions as the Council on Foreign Relations and the Trilateral Commission. It for such people that they were written.

Their forecast—a period of continuous turbulence, especially economic turbulence leading to economic decline—had its political corollary in the CFR’s *Project 1980s* reports drafted in the mid-1970s. There, we find reference to plans for the “controlled disintegration” of the American economy.

In 1972, twenty years of television-watching in the United States and most of the West had left populations with three basic *maladaptive* scenarios for dealing with the tension.

One scenario is called *superficiality*. It is a form of psychological retreat, an attempt to simplify choices. Tension, say Emery and Trist, makes man desire to break free of the emotional values formerly placed on choices. A person reduces the “value of his intentions, lowering the emotional investment in the ends being pursued, whether they be personally or socially shared ends.... This strategy can only be pursued by denying the deeper roots of humanity that bind ... people together on a personal level by denying their individual psyche.”

Emery and Trist, writing in the Vietnam era, point to drug-soaked rebellion of the “flower children” against society as an example of how this scenario functions. Fighting an increasingly senseless and brutal war, the older generation begins to ultimately accept the moral decadence of the drug culture of its children, rather than seek conflict. Society as a whole accepts a *lower moral standard*, posited as a higher value.

Citing the Frankfurt School philosopher, Herbert Marcuse, popularized by the 1960s counterculture, Emery and Trist say that under such conditions choice becomes meaningless. What is important is “the moment,” and “the momentary experience becomes all,” they state.

Quoting from Marcuse in his *One Dimensional Man*, Emery and Trist say that modern society is thus confronted with “the rational character of its irrationality.”

The organized societal response to this process is best identified by Aldous Huxley’s *Brave New World*, the drug-controlled society, in which there are *no* individual moral choices. They identify the 1960s counterculture as “pioneers” for this scenario.

The second scenario involves the *segmentation* of society into smaller parts, of a size that one might be more easily able to cope. “There is an enhancement of in-group and out-group prejudices as people seek to simplify their choices,” say Emery and Trist.

“The natural line of social divisions have emerged to become barricades.”



In this scenario, it is every group—ethnic, racial, sexual—against the other. Nations break apart into regional groups, those smaller areas in turn fissure into even smaller areas, along ethnic or other lines. It is an incredibly violent scenario, but a violence associated with a purposefulness of sorts, in individual defense of each ethnic or other group.

The organized social response to such a psychological and political disintegration is the Orwellian fascist state, modeled on George Orwell's book *1984*. In the book, individuals turn to "Big Brother" to regulate their lives and conflicts among various castes within society. A continuous conflict among three superpowers, writes Orwell, is "waged by each ruling group against its own subjects, and the object of the war is not to make or prevent conquests of territory, but to keep the structure of society intact..."

While noting that the Orwellian scenario is not acceptable in its fully regimented form, any more than Nazism could now be replicated in its exact form, Emery and Trist state that there are nonetheless obvious parallels in the "Cold War" to the Orwellian "war of each against all"; they comment elsewhere that, should the Cold War collapse, the ability to control a segmentation scenario on a societal scale would also collapse.

The third scenario is most intense, involving a withdrawal and retreat into "private world and a withdrawal from social bonds that might entail being drawn into the affairs of others." Emery and Trist caution that *dissociation* is not the more assertive statement of "me first," of personal selfishness that became the hallmark of the 1970s and 1980s. Fearing the terror that surrounds him, the individual seeks to avoid all forms of danger entirely. Individuals seek *invisibility*, to fade into their environments; they see nothing and no one, so that no one might see them.

The brainwashers remark that *dissociation* has always been a response of sorts to living in a city. People tend to "look the other way," at some of what is going on, just as the person who rides the subway tries to "remain invisible" although in a crowd.

Here we can see how Freud and others' predictions about the behavior of crowds or masses of people is specific to only certain types of specially organized experiences: ones in which the mass is organized around appeals to emotionalism, that lead to the regression of the individual to an infantile state of mind, to an animal-like "freedom" of hedonistic expression. Emery and Trist describe a level of *dissociation* so great that the individual is reduced to an animal. He withdraws from the terror around him, and like an animal "playing possum," tries to hide.

With individuals withdrawn into their fantasies, their minds numbed and brainwashed by their televisions, the brainwashers "predict" that men will be willing to accept "the perverse inhumanity of man to man that characterized Nazism"—not *the structure* of the Nazi state, but the *moral outlook of Nazi society*.

Ultimately, the majority of people withdraws so far that they don't even bother to go to their sporting events or rock concerts: *they have such experiences mediated through television*. It is the television that "gives them solace," write the brainwashers.

To survive, such individuals require the comfort of a *new* religion; the old religious forms, especially Western Christianity, demand that man be responsible for his fellow humans. The new religious forms, will be a form a *mystical anarchism*, a religious experience much likened to satanic practice of the Nazis

and the views of Carl Jung. Again, it is to be television that provides the “social glue” that binds the minds of the population to their new religious forms: It is television as the leader, in this case, the *anti-Christ*.

## A Clockwork Orange

The organized social response to *dissociation*, say Emery and Trist, is a society described in the pages of Anthony Burgess’s novel *A Clockwork Orange*.

In the book, Burgess depicts a society gone controllably mad. A majority of people are engaged in useless “schooling,” a few engaged in mind-destroying trivial labors, and somewhere, there are people running all this as if it were an insane zoo.

Senseless violence is everywhere in the streets, committed by gangs of youth who lust for blood. In a typical *Clockwork Orange* street scene, a gang of drugged, outlandishly dressed teenagers viciously beats an old man. He had it coming, said one of the gang members; everyone knows that if you go into certain parts of town, you will be beaten and raped.

There is no politics to any of it: Burgess made sure that his “hero,” Alex, repeatedly makes clear that he is *apolitical*. Alex speaks a language invented by the linguist Burgess, appropriate to his infantilism; It is never translated—the reader is forced to “learn” what it means by description or “word pictures.”

Burgess provides no explanation about how society got this way; there is no war or other social calamity referred to. “That’s just the way things are,” one character says.

*A Clockwork Orange* portrays a society dominated by infantile animal-like rage. The *dissociated* adults cannot exert moral authority over their children, because they are too involved with their own infantile fantasies, brought to them through their television sets. Even as they watch the reports of the daily mayhem, they convince themselves that it isn’t *their kids* who are doing this.

For Emery and Trist, Burgess’s *Clockwork Orange* vision is the Nazi state without the superstructure. It is organized disorder, without moral control.

It is the force of the mass communications media, the *power of television*, however, that is driving us toward the *Clockwork Orange* society. As we have explained in previous sections, television, when watched in habituated, long viewing induces *dissociation*. It also provides the tension and images of violence required to create the form of social organization in *A Clockwork Orange*. Under its ever-present eye, the *leader*, television, transforms children into beasts like Alex and parents into impotent caretakers of beasts.

Over time, one state of mental and social disintegration can transform itself into another. Given the power of television over society, all states will tend to become more *dissociative*, more like *A Clockwork Orange*. As the Futures Group brainwasher Hal Becker put it back in 1981, “Orwell made a big mistake in his *1984*. Big Brother doesn’t need to watch you, as long as you watch it.”

That is enough for now. When we speak again, I will explain how the programs you watch on television have been crafted to brainwash you.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 5

### The Programming of America by Television

by L. Wolfe

Reflect on the following for a moment: Suppose someone told you that they wanted you to take a large dose of a mind-deadening drug, and that after you took the drug, they were then going to suggest that you do things that without taking the drug you would probably never conceive of doing. And, they also told you that *you would not be held accountable for what you did, that you would have no conscious memory of what took place*. Would you take it? Definitely not, you say, no way.

Yet, for the last more than 40 years, the majority of Americans, like yourself, have been taking a daily dose of a mind-deadening drug, one of the most powerful ever invented--*television*. With your mind in a deadened state, things have been suggested to you that, were you alert and reasoning, you would have rejected. And, *over time*, under the continual dosage of this drug, you have followed the suggestions, changing the way you think about yourself and the world around you. And, you never knew that this was happening and you may even yet, despite all the things we have already shown you, have trouble believing it. That is how complete this brainwashing process is, how strong is its power over you.

People like Sigmund Freud, his direct followers in the psychoanalytic movement, and the neo-Freudians that split from him, as well as all *social psychologists*, deny the existence of the universal truth that man is made in the living image of God and is therefore distinct from the animal. They deny that man has been endowed by his Creator with the Divine Spark of reason, and that by the gift of reason, man can *consciously* perfect his knowledge. For them, creativity is fundamentally an unknowable, mystical, concept, an act linked to repression of carnal and sexual desires.

By denying these most fundamental of truths, they deny the existence of any truth. They seek to impose on mankind a *paradigm shift that will wipe out 2,000 years of Christian civilization*, returning man to a bestial and primitive social order.

Using television as their weapon, the brainwashers have launched a 40-year assault on the universal truths of Western Christian civilization and on the concept of universal truth itself. In place of morally informed reason, in the absence of universal truth, they have raised the false god of *popular opinion*. As we shall show, they have consciously targeted *the higher moral values* of society, and even the idea that there could be a set of true moral values, seeking to substitute *amorality* as the axiomatic assumption.

#### Reality as Opinion

Once the concept of universal truth is obliterated, reality can be redefined by internal “perceptions” or “images” of that reality. Those perceptions and images are then validated by *popular opinion*. Reality becomes a set of conflicting opinions validated by a mass consensus.

Freud, in discussing this transformation in his 1921 *Mass Psychology*, identifies the process in masses of people as a loosening of the hold of what he calls moral or social conscience (the “Over I” or “superego,” as it is mistranslated in English) over a person’s more infantile and hence, more animal-like

nature (the I and It, or the “ego” and “id”). To use a term developed by the neo-Freudians, the individual becomes more “other-directed,” governed by the perceived opinions of others, and thus, more easily manipulated.

Television brainwashing works through the manipulation of images and perceptions to cause a *paradigm shift* in the “public mind.” It does this through what the television people appropriately call *programming*, the content of which is shaped and fine-tuned by “social analysts.”

Let’s see how Walter Lippmann, one of the earliest practitioners and theorists of the mass manipulation of opinion, describes the process. Lippmann, trained by the British psychological warfare unit at Wellington House during World War I and a follower of Freud, was to become regarded as the most influential American social and political commentator of the first half of the twentieth century.

In 1922, following the publication of Freud’s *Mass Psychology*, Lippmann authored a handbook on the manipulation of the public mind, titled *Public Opinion*. In its introductory chapter, titled “The World Outside and the Pictures in Our Heads,” he describes the concept of public opinion:

“Public opinion deals with indirect, unseen, and puzzling facts and there is nothing obvious about them. The situations to which public opinion refers are known only as opinions.... The pictures inside the heads of these human beings, the pictures of themselves, of others, of their needs, purposes and relationship, are their opinions. Those pictures which are acted on by groups of people, or by individuals acting in the name of groups, are Public Opinion with capital letters.... The picture inside so often misleads men in their dealings with the world outside.”

While television might shift some opinions relatively quickly, a *paradigm shift* involving the *axiomatic* assumptions that govern all individuals thinking in a society does not occur overnight; it occurs over a long period of time, in stages.

Think about a profile of the American population, correlating it to the cumulative amount of television viewing.

First, you have a generation which was born before the advent of television, the generation who fought in World War II; they had the strongest set of moral values, since they were influenced by the war experience and their parents’ strong moral values. They were the most resistant to brainwashing.

Their children, the “baby boomers” of the 1947-55 period, were the special targets of the brainwash programming, as we shall show. They have been subjected to television brainwashing all their lives. All succeeding generations have been totally immersed in the television brainwashing experience.

Thus, you have an older generation which has been watching television since approximately 1950, and successive generations who have been watching for their entire lifetimes.

Now, you have parents who were themselves reared by television, raising children, who were reared by television, who are now starting to have children themselves: three successive generations subjected to television brainwashing, without any conscious memory of anything different.

With this profile in mind, focus on the following: The goal of television programming is to make each succeeding generation more infantile, more animal-like, more amoral, thereby *shifting* the value structure

of the whole society. By the end of the process, the parents of the “baby boomers” have adopted all the fundamental, infantile assumptions of their children.

## The Lost Generational War

The Tavistock brainwashers Fred Emery and Eric Trist, writing nearly 20 years ago, identify the crucial period in this brainwashing process: the point at which the pre-television generation tried to raise their “baby boom” kids, approximately 1949-69. They note the following scenario. Throughout the period, children’s television watching increased, especially as the number of shows oriented to them increased; at the same time, adult watching increased. Children, they say, learned from what they saw their parents doing: It became socially approved behavior to watch television.

But then something interesting happened: The television, itself, took over as a surrogate parent. Children watched to amuse themselves, and were encouraged by parents to do so. They became habituated to watching.

The images presented on the screen were more real, more powerful than the outside world. The messages presented in the shows became more important to the children than what they were told by their live parents.

Children watched the same shows, often with their friends, and talked about the shows, socializing the experience. Emery and Trist, citing the work of others, report that television became the “Pied Piper” for the children, the *leader* that they followed.

The whole process created an estrangement between child and parent, although not necessarily apparent at first, creating a crisis in the fundamental unit of social reproduction, the family. It was only as these baby boomer children grew into adolescence in the 1960s that the conflict broke into the open. Write Emery and Trist:

“a generation of children grow up on a TV diet, and the more affluent get sets, then multiple sets, the more likely to use it as substitute for a presence with their children. The children grow to adolescence, spend less time viewing, but have a different world view. They challenge the world view of the parents, face to face....”

In previous generational challenges, Emery and Trist write, the disciplinary authority of the adult society ultimately won over its young-adult values. But this time, adult society had lost its ability to discipline; the adults had been infantilized by their own television watching. The generational war is lost, Emery and Trist write, as all society plunges to a new, *lower* infantile level. The behavior of the children—the drugs, the sex, the anti-social behavior—is excused or to use a brainwasher’s word—*rationalized*, with the help of the messages contained in television programming.

Emery and Trist reach a startling conclusion: The generational war between the so-called counterculture and the generation that fought World War II will be the last such sharp confrontation of values. Under the influence of television, each succeeding generational transfer of power will be smoother: When the adults are infantile already, it is more easy to accept the infantilism of their youth. The children, they state, may be violent, insane and anti-social, but no one will assert that it isn’t their right to be so!

To understand better how we got into this mess, we are going to have to go back to the early period of television in the 1950s, and show how what you watched as a child helped determine your values as an adult.

As we said, the “baby boom” generation was the first to be reared by the television set. By 1952 there were already 30 million TV sets in America; by the end of the decade the penetration in American homes was near universal. This provided the basis for mass brainwashing, targeting especially the children born since 1949.

It is important to understand that the brainwashers think in *long time spans*. They know that it is impossible to effect any significant change in social values over anything but time frames measured in several generations. Hence, the messages presented in mass television programming in the 1950s, which were planned to *play back* one and two decades hence. In the same way, what you and your children are watching today, will shape the first part of the next millennium.

While your brainwashers think in *long periods of time*, you are being induced to think in shorter and shorter time frames. Your attention span is shrinking almost daily. For example, the average half-hour television show is broken into at least four segments, with usually the longest running no more than five to six minutes, with the remaining portions occupied by commercials, theme, and credits. Television news presents items in 30 second bites, with slightly longer feature pieces. The very nature of the majority of your television viewing makes it impossible to consider difficult concepts, especially developments over long periods of time.

## Cultural Warfare

Your brainwashers themselves actually fall into two major categories.

They both have the same world view—the concept of man as a beast, to be controlled and manipulated like an animal—but there is a division of responsibility between them. There are the people like Emery and Trist and others at places like Tavistock, who create and analyze mechanisms for brainwashing, who study the effects of this brainwashing with what are called *profiles*, and who make recommendations on how to do it better. They work as social psychologists, and in similar professions.

Then, there are the people who create the *idea content* of the brainwashing. They operate on the culture or *paradigm*, as we have explained—the sets of axioms that govern the way we think. These are the *cultural warfare* experts, who create the value systems which are in turn imposed on the society by the brainwashing mechanisms, such as television.

In the late 1930s and during the war, operatives of the Frankfurt School were involved in major studies of mass radio programming, and their effects on the population. Their work, with Tavistock-linked personnel, in what was known as the Princeton “Radio Project” provided important conceptual material for later, mass television brainwashing.

One of the key early pioneers in television brainwashing techniques was Theodor Adorno, a Frankfurt School operative and a former member of the “Radio Project.” Adorno shared the bestial outlook of the neo-Freudians, developing, along with others associated with the Frankfurt School network, a perverse theory on the use of mass communications technology for mass brainwashing. Given the appropriate

message content, said Adorno, media such as television and radio, could be used to make people “forcibly retarded.” An adult personality could be reduced, through interaction with mass media, to a more primitive, childish or infantile state.

In a 1938 report, Adorno compares the retardation capability of existing media. Radio has one level of effect, but sound film is an even more powerful “retardant,” Adorno indicates. Television is yet another level more powerful, said Adorno in 1944: “Television aims at the synthesis of radio and film, and is held up only because the interested parties have not yet reached agreement, but its consequences will be quite enormous and promise to intensify the impoverishment of aesthetic matter so drastically....”

In the minds of Adorno and his “fellow travelers,” the power to control the new medium meant the power to determine and control the values of society: “Television is a medium of undreamed of psychological control,” Adorno wrote in 1956.

That same year, Adorno wrote an essay titled “Television and the Patterns of Mass Culture” that elaborated on the brainwashing techniques that could be employed with television. It was intended as a cookbook and discussion guide for people involved with the programming. For people like ourselves, intended television brainwash victims, it provides insight into how the messages in the programming can be “decoded.”

Outlining his study, Adorno writes, “[We will] investigate systematically socio-psychological stimuli typical of televised material on both the descriptive and psychodynamic levels, to analyze their presuppositions, as well as their total pattern, and to evaluate the effect they are likely to produce. This procedure may ultimately bring forth a number of recommendations on how to deal with these stimuli to produce the most desirable effect....”

Adorno states that all television programming contains an *overt* message as defined by plot, characters, etc. in the images presented and a *hidden* message that is less obvious, and is defined by the larger intent of those presenting the images. These *hidden messages* are the brainwashing content, while the *overt* message—the plot, etc.—is the *carrier* of that brainwash content.

The *hidden message* operates on the mind so as to cause *value conflict* over a period of time. As we have stated before, the conflict will not surface immediately, but occurs over generational time spans. The *hidden message* in a show may not surface for 10-20 years as a change in attitudes of the majority of the population, but Adorno asserts that *it will ultimately surface*. This is the concept of *playback* to which we have referred in other sections of this report.

## Those ‘Wholesome’ Shows

To make his point, Adorno unmaskes the *hidden message* of a number of popular shows of the early television period.

*Our Miss Brooks*, a popular situation comedy (sitcom), pitted a trained professional, a school teacher, against her boss, the principal. Most of the humor, according to Adorno, was derived from situations in which the underpaid teacher tried to hustle a meal from her friends.

Adorno “decodes” the *hidden message* as follows: “If you are humorous, good-natured, quick-witted, and charming as she [Miss Brooks] is, do not worry about being paid a starvation wage. You can cope with your frustration in a humorous way and your superior wit and cleverness put you not only above material privations, but also above the rest of mankind.”

This *message* will be called forth years hence, as the economy collapses in the form of a “cynical anti-materialism.” It came forth with a vengeance among the 1960s “lost generation,” and the first wave of the “counterculture.”

Generalizing from this, Adorno points out that it is *social tension and stress* that call forth the television images of *pyschodynamic stereotypes*, the role models and images from the early television viewing. The more confusing life becomes, the “more people cling desperately to clichés to bring order to the otherwise un-understandable,” Adorno says.

Another “decoding” by Adorno emphasizes this point. Remember the show, *My Little Margie*? The heroine of this sitcom was a pretty girl who played “merry pranks” on her father, who is portrayed as well-meaning but stupid.

Adorno says that the *hidden message* is the image of an aggressive female successfully dominating and manipulating the male father-figure. He “predicts” that years later, that young girls will increasingly mirror this image of the “bitch-heroine.” Little Margie is the role model image for the feminist movement of the 1960s and 1970s that took off as the *My Little Margie*’s viewers grew up.

The messages need not be contained within a single show; they could be transmitted through a series of images contained as primary or secondary features within *several shows*. For example, Adorno indicates that several shows featured characters who were artistic, sensitive, and effeminate males. Such images cohered with Freudian notions that artistic creativity stemmed from either a repressed or actual homosexual passion. These effeminate, sensitive males usually come up against the other more, aggressive male “macho” images, such as cowboys, who are uncreative.

Recognizing the psychological power in the *hidden image*, Adorno predicts that the “creative sissy” will find an “important” place in society. Such images are *playing back* today in the spread of homosexuality throughout society, and in all creative arts.



## Turn Off Your TV: Part 6

### Television's Killing of God

by L. Wolfe

One of the fundamental relationships that defines our civilization is that of man to God. That relationship is mediated through organized religion. It is religion that teaches the values and *axioms* of western Christian civilization, which creates in the individual the capacity for moral judgment that must inform our reasoning processes.

As we have explained in another section of this report, the evil Sigmund Freud, whose mass psychology became the basis for theories of mass brainwashing, hated all religious belief, precisely because it told man that he was endowed with divine powers to perfect his existence; according to Freud, this belief, the root of our moral conscience, brought man into conflict with his more infantile desires, thus causing neuroses.

Freud's system and its variants in social psychology must deny the perfectibility of the soul, as described by Dante as the passage of man from the Inferno, through Purgatory, to Paradise; man, the two-legged animal, must not aspire to be any more than he is, a beast, at war with himself, whose base emotions must be repressed and controlled.

In the early 1950s, the majority of Americans still actively worshiped God in churches and synagogues. The practice of religious belief was an *axiomatic assumption* of American life, even if Americans did not always act according to those beliefs. Television could not *actively and openly* attack this; to do that would bring down the wrath of an angry nation on the new medium, and lose its potential hold over the population.

So the programmers took another tact: *Television shows made organized religious belief, invisible, made it disappear from the screen.* Studies of the content of television shows in the 1950s show almost no references to church-going or religious activities.

Think about such shows as *Leave It to Beaver* or *Father Knows Best*. Do you ever remember those families going to church or discussing religious beliefs? Do you even know what faith those families were? You don't because they never told you: They never discussed such matters.

Most importantly, when these families had problems, did they ever turn to their church or their religious leaders as resources to help solve them? Never. They were all worked out within the family—in the absence of organized religion or religious beliefs. The family and its values were thus *secularized* and what were once called moral and religious values became known as *family values*--a secular belief structure that has nothing to do with fundamental values of western Christian civilization.

This was the *hidden message* of those so-called wholesome family shows of the 1950s, the ones that some Moral Majority-types and people like Tipper Gore now hold up as examples of a golden era of television!

The *playback* came in the late 1960s, with the nation convulsed in generational battles over values, triggered by the Vietnam conflict. Tavistock brainwasher Fred Emery noted at the time that, unlike previous periods of social chaos, in the late 1960s no one was turning to organized religion to help find a way out, to seek more fundamental values that could bind together society and troubled families alike. Instead, he describes the rise, especially among the television-weaned baby boomers of a *mystical anarchism*, that rejected all organized religion as false and “sought a new definition for God.” This is the “New Age,” the “Age of Aquarius,” preached by Frankfurt School gurus like Herbert Marcuse.

More recent surveys taken by Tavistock’s population profilers show that fewer people than ever before say that they hold *strong religious beliefs* of any kind. A standard answer has a person saying that he was brought up religiously, “but no longer practices any organized religion.”

## We’re All Animals

Now, let us turn our attention to how the programmers created an identity between man and the animal.

One of the earliest forms of children’s programming was cartoon shows; often those shows had human hosts, such as *Bozo*, or *Terrytoon Circus’s* Claude Kirshner. But the majority of the content of the half-hour shows was the five to six minute cartoons. Much was made in those early days about how silly and innocuous the cartoons were, with some parents’ groups complaining that there should be more “content” in children’s programming.

But they weren’t innocuous. Almost every cartoon portrayed *animals* acting as if they were human beings. Studies of children who had a daily, steady diet of television cartoons show that the kids lost their ability to see the difference between most animals and human life: The animal kingdom appeared to mirror human society. The children identified with certain animals as “heroes” and feared others as dangerous “bad guys.”

The same kind of cartoon fare had been available to Saturday matinee and other movie audiences. But children went to the movies at most once or twice a week, for an hour or two. During the first 10 years of television, children aged 2 to 10 watched more hours of cartoons than they spent doing any other activity. They received more than an hour and a half a day worth of cartoon brainwashing.

Toward the end of the decade, the cartoon shows started to mirror adult television: *Yogi Bear* and other Hanna-Barbera features were put in the weekly series format, to create a regular, habituated audience. As some of the programmers predicted, this format also drew adult audiences to the cartoon series.

## That Lousy Mouse

The most powerful of the children’s shows were produced by Walt Disney Studios, which had years of experience in producing a mass brainwashing product directed at children. Walt Disney and his brother Roy were both involved in the production of propaganda films during World War II, overseen by the Tavistock-dominated Committee for Morale. His studio was the first to produce feature-length cartoons that incorporated human and animal characters; Disney recognized that the cartoon, with its color and larger-than-life imagery, was the perfect vehicle for carrying “messages” to children. His films, such as

*Sleeping Beauty* and *Snow White*, were all aimed at becoming universal experiences for generations of children and their parents, containing *moral messages* that would stay with a child through most of his or her life.

Thus, it was not surprising that the most popular children's show of the first television decade was the "Mickey Mouse Club", which mixed cartoon, movie and live interaction between human and animal characters.

The "Mickey Mouse Club" was *an experiment in mass brainwashing of children through television*. Around the show was built an actual club organization, which by the end of the decade had more members than the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts combined. Along with membership came a club magazine and other items, which, in turn, suggested other group activities, which usually meant the purchase of some Disney-licensed toys and paraphernalia.

Each child at home was "indoctrinated" in a membership ritual, with prompting from the television, and was urged to sing-along with songs, with words flashed on the screen, and chant things as instructed by their television group leader. They did so while wearing their "mouse ears," which were designed to make them identify with an animal figure, Mickey Mouse.

At the end of each show, there was a sermon by the "group leader," a young adult male, whose preaching was reinforced by statements from the "live" Mouseketeers in the studio, each of whom was known only by his or her first name. The sermon usually spoke of the need to honor parents and other family members, and to do "good" things for little creatures and other little children. All of this was done while children at home and on the stage wore their ears and gave their "club salute."

There had been other children's clubs before, around radio shows such as "Captain Midnight," and around television figures like Roy Rogers or "Howdy Doody," but nothing on the scale of Disney's Mickey Mouse Club, and nothing organized around identification with an animal. American children had been given a new pagan-like religion, and its god was a mouse!

The parents saw nothing wrong in this. The mouse, through his surrogate, his human spokesman on the show, Jimmy, supported "American values." Children were being "taught" to respect their parents, to be "patriotic" and to act well-behaved. The parents were happy to let a mouse, or rather television, through a mouse, give those values to a generation of children.

Reflect for a moment on a different time and a different place. There was another generation of children whose values were given to them in an organized form from someone other than their parents. *The Hitler Youth* of Nazi Germany. They too had their rituals, their uniforms and symbols, and their songs. They too had their leaders, who preached sermons. And they too were "taught" to be "patriotic" and respect their parents, and to always be polite and well-behaved. Remember what we said: the Nazi state and values without the Nazi baggage. Mickey Mouse, the Fuhrer? Makes you think for a moment, doesn't it?

## Those Murderous Animals

One of the “values,” that was inserted into the various serial adventures within the “Mickey Mouse Club’s” format was the need to protect “little creatures” and “nature” against greedy man, who would destroy them to make money. Similar themes were contained in the prime time “Walt Disney Presents” series.

Meanwhile, other more “standard” format shows, such as “Lassie” and “Rin Tin Tin” created further identification between children and the animals. In these shows, the animal was the “hero,” who often defeated bad people, sometimes without the help of any human intervention. In each case, the shows featured a young boy or girl, who was protected by the animal (in the two cases cited, dogs). As later brainwashers’ studies found, this made the images on the screen easier for the children viewers to identify with.

All of this identification with the animal, and the blurring of the distinction between what is human and what is animal, *played back* a generation later in the lunacy of the environmental movement.

Now, it’s 1990. Those nice stories about “cute little animals” have turned a bit gruesome. The average nature show, whether it be on cable, on the networks, or on public television, shows animals killing each other and copulating. Some of the Moral Majority-types are a little squeamish about the copulation, but they apparently find little wrong with the violence.

The new shows have the blessing and the guidance of various psychologists, who have profiled children’s responses to the animal gore and sex. They openly state that the shows provide lessons for children about *human behavior*, since the animals merely reflect the darker side of man’s own nature. Eli Rubinstein, a psychologist working on the American Psychological Association’s task force on television and society, claims the violent nature documentaries “puts human behavior in context.” He says that parents should watch such shows with kids so that they can use them constructively to “reinforce positive human behavior.”

Such shows are especially good at explaining to children why it is bad to create large populations. The children can see that unregulated population growth leads to death and suffering, these brainwashers say.

Thus, the next generation of children are to be told that they are to mimic “good” animal behavior and avoid the more nasty stuff. We don’t want too many children, now, do we? And you tolerate this brainwashing and may even participate in it, as the psychologists “recommend.” This is where those cartoons and Mickey Mouse have led us.

Next time you’re around an environmentalist over 35 years of age, ask him if he still has his “mouse ears.”

## And Justice For All

Now, let’s take a look at another brainwashing message, *justice, as carried out by law enforcement officers*, and see how television handled it. Here we will see how the hidden message shifts to an increasingly more fascist outlook.

In the first decade of television, the image of law enforcement was conveyed in both the westerns and the so-called “cops and robbers” shows. Children watched both, since they were on during prime time and were among the most popular viewing for families.

Usually, the law enforcement officers were either the heroes, or major secondary characters, who worked with the heroes to solve problems. The sheriff or the detective or police officer was the “good” guy, who risked his life to protect citizens from “bad” criminals.

The simple message delivered was “crime doesn’t pay.” What was crime or criminal activity? Anything that violated the law. And what determined the law? On what principles was a society governed by law founded? Certainly not on the concepts of charity and justice contained in the Bible or on the concepts of Natural Law embodied in our Constitution. At best, what was shown was that the law was based on a *social contract* to control the worst elements in society. At worst, it was shown to be based only on retributive justice--“an eye for an eye.” As studies of the program content of such shows as “Gunsmoke,” “The Untouchables,” or “Dragnet, show often such “justice” was swift and final: More often than not the “bad guy” wound up dead, without any trial.

As television entered its second decade, the brainwashers altered the programming content. With the baby boomers approaching adolescence, new shows started portraying the *corruption* in society and the legal system. The series “The Fugitive,” for example, featured as a hero a man wrongly convicted of murder, running from the law while trying to find the person who framed him. Each episode showed the corruption in the society around him, including corrupt lawyers and police officers.

Other shows had plot lines with the message that crime was a *sociological problem* and that *justice could not be found inside the “system.”*

Such images, imprinted on the minds of impressionable adolescents and children growing up, *played back* during the “revolution” against the social order in the late 1960s.

More recently, television provided new messages telling viewers that the “system” had become so corrupt, that the corruption was everywhere: Judges were crooked, law enforcement officials were crooked, etc. The heroes of shows are now people who operate outside any law, who bring people to justice one way or another Rambo-style. A new fascist vigilantism is being organized by such shows as “Dark Justice” about a judge, who seeks to destroy people whom he cannot convict in his courtroom.

The brainwashing message: *Constitutional law is itself a means to protect only the criminals and must be side-stepped to achieve “justice.”*

This message finds no contradiction in the images from 35 years ago that lie in the recesses of the minds of the baby boomers. The westerns and “cops and robbers” shows told you that justice is defined by the “eye for an eye” dictum, and that most often it was found at the barrel of a gun.

## **The Sexual Revolution**

Finally, let’s turn our attention to one of the most discussed questions about television programming: the widespread sexual content of shows. A flip through the dial makes it obvious that there is plenty of every kind of sex one could imagine on the tube, and what isn’t shown explicitly in network prime time,

is implied in dialogue. But it wasn't always that way. Again, we will see how the images have shifted, to an increasingly debased level.

Let's go back to the 1950s again, when the brainwashing of the baby boomers started. In the early television shows, there was no depiction of any sexual activity and almost no discussion of the matter. Those early shows supposedly featured "wholesome" family situations, at least if you believe what some of today's television's critics now tell us. But the brainwashing message was more subtle. It didn't rely on visual image or dialogue.

It is important that we make some distinctions about "love" and "sex." The very fact that people focus on "sex" or "sexual activity" already reflects a debasement of fundamental human emotions into their most carnal. We must draw a distinction between what is commonly called "sex" or "love," and the concept of Christian love, known as *agape*. Man, as distinct from the beast, can experience love, in its most profound sense, as separated from instinctual cravings of animals, and to experience such love is joyful.

There is no separation of the mind from such emotion, no split between emotion and reason, in this most fundamental sense of the concept of love or *agape*. It is this concept of love, as in man's love of God, that is the fundamental emotion, that truly makes man human. To say that all human society is fundamentally based on man's love of God and his fellow man is not incorrect.

To reduce love to simple emotion, and to further reduce it to a sexual attraction, is a degradation of man. The Freudian paradigm and all its derivatives deny the existence of a love that is anything different than carnal or romantic. Any other kind of love is defined as *neurotic*, the product of a denial of man's basic *animal* instincts. In the Freudian system, *agape* has been replaced by *eros*, whose carnal cravings must determine all human relationships.

There is no better example of *agape* than the love and joy that a parent feels in seeing his or her child develop into a reasoning, human being. The tears of joy that come to parents' eyes when they see a child understand something for the first time are indicative of a profound emotional experience. This *fundamental* emotional experience puts man in touch with his human identity.

The goal of the brainwashers was to destroy *agape*, using television as their weapon. Over a period of several generations, television would steer man away from *agape*, and place him under the thrall of *eros*.

As we have stated, the earliest television was in no way sexually explicit or even implicit: The prevailing morality within the society, though weakened by hedonistic pursuits, would still not tolerate that. Instead, what was presented were simple *romantic* notions or no notions of love at all. Further, studies done during this early period revealed that early television reinforced infantile concepts about "boy meets girl" and "infatuation," which, in turn, reinforced "common knowledge" among children and adolescents about human relationships. The Frankfurt School crowd realized that by presenting no *positive* concept of loving, they were helping to "wipe the slate clean," leaving the door open for more debased images at a later point.

But there was another flank to the attack on *agape*, one with a more *hidden* message. Emery and others studying early television found that such shows as "Father Knows Best," "Ozzie and Harriet, and

“Leave It to Beaver,” had a secondary effect on the children viewing them. The fictional parents were portrayed as “perfect,” without flaws.

No real world situations were actually solved so perfectly. Tension was thus created between the *image* of the “perfect parents” that appeared on the screen and the *real* parents who lived in the children’s homes: The latter could never measure up to the former.

Meanwhile, the parents, who watched these shows with their children, were being shown television images of kids who were nothing like the real thing: They were too “good,” too well-behaved, too respectful. When they tried to measure their own kids against the tube’s images of children, they found their own wanting.

The brainwashers noted that this was the first generation whose images of parents and children were coming into conflict with reality. An obvious conclusion can be drawn: the early television programming message *played back* in the generational war of the late 1960s, when the tension exploded into anger and rage.

As the baby boomers reached adolescence, they were bombarded with new, more degraded images of “love,” and “love-making,” which were to prepare the way for the next phases of the “sexual revolution.” Only ten years earlier, the images and situations of “Love, American Style” or “MASH” would have been unthinkable to put on television.

A new image started to enter the scene: the shattering of the nuclear family, the fundamental unit by which society is reproduced. In the early 1970s, shows featuring unwed mothers, extramarital affairs, adultery, people “living together” out of wedlock were widespread. Sex and sexual references were everywhere on prime time.

A study was done comparing a week of prime time shows during 1975, 1977, and 1978, which shows how fast this *carnalization of America* was spreading: “[C]ontextually implied intercourse increased from no weekly occurrences in 1975 to 15 in 1977 and 24 in 1978; sexual innuendoes increased in frequency from about one reference per hour in 1975 to 7 in 1977 to 11 in 1978. Most dramatically, verbal references to intercourse increased from 2 occurrences in 1975 to 6 references in 1977 to 53[!] in 1978....”

It isn’t just the amount of sex being shown and referred to on television, but the *messages* that accompany it. For example, in the early period of television, which we will define for our purposes as prior to the 1969 season, a study done by a research team and published in the excellent source book *Watching America*, showed that 38 percent of shows “presented extramarital affairs as wrong. The proportion dropped to 7 percent after 1970. Before 1970 none of the shows ever portrayed recreational sex as acceptable without qualification. In prime time’s passionate world of the 1970s and 1980s, 41 percent of the shows viewed portrayed recreational sex as acceptable without qualification, and 33 percent made no moral judgement.”

The same book notes: “On the TV screen, sex is usually without consequence, without worry and with rarely a bad experience.”

The images of the 1970s are *playing back* with a vengeance in the 1980s and 1990s. There is an important point to be made here. While changes in values do not occur overnight, they are occurring at

an increasingly rapid pace. This has to do with the cumulative effect of television brainwashing on an increasingly amoral and immoral population. *As morality collapses and breaks down, there is less resistance to suggestion in the individual.*

The authors of *Watching America* sum up television's view of eros, and what the message is that television delivers to its brainwash victims: "Today television is both willing to talk about sex and tell the truth about it as the Hollywood community sees the truth. That truth is roughly, that sex is important, it needs to be dealt with, in all its diverse expressions, and those who would suppress it from popular entertainment are doing the mass audience a disservice. Indeed the real villains on programs that deal with sexual issues are ... the Moral Majoritarians who would deny romance its natural physical expression, restrict free expression and much-needed information, or condemn 'deviant' social victims like gays and prostitutes who are no different than the rest of us except in one minor regard—their sex lives. As for extramarital sex, it's a fact of life, which popular entertainment would be foolish to ignore or treat moralistically according to outmoded standards."

They note that television, with its power, need not be direct in its advocacy: "As a leading form of mass entertainment television rarely mounts the barricades. Instead it breaks down barriers one by one, gradually extending the limits of social acceptability."

How well this brainwashing has worked is reflected in some new reports from the Census Bureau, based on 1990 data.

-some 61 percent of all adults are wed, compared with 72 percent in 1970.

-In 1970, 85 percent of all children under the age of 18 lived with two parents; now only 72 percent do. Divorce caused 37 percent of the single-parent homes. In 33 percent of the single-parent homes, the parent has *never* married.

In a reflection of the infantilism that now grips society, these reports also show that a larger number of youth aged 20-30 continue to live at home with their parents than at any time in recent history, be they single or married and *regardless of economic circumstances.*

## **Brainwashing by Remote Control**

In the early days of television, the Hollywood-based programmers were *directly* influenced by Frankfurt School operatives. Now, most of the people in charge of programming, both in writing and producing shows and determining which of those produced make it on the air, are in the approximate 35- to 45-year-old age range. In other words, the programmers themselves have been brainwashed by 40 years of television programming! To use a television metaphor, *the brainwashing is now taking place on remote control.*

This is confirmed by a profile made by the authors of *Watching America*. Their survey of a random sampling of the top 350 people involved in television programming reveals the debased moral value structure that now determines what you watch:

-some 73 percent of this crowd comes from either the Boston-Washington corridor or California.



-Although 93 percent had a religious upbringing (59 percent were Jewish), 45 percent claimed no religious affiliation or belief in God; those who said that they had retained some religious faith, said that their religious affiliations were nominal; 93 percent said they seldom or never attended religious services.

-some 75 percent described themselves as “left of center” politically and “liberal.” These “liberals,” however, are strong believers in “free enterprise,” and almost all support the “free market system of economics.”

-some 43 percent think that the American system of government and the Constitution need a “complete restructuring.”

-some 91 percent are in favor of unrestricted rights to abortion; 80 percent believe that there is nothing wrong or abnormal about homosexuality, with 86 percent supporting the rights of homosexuals to teach in public schools. More than 83 percent think that extramarital affairs are okay, while 51 percent do not think that there is anything wrong with adultery.

In addition, nearly all support a radical environmentalist agenda to one degree or another. No question was asked about whether they believed that man was a beast, but their other answers reveal that their answer would have been a resounding “yes.”

Finally, asked which groups should influence American society the most, they listed consumer groups and intellectuals at the top and religion at the bottom. Two-thirds believed that it was their role to program television entertainment to promote “their” social agenda.

Think back a moment to those figures from the Census Bureau on the American family, which showed in statistical form the collapse of the nuclear family. Can’t you see the correlation between those figures and the degenerate values of the television programmers?

## Remote Control

Let’s go back to the *remote control* concept for a moment.

Back in the early days of television, you had what you could appropriately call some “hands on” brainwashing—you had that crew from the Frankfurt School operating out of Hollywood, designing the programmed brainwashing messages. But such people as Theodor Adorno realized that this tight control would not always be necessary to accomplish the task. The brainwashing messages of the 1950s and 1960s were conditioning responses in a new generation of programmers who would start having impact on programming content in the 1970s and 1980s.

The operative concept is similar to what Adorno describes with his “forced retardation.” You create a society based on the infantilism of the majority of its members; that society bombarded with television, becomes increasingly more infantile, more *dissociative*, as we learned from Emery and his fellow Tavistockian Eric Trist. Under such conditions, the so-called creative individuals, operating within the infantile geometry of the society as a whole, produce new ideas that further feed the infantile, carnal impulses of the individual. This in turn plunges the society to a new, *lower* level of thinking: People become more stupid, led by their stupid “creative leaders.”

The oligarchical elite, through their control over the television and cable networks, as well as the Hollywood studios, and the advertising funding conduits, keep this entire crew of “creative” people in a *controlled environment*. It is in that *indirect* way that they exert a veto authority over what is being broadcast.

The New York-Hollywood social community of “creative” people functions in what the brainwashers call a *leaderless group*: They are unaware of the real outside forces that control them, especially unaware of their own brainwashing by 30-40 years television viewing. They believe themselves free to create, but they can lawfully only produce banality.

Ultimately, these creators of our television programming turn to their own brainwashed experience and values for their “creative inspiration.” One producer was asked by an interviewer how he determined what was in his shows. “I think of the audience constantly,” he replied. But when asked to elaborate on how he knows what would appeal to them, he replied, “I think of myself as the audience. If it pleases me—I always think that it is going to please the audience.”

The authors of *Watching America*, who interviewed numerous producers, agreed with the conclusion, “What you see on any television show reflects the morals and conscience of the people on those shows who have influence.”

## The Invisible Government

The power that such people have over our minds and the way they function as a “leaderless group” was understood by the original theorists of mass brainwashing. Eduard Bernays, Freud’s nephew, who was trained with Walter Lippmann at the Wellington House psychological warfare unit in World War I, wrote in a 1928 book *Propaganda*:

“The conscious and intelligent manipulation of the organized habits of the masses is an important element in democratic society. Those who manipulate this unseen mechanism of society constitute an invisible government which is the true ruling power in our country.

“We are governed, our minds are moulded, our tastes are formed, our ideas suggested largely by men we have never heard of.... Our invisible governors are, in many cases, unaware of the identity of their fellow members of the inner cabinet.

“Whatever attitude one chooses to take toward this condition, it remains a fact that in almost every act of our daily lives, whether in the sphere of politics or business, in our social conduct or ethical thinking, we are dominated by a relatively small number of persons ... who understand the mental processes and social practices of the masses. It is they who pull the wires which control the public mind, who harness the social forces and contrive new ways to bind and guide the world.”

*An invisible government* acting through the power of the television brainwashing medium to control our world! Sounds fantastic, but after what we have shown you, it is impossible to deny. It is important to keep that in mind: Somebody is responsible for what is happening to you, for how your morals and society have degenerated. *And they planned it to be that way!*

## Decoding Some Messages

Now we are ready to apply what we have learned. It's time to take a look at a few more recent shows to see if we can discover how you are being brainwashed. We'll see if we can uncover the "hidden messages."

Let's start with an easy one. Let's take one of the most popular children's television show, the one that everyone says that your kid has to watch to successfully adjust to society:

"Sesame Street." Did you ever really watch it? Given what we have been talking about, what's the first thing that you see: The show is dominated by animal-like creatures with human characteristics, the famous Muppets. It's symbols are "Big Bird" and "Miss Piggy." A child relates to these puppets as real objects, thereby creating a bond between the child and the beast-like creatures. The *hidden message* is not all that different from some of the early children's programs we have already discussed.

That would be bad enough, but, governed by a new bunch of programmers and child psychologists, "Sesame Street" seeks directly to preach to the children its brand of amorality. The Muppets talk openly about environmental questions, while also infusing a heavy dose of "be good to Mother Earth" in the "teaching" of the alphabet and reading skills. The show also is infused with rock music, or "kid rock" as it is called. More recently, it has used "rap music" as a "teaching device."

All of this is sold to people in an advertising package that tells parents that "Sesame Street" is a "great teaching" institution. It has been incorporated into the classroom experience for kids from pre-school to day-care to public school. But studies demonstrate that the show does not enhance learning; in many cases, it appears to inhibit their ability to understand more complicated ideas. More importantly, the studies indicated that the children appear "addicted" to the show, and by that "addiction" to become addicted to television viewing in general.

As Neil Postman, a New York University professor, wrote in his book *Amusing Ourselves to Death*, "If we are to blame 'Sesame Street' for anything, it is the pretense that it is an ally of the classroom.... 'Sesame Street' does not encourage children to love school or anything about school. It encourages them to love television."

Some of "Sesame Street's" biggest defenders are those very same critics of television from the so-called radical right. They defend it because it doesn't show violence or sex, and upholds "family values." In the most recent debate over funding for public television, Sen. Jesse Helms (R-N.C.) rose to defend "Big Bird" on the Senate floor: "If anyone wants to know whether Jesse Helms of North Carolina votes for Big Bird, I do. And I vote for 'Sesame Street!'"

The majority of America's brainwashed parents agree with Sen. Helms. They see nothing wrong with the show because it "sounds" right to them—it contains the same cacophony of ugly noise that permeates every aspect of their lives. And, most importantly, it keeps those kids "occupied," as they sit staring at the tube. They even find some of the little scenes mildly amusing—as they are intended to be by their producers, who claim that a good third of their audience are adults. Together with their children they have made "Sesame Street" goods and services a *\$1 billion* industry, one that, unlike the rest of the economy, is expanding each year!

And you don't even think it's odd that your three-year-old daughter wants to grow up to be just like Miss Piggy! Look into those blank stares the next time they watch: See your child being brainwashed.

Okay, we'll try another one. Let's take one of those "deeper" shows, the ones the so-called critics tell you are "socially relevant." How about "The Wonder Years"? Here we have a series about growing up in the 1960s, from the perspective of an adolescent.

Does the show focus on any of the real horror of that period? Does it show the chaos, the drugs, the destruction, the collapse of social values, that we talked about? No siree. It was all a good time back then, or so we are told. It was full of simple problems, like how to relate to the girl you had a crush on or your sister's hippy life style or how to make your parents not act so "square." And when some social issue enters into the show, it is handled with the kind of sugary-sweet moralism that has more to do with the current degraded moral values of its producers than it does with the confused history of the 1960s.

"The Wonder Years" is a controlled *flashback* for baby boomers to what they would *now* like to "think" the 1960s were like. By so doing, the producers have put you in touch with your most infantile and banal emotions, and made you feel nostalgic for them. The *hidden message*: In these difficult times, one had best cling to memories and values of one's infantile past.

The show bonds a 40 year-old infant to a romanticized view of his adolescence, making him that much more infantile. It might even make him pull out one of those old Jimi Hendrix albums.

"The Wonder Years" is part of a genre known as "nostalgia" shows and movies. They made one for the 1950s adolescents, called "Happy Days" which aired in the 1970s, and they will no doubt make one for the 1970s teenagers later this decade.

Try to think of them in another way. Think of television as a big eraser, wiping away your real memories of the past, the reality of the way things really were. With "the slate now clean," the tube superimposes a twisted and distorted view of that reality through an appeal, not to your mind, but to your infantile emotions. If they can make a majority of people believe that the 1960s were whatever they depict them on the screen, then television has created a *new reality, a new history*.

We'll take one final example, one of the most popular shows: "The Simpsons." A cartoon series about a family with three kids, the older one being especially obnoxious and manipulative. The parents are depicted as self-centered and stupid, and extremely banal. The obnoxious kids, especially Bart, are the heroes of the show, around whom the plot develops. This then is the brainwashers' image for the family of the 1990s: one dominated and effectively run by obnoxious, almost devilish children, which causes some conflict with the banal parents.

"The Simpsons" family life both mirrors and shapes perceptions of the real, banalized life of families outside the tube: The experience is mediated through television, which explains what is happening to them. In a famous episode, the father, Homer, sees a television report that an accident has happened to him, which causes him and his family to try to find out whether it did indeed happen; in the end, they bring their lives into conformity with the screen's image. As Homer, says, "The answers to life's problems aren't at the bottom of a bottle. They're on TV."

The show is popular with all age groups, but has a cult following among children and adolescents. Bart Simpson is the hero of their generation, whose face appears on their tee-shirts, whose mannerisms and whose slang expressions they have adopted as their own. But not just the kids; the whole society has accepted Bart Simpson as a role model, so much so that he is used by the government to preach an anti-drug message. President Bush quotes him. So does Bill Clinton.

“The Simpsons” hidden message: There exists no real moral or adult authority in this world, save the television; in such a world, it is the children who must assert themselves, assert their right to be infantile; parents are powerless, save for occasional brute force, to do anything but assent. It is the image of the *Clockwork Orange* society packaged in a more palatable fashion; Bart Simpson is the brutal Alex’s alterego.

## It’s Your Turn

Now, if you remember way back when we started this section on programming, I said that I would ask you at some point to turn on your television sets. Well, we’ve reached that point.

I want you to turn on your set during prime time for an experiment. I want you to see if you can find the hidden messages in prime time series. Exclude the news and newsmagazine shows; we’ll be dealing with them in our next section. But take some other series and see if you can pick up the brainwashers’ hidden message. Try this with a few shows.

Don’t worry if you make some mistakes. Think about what we have learned in our study of television so far and take a stab at it.

It’s a form of therapy: Once you realize that *you are being brainwashed*, your mind still has the power to discover the means by which it is being accomplished. Use your mind and you have started to make yourself less capable of being brainwashed. But be careful: Don’t leave that set on for too long! Remember, watching it for any length of time—for a few hours—will make you stupid. So shut it off after trying your hand at a bit of *deprogramming*.

When we talk again, we’ll explain how television news and opinion polling prevent you from understanding the world.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 7

### Here Now the News....

by L. Wolfe

I'm not even going to ask if the television set is turned off. I know that it is: I'd be very surprised if it were not, after what you have learned from the preceding sections of this report.

But I suppose that I should remind people who may not have followed all that we have said or who are coming into this dialogue at this point, of the ground rules. Since watching television limits your powers of comprehension, we require that the set be turned off while you concentrate on what we are saying. So, if there are any sets on out there, now is your chance to turn them off.

Okay, we're ready to begin. In this section of our report, we are going to explain how you are brainwashed and controlled by the *news* you watch on television.

### It's All the Same

"More Americans get their news from ABC News than any other source." So says the trailer to the nightly news broadcast on that network. Let's modify the statement a bit: More Americans "get their news" from television news broadcasts than any other source. That is the result of recent surveys, but it has been true for almost three decades.

Of the *six to eight hours a day* Americans spend in front of their television sets, one to two hours is spent watching news or news-related programming. On average, most people watch at least one news broadcast in the evening, either the national network news or local news, and then watch a wrap-up news show in the later evening. A housewife will generally watch an additional "early evening" news broadcast, occasionally leaving the news on in the house continuously between 5 p.m. and 7 p.m.

Viewership studies, as recent as spring 1991, show that if the television set is on during dinner hours between 5 and 7 p.m., it is more than 80 percent likely to be tuned into news programming.

Content analysis of the news broadcast during these hours, both national network programs and local news, shows that, from channel to channel, the principal stories covered—the so-called "lead" and secondary "lead" items are *identical* in all major aspects. Flipping the channel from one news program to another, also shows that beyond these "lead" items, most other news items reported are identical in major content, varying only in the order of presentation. The text read by news anchors is also strikingly similar, as are the picture images that accompany the text.

To the extent that there is any variation, it is in what are called news features or human interest stories, and even there the difference in coverage tends to be slight.

Even the breakdown of the time spent for each major category of story on the network news is *identical* across the networks. A 30-minute nightly news broadcast consists of 22 minutes of "news." Each network spends between six and eight minutes on national news, four and seven minutes on

international news, seven to ten minutes on so-called special reports and one to two minutes on so-called soft news about entertainment or media, etc. The remaining eight minutes are commercials.

The compositional breakdown of all local news telecasts is similar.

No wonder few viewers could tell the difference between the *content* of the different networks' and local stations' broadcasts. When asked in a recent survey to cite a difference, most could only name the different "anchor" people or sportscasters.

Focus on this for a moment: Every night, at approximately the same time, nearly every American between the ages of 10 and 80, watches the *same* representation of what has taken place in the world that day.

Think back to what we described in an earlier section of this report about Nazi Germany, about their propaganda machine. Now you can understand why former CBS chairman, the late Bill Paley, once said that television created the capability to "out-Goebbels, Goebbels."

## The News, In Brief

And what is it that all of you see and hear, as you "get your news" each evening? A *New York Times* piece on local television news begins with this description:

"Another night, another nightmare. The teenage killer gives way to the subway slasher. The face of the weeping mother dissolves into a close-up of a bloodstained shirt. House fires become 'raging infernos.' Traffic snarls. Kids fall out of windows. Babies die in random shootings. Manhunts are commonplace. "She killed for love. Details at Six."

All "stories" are told in brief, most running no longer than 30 seconds. A *long* story runs a minute. Voice over pictures. Short interviews, usually only a few sentences. The average 30-minute segment may report as many as 40 items in this manner, in a seamless style, broken only by slightly longer features, followed by a sports report and weather. Is that the world? Are the images and pictures being presented *reality*, or only a distorted and edited version of something that the news show *tells* you is reality? How would you know?

Let's ask the question another way: Given the way the news is presented, in these short items, does your mind ever engage in deliberative thought about any single item? Or, isn't it the case that you watch a news show, never thinking about any item at all, merely taking in the "information."

This would explain the startling results of some studies done by brainwashers to profile TV newscast audiences. They have found that the average viewer cannot remember *facts* from any story presented, even only a few hours after the broadcast. Instead, viewers remember only vague generalities about what they saw, an impression about the way the world looks, according to the news broadcast: "There were a lot of killings. The economy is doing badly and the President isn't doing anything about it. Donald Trump has a new girlfriend. And, oh yes, the Mets lost."

The items remembered relate to the *emotional connection* made by the individual to the totality of what is being reported. For example, the *fear* associated with the increase in crime, causes such stories to

“pop out.” As the stories move from “hard” news to human interest, the tension lessens and infantile emotional connections take over. Although, as we stated, most people remember little about what they saw in general, they remember relatively more about these human interest stories.

The brainwashers call this type of memory *selective retention*. They say that television causes people to *suspend* their critical judgment capabilities. Whether a person is watching news or regular programming, the combination of sound and images places the individual in a dream-like state, which limits cognitive powers. In that condition, a person can merely *react* to whether what he sees and hears coheres with his opinion of what the world is like.

These opinions created by television news have such power that they will overwhelm a contrary reality. Think about that news broadcast cited. Most likely the “crime” stories were about blacks killing blacks, or blacks killing whites. In a controlled test, people were shown a story about a white man threatening a black man with a razor. When asked to recall what they had seen, a significant minority of the audience, both blacks and whites, of varying ages, responded by saying that the *black man had the razor* and was threatening the white person!

The ordering of stories on a news program helps *program* this process of *selective perception*. The most tension-causing or fearful story of the day is usually put first, followed by stories of decreasing tension. The brainwashers say that this *encodes* those stories with an order of importance. This is not to say that the programming is trying to make you *think* about what you are viewing: They are merely stimulating you enough to *receive* the message being transmitted. In fact, by watching the news for all these years, you have been conditioned to *expect* this type of ordering. You don’t have to judge what is important, it’s the first few items they report, isn’t it? The rest is merely filler.

Now, let’s go back to that report of what one viewer saw, in watching one to two hours of news. Only four items are recalled, or more precisely *played back*. The first item is about killings, a collage of reports about violence in international affairs, with some national and local murder stories. That is the principal image: a violent and degraded society.

Then we have the next item about the state of the national economy and the President: This is the lead national news item, reduced to its simplest, fear-ridden image. This is the secondary image conveyed in the overall reporting, one that resonates with the fear of daily life.

Then “a big fire,” which was probably a story with pictures, that was near the lead of the local news.

Then a “human interest” or entertainment story about “the Donald,” the soap opera saga of Trump’s affairs, which has been effectively serialized over a period of months and years. The mere mention of such stories is usually enough to cause most of the audience to remember something about them.

Finally, we have a sports score, indicating the viewer’s obsession with a local team.

What is the ordering principle? *Primary image*: degraded view of man as an animal, killing, murdering, raping. Violence as a primary mode of existence. *Secondary image*: economic collapse, fear and hopelessness, leading to a sense of bewilderment. The other stories remembered deal with infantile obsessions.



This, then is the *picture of man and his society* planted in the minds of Americans watching the news on that given day. That is how the brainwashers use the news: not to inform, but to paint *a picture in the minds* of viewers of reality, one that is neither questioned nor thought about, but is simply there.

## The Cult of Public Opinion

The brainwashers understand this concept of *painting pictures* in your minds. They call it the making of *public opinion*.

In a previous section of our report, we referred to a quote from a book by Walter Lippmann, the famous commentator. We explained that Lippmann had been part of the World War I British psychological warfare unit at Wellington House that studied the manipulation of “mass opinion.” Lippmann was also an admirer and student of Freud, and was especially struck by Freud’s book, *Mass Psychology*. For our present discussion, we draw renewed attention to the following quote:

“Public opinion deals with indirect unseen, puzzling facts and there is nothing obvious about them... The pictures inside their heads of these human beings, the pictures of themselves, of their needs, purposes, relationships are their public opinions. These pictures are acted upon by groups of people, or by individuals, acting in the name of groups are Public Opinion, with capital letters....”

Lippmann says many of these pictures are what he calls *stereotypes*, shared, common *perceptions* of the categories of things: “All blacks are like ...; all Italians are like ...; etc.” Such “stereotyping” is possible, he says, because people seek simple explanations for complex problems, because they prefer to see every individual as part of some social group or mass. “Everyone knows that all Germans are like ...” Stereotyping, which plays upon individual racial and other prejudices and is reinforced by the media, becomes the principal way that the *image of man* is socially communicated between groups of men within society.

Lippmann wrote this before the advent of television. His later work discusses the potential for radio to place such *images inside people’s minds*. But television, with its ability to provide simultaneous audio and visual messages, creates even more powerful and overwhelming *pictures* than radio. And television, as we stated, has the capability to cause one to suspend *critical judgment of reported information*.

Remember Hal Becker, the brainwasher from the Futures Group, who calls man “homo the sap”? Becker contends that through the control of television news programming, he can create *popular opinion* on a nightly basis; and through the control of *popular opinion*, he can manipulate the way you think and act about the world you live in. Listen to what he has to say about how easy it is to *shape your opinions*:

“Americans think they are governed by some bureaucrats in Washington who make laws and hand out money. How wrong they are. Americans are ruled by their prejudices and their prejudices are organized by public opinion.... We think that we make up our minds about everything. We are so conceited. *Public opinion makes up our minds*. We do, generally, what we perceive public opinion says we should do. It works on our herd instinct, like we are frightened animals.”

Before we discuss more about how this is done, we must examine what lies behind Becker's arrogant assertion of how easy it is to manipulate you. To do that, we must show you how closely you actually do act like the animals he asserts you are.

## Aborting the Search for Truth

All human progress is based on the search for eternal Truth. Man, as distinct from the animal species, has been made in the image of his Creator, the living God. He has been endowed by his Creator with the Divine Spark of reason, which gives him the capacity to perfect his knowledge of the universe. Man seeks Truth, and in his search to discover Truth, learns what is eternal in the universe.

As man perfects his knowledge, he comes to understand some things that he once believed to be true as no longer so. More importantly, he comes to understand *the assumptions which underlie how he understands things to be true* as no longer correct. Man, using his power of reasoned moral judgment, willfully changes the assumptions which underlie the way in which he thinks. In so doing, *man becomes increasingly more human*, more distinct from the animal, which cannot reason.

Man, his judgment morally informed by the moral teachings of Judeo-Christian religion, is compelled to seek Truth as his highest goal. By so doing, religion gives man an identity that is beyond the sway of the *cult of public opinion*. Man must act to do Good, as he understands Good in relation to God's Word. He must answer only to his God and he must never bow to *public opinion*.

The brainwashers and mind destroyers of the Tavistock Institute and the Frankfurt School have concentrated so much of their firepower on destroying man's relationship to his God, because by so doing, they destroy man's capacity for morally informed judgment.

People like Hal Becker, Fred Emery, and Eric Trist, as well as the evil Sigmund Freud, and all those who believe that men are no different than animals, must deny the existence and relevance of a *higher Being*, to render all men morally insane.

Freud despised organized religion, and especially the Catholic Church, precisely because it gave man a *higher moral purpose*, because it reinforced man's moral conscience by defining a relationship between man and his Creator that was based on *universal truth*. Freud saw the Christian apostles, people who refused to be swayed from God's work by the *popular opinion* of their times, as *neurotics*; they were maladjusted people, who made up stories to deceive others, he raved.

Freud and the others who have followed him, reduced religion to *ideology*, to one of many conflicting *opinions* about how the world works. Freud claimed that it would ultimately pose no threat to his view of man, since, robbed of his *higher moral purpose*, man would, as society became more perverse and complex, see his religion as an ineffectual guide for his existence: it would become a *minority view*, a *minority opinion*.

Freud's successors, like Trist and Emery, also denied the existence of universal Truth, and profanely asserted that they have the power to create reality, or, more precisely, to impose *images of reality* on the sovereign minds of individuals. To them, all man's thought is reduced to individual *opinion*. The

majority of those individual opinions become the *popular opinion* which governs the way the “masses” are to act.

In this system, the most man can aspire to do is to know *true opinion*. This is what he gets, for one to two hours each night, from television news. Becker et al. see television, and especially the television news, as a god, a creator of mass opinion. Emery and Trist have compared television viewing to a religious experience, by which man gets the “logos,” the news.

Using the parameters of the same *Freudian mass psychology* that defined the Nazi experiment in brainwashing, they understood the television viewing experience as an externally organized *mass process*. People in such circumstances, according to Freud, tend to identify their own thoughts and desires with what they perceive to be the thoughts and desires of those involved in the same process. In other words, their *identity* becomes something shaped by what others think about them and what they think about others. This is what the brainwashers call being *other-directed*--a constant and unending desire to act as you perceive others would want you to act.

Television, with its overwhelming presence in your life, both *creates* popular opinion and *simultaneously validates it*. It can do so because you have become so *other-directed* that you have given up the search for Truth.

“If it’s a fact, I’ll believe it,” says the man in a commercial for a popular beer. He has been told that this beer is more popular than another leading brand. “Hey, I saw it on television,” he says. “It must be so.”

*It must be so.* Why? Because I saw it on television.

How could the images and sounds of the television news lie? They are right there, right in your living room. As Becker says, “the world is in that box. And it’s there every night.” Well, it is really there a lot more than that—six to eight hours a day.

This is a power that the Nazi propaganda minister Josef Goebbels could only dream of, could only imagine. Now, it is in the hands of your brainwashers. And still most of you watch, and more importantly, in the case of the news, accept what is represented as *reality, your reality*.

## What Do You Know, Really?

Let’s have you pull your head out of the tube and the pictures placed there by it. Now, let’s think about the news programming from a different perspective, to show you how totally you are brainwashed.

On June 9, 1992 Lyndon LaRouche won the Democratic presidential primary in North Dakota. Did you hear that reported on network news or the national sections of your local news? Not a word, right? Surely, it’s a “newsworthy story,” when a man running for the White House from a federal prison cell where he is a political prisoner, wins a primary of a major party, even if it is in a small state and it is at the end of the primary season, with the nominations supposedly locked up.

But LaRouche wasn’t supposed to win that primary. Therefore, television news, across the nation, was not to report it, let alone feature it. It fell outside what they had been telling you was the *public opinion* of the way the campaign was going. So, unless you are a reader of this newspaper, or caught the

chance item in a newspaper wire story, you probably never heard about this. *The television news smothered reality.*

The next day, with the television news still not *validating* the LaRouche win by reporting it, there was some frantic scrambling to actually *erase* the results. By moving some votes here and there, new results were announced that had LaRouche finishing second, to Ross Perot; still an impressive showing for LaRouche, but with Perot winning, something that more fit the then-current television images of the election campaign.

The point being made here is that the news program doesn't simply brainwash you by what it *chooses* to report, albeit distorted in content and with an implied "message," as we have discussed. As your chosen *most important source of news*, it limits your understanding of the world by what it chooses *not to report and to ignore.*

We'll try another image: Imagine putting your head in a bag and then having the world described to you by someone telling you what *he or she* sees. That's how the news operates, and you tolerate it and think it tells you the "truth." So do your neighbors, because they think that you do.

So, if you didn't see it on the television news it didn't happen. And if it *did* happen and it wasn't on the television news, then it really *wasn't* important anyway. Sounds pretty infantile and stupid, doesn't it?

Let's go back for a moment to the coverage of the state of the economy. There's a point to be made about the *limits* of the power of television to annul reality. Television news coverage may alter your perception of *reality* but it cannot, as the arrogant Hal Becker of the Futures Group asserts, *change reality*. If something happened in this world, simply because television didn't report it doesn't mean that it *didn't happen.*

If television news failed to report that an avalanche was descending on your town, it wouldn't stop you from being buried by that avalanche. You might get pretty angry if something happened to you that you could have done something about, had you only known about it. Similarly, you'd get pretty angry if you actually caught the television news lying to you, telling you something that you had first-hand knowledge was false.

That is precisely what was happening with the economy. The television news, for a period of several years, told you that the American economy was in good shape. That seemed to cohere with what most people were experiencing: That was the majority *opinion* of what was happening in the economy.

But the collapse of the economy is not a matter of perception. It can be calculated by examining the collapse of physical output of our factories, farms, and mines, the collapse of the infrastructure, services and technology required to support them. The American economy, according to these standards of measurement, has been in a state of collapse since approximately 1972.

Wait a minute, you say, that's impossible, no one ever told me that. Well, that's true--*the television news never reported the facts to you in that way.* Instead, they presented reports of distorted and "massaged" government economic indicators that purported to show the exact opposite.

About three years ago, reality started to assert itself, hitting with the force of an avalanche of bad news: Banks were collapsing, layoffs started to mount, and the real estate market started to collapse. The television news was still not reporting the true extent of the economic collapse.

As the economic downslide picked up steam, as more of you were buried under your own economic bad news, the people who control the television news had a choice. Either the coverage had to shift to be more in line with current popular perceptions of reality, or they would face a loss of their credibility. It was only at this point that coverage started to change. Those reports have picked up in intensity of image in the last several months, but they still do not say that the economy is in a depression.

Recall what the man who watched the news remembered: “The economy is doing badly and George Bush isn’t doing anything about it.” The television news created that *thought image*, which is a more or less accurate, if limited, perception of reality. Starting about 18 months ago, the nightly news started aggressively *linking* the images of economic collapse—layoffs, bank closings, real estate collapse, municipal crisis—with the policies of the Bush administration and with George Bush directly.

Think back, to about a month or two after the end of the war with Iraq. From that point on, the image of Bush, the new Herbert Hoover, was linked with the economic collapse. If you remember what we said earlier, television news reporting relies not on making you *think* about what is happening, but on giving you an emotion-laden image of reality that serves to *prevent* you from thinking. Bush now serves as the *hate object* to some people, the cause of their problems, the *hapless fool* to others; in either case, he becomes a *cause* for the economic collapse.

All of this is necessary to continue to keep you under *control* to prevent you from actually thinking about what is happening to you.

How did your brainwashers know when to shift gears? They followed the *poll* results. You told them that the economy was making you feel uneasy.

## For Whom the Polls Toll

Your brainwashers have been profiling the American population for nearly 70 years. *Public opinion polls* have been probing every aspect of your life, all your tastes and desires, to get a *picture of the pictures inside your mind*.

The origins of public opinion polling lie in the mass manipulation of public opinion studied during World War I at Wellington House by the group that included Walter Lippmann and Eduard Bernays, Freud’s nephew. The polls had two purposes. First, they provided a detailed profile of the prejudices of a target population; those prejudices, as Lippmann and Bernays both explained, become the basis for mass brainwashing campaigns. Second, the results of the carefully constructed polls, fed back to the population through the mass media, provide the basis for shaping *opinion*.

*Creative thinking* defies measurement in quantifiable terms. It is impossible to come up with a statistical correlation that would tell somebody whether one creative idea is better or more appropriate than another, whether it should be accepted by others as useful, important, or true.

*Opinions*, however, can be easily counted. You can ask a group of people how they *feel* about something, or whether they think that such and such a statement is *true*. You tabulate the numbers, and come up with a count. So many *agree*, another number *disagrees*. The larger number becomes the *consensus*, which represents the *majority opinion*.

But no matter how many people agree with something, *it doesn't make it true*.

A poll taken in the first millennium would have certainly found the majority opinion, the *consensus*, to be that the Earth was the center of the universe. A poll taken today, under the influence of perverse Freudian and other outlooks, might find that man is no different than the beast or even that he is the most destructive of all beasts. Neither result has anything to do with Truth, in the sense that we have discussed Truth.

People like Lippmann and Bernays, the pollsters such as George Gallup and Lou Harris, and others who have followed them, have abandoned Truth as a criterion for judgment. If one denies Universal Truth, as we have explained they do, the concept of truth itself becomes meaningless. If there is nothing that is eternal, nothing that is universal, then there is only what is perceived to be true today. There is only *true opinion*.

Emery and Trist, reflecting the thinking behind the polls that governs their design, claim that over the last 50 years, American society has been bound together by the concept that “we all behave according to the consensus.” Americans, they claim, are so *other directed* that they wouldn't dare break this *social contract*. They must do what others perceive that they should do; to do otherwise would cause psychological pain. We seek the comfort of the consensus, they say, “because it gives meaning to our lives.” We can only measure how we are doing against what we are told are *norms*, and those *norms* are derived, they say, primarily from *poll results*.

## Rigging Results

“If you want the American people to believe something, then all you have to do is get a poll taken that says that it is so and get it publicized, preferably on television.” The speaker is Hal Becker of the Futures Group.

Becker went on to say that he and any other brainwashers could design a poll so that it would show any result that he wanted. It is all in how the questions are asked, he said.

Is he correct or does he exaggerate? Is it really that simple to create opinion? Let's try a test. We'll take our own little poll among you readers. I say that the majority of your fellow Americans are brainwashed by television. Do you agree? Well, after reading this series, I should hope that I have presented sufficient argument to convince you of this point. But what if you hadn't been reading these articles? What if someone on the street or on the subway were to have come up to you and asked that question, without your ever having seen my articles? What would your response have been then? You would probably have answered that you didn't agree. Why? Because it is *your perception*, validated by the opinions of others, that Americans are not brainwashed by television.

Now, let's change the polling question slightly. You are *told*: *According to a recent poll, 85 percent of all Americans think that television is their most valuable source of accurate news. Do you agree?* Remember—you haven't read my articles. What would you answer? You'd probably say that you agree, without too much hesitation.

Why did you answer that way? First, the way the question was posed: You were given *poll results* that *guided* your answer. You were told that 85 percent of your neighbors held the opinion that "television was their most accurate source of news." The poll question, the poll itself, was merely asking you to step in line behind an existing consensus. This is called the *bandwagon effect* and is one of the most common of pollsters' tricks. With the question posed that way, it is hardly likely that you even thought at all about the *content* of the proposition: whether television news is accurate or even the most accurate source of news.

And, I am certain that you would never question whether the poll results were *rigged*. That would happen only if the content of the question were at very sharp odds with your perception of *popular opinion*. The presentation of the poll results defining that consensus would tend to prevent that from occurring.

So, I think that you can see how easily pollsters can *trick* you into validating what might be completely spurious propositions. Becker wasn't really being overly boastful, was he?

Over the years, since Bernays and Lippmann, there have been changes in the *techologies*, both in polling and in the transmission of results. However, the *basic method*, as defined by *Freudian mass psychology*, remains the same: to appeal to the most infantile and therefore most animal-like in man, to therefore bypass or abort creative reasoning powers, informed by moral judgment.

Polling questions, starting back in the 1920s, were designed to seek not what a person thought about something, but what were his *feelings*; such questions in fact bypass thought and are designed to spur an unreasoned, unthoughtful response: True opinion is thus a *feeling state*.

This fits directly the profile of the American: "Keep it simple," he says, "my time is short." Complicated issues are reduced to simple sets of choices, often "critical choices," in which neither choice is really acceptable. By rigging the choices, the results are easily predetermined.

Let's look at an example of how polls were used in concert with the television news, to alter the way Americans thought about the space program. First, I'll give you a little background that has not been reported on television.

In the mid-1960s, Tavistock, under a grant from NASA, undertook a study of the effect of the space program on the American population. To their dismay, the survey showed the space program had produced an extraordinary number of scientists and engineers, who were in turn reproducing their positive outlook, their *cultural optimism*, among wider sections of the population. The surveys, among a wide cross-section of the population, discovered that the success of the space program had produced a renewed faith in the power of science to solve problems, a view of society that saw no limits to either growth or prospects for expanding human dominion over nature.

Such views were *contrary* to those of the oligarchical elite that dominates our society and which employs the brainwashers like those taking this survey. They would not tolerate an American society whose *moral outlook* was bound up in the idea of scientific progress, with this idea of progress and hope reaching all layers of society, from the skilled workforce, to the clerks, to the housewives, to young school children. *It threatened to undo 20 years of television brainwashing, because any society whose values are shaped by moral human progress cannot be easily manipulated.*

There is evidence to show that this report, called the Rappoport Report, after its Tavistock author, provided the basis for the decision to dismantle the space program by the early 1970s. This decision was followed by a step-up in polling activity directed toward that end.

It was necessary to provide you with this information to help you rethink what you know happened in the period under discussion. It is important that you understand that there is an “invisible government,” as Bernays called it in a previously cited quote, that operates to shape your *opinions* through television and other media, and through the control and shaping of *popular opinion* is destroying our nation and more than 2,000 years of western Christian civilization.

Now, I want you to think back to 1969, to the days immediately after Americans walked on the Moon, as millions watched them do it on Earth. Your immediate response to that event was a great burst of pride in your nation, but even more importantly a joy in the accomplishment of man in taking a bold step into the universe. It reinforced your belief in the power of human creativity to solve fundamental problems of science, and gave you confidence that the future for men, all men, was indeed a bright one. You were *optimistic*.

But all that was to be changed. Shortly, that Moon landing was to be eclipsed in the media by a highly publicized satanic orgy of the counterculture known as Woodstock; still later, there were the violent protests against the war in Vietnam. But try to focus on the weeks immediately following the lunar landing. The first Harris and Gallup polls started telling people that in the opinion of *their neighbors*, the space program had now served its purpose. It was branded as *non-essential*, with a very large budget, while *more useful* and *less esoteric* programs on Earth required funding; these poll results, widely reported at the time on television, were backed up by news stories of poverty and chaos at home and the images of the counterculture, whose spokesmen at Woodstock demanded an “end to wasting money” on the space program, even as the dust of the Moon walk was settling.

The pollsters phrased their question in the following manner:

Landing on the Moon was a tremendous scientific achievement. But many scientists say that everything that man did on the Moon could be better done by machines. Given the huge budget deficits and the need to spend money on programs here on Earth to help needy people, do you feel that the space program is essential or non-essential in its present form?

A strange way to put the question, but the *only* way they could put it to get the results they desired. Had the American population been asked, back in 1969, whether *they supported the American space program*, they would have answered, in overwhelming numbers, “Yes!”

Instead, a majority of confused Americans, agreeing with the first statement about the glorious scientific achievement, not sure about the second, since “some scientists” appeared to question the value



of manned space flight, and *feeling guilty* about the third, saw reason to *agree* that the space program *might* be non-essential.

Other polls questioned whether Americans were giving scientists too much control over their lives. Such polls attempted to play off the well-known, irrational, profiled fear Americans have of “eggheads”; scientists who ran the space program were being lumped with the rightfully hated liberal intellectuals.

As the results were *played back* over a period of years on television newscasts, Americans were conditioned to accept deep cuts in the space program, first administered in 1970-71--even though the majority of Americans did not believe such cuts desirable when the process started!

## Instant Opinion

By now, each network news organization has its own polling operation, or one linked to a newspaper, such as the *New York Times* or *Washington Post*, or to one of the national polling operations, such as Gallup or Harris. They are able to provide almost instant responses to breaking news developments, letting each of you know what the *majority opinion* is about what they are reporting. In that way, you are being told what *your appropriate opinion* should be about an event or statement.

Think about any recent news event. Take the Democratic or Republican conventions, for example. As you watched, you were given the results of a network news poll that told you how Americans thought about what was happening.

Now, remember what your response was to all of this. You listened to Clinton’s speech at the Democratic Convention and weren’t impressed. Yet, the news commentators, armed with poll results, told you that Americans thought differently. You started to rethink what you had just heard: You’re not different than your neighbors; your *opinion* must be wrong. By the end of the evening, you started to think that maybe the speech was much better than you thought. Nothing had changed—except that you were being moved into line behind *popular opinion*. The next morning, when someone asked you what you thought about Clinton’s speech, you *reported back* what the poll results had told you the night before.

And who determined this so-called *popular opinion*? The poll results, in general, are based on *very small numbers of people* who are supposed to reflect a cross-section of a target population. The total number of respondents to the polls on the Clinton speech, for example, numbered less than 1,000.

Think about your response to the speech again. Clinton didn’t say anything: That was your first impression. But the pollsters didn’t ask people whether he said anything of importance or even anything at all. They asked whether the people *felt* that it would help his campaign, a question that had nothing to do specifically with what he said.

These results were in turn reported on television as *meaning* that in the *opinion* of the majority of Americans, Clinton gave a “good speech.”

These same polls show that Americans have a fascination with the numerical presentation of facts in polls. The poll results, as reported on the nightly news, are said to be among the most popular segments of the show, and the ones that people are most able to repeat in detail approximating what is reported.

This brings us to the final point we want to make about polling. In some of the first major national polling work done by the Tavistock crowd in the 1930s and early 1940s, they discovered that our *other-directed* citizens, who determined their opinions about something based upon *counting* the opinions of the friends, were more susceptible to believing something as true if it were presented as a *statistical* fact.

The poll results are presented like ball game scores: There are winners and losers, with the scores telling who won and who lost. More recent studies of the response of people to polls confirm this: To the extent that questions are asked and posed in a way that shows somebody or something “winning” or “losing,” viewers tend to pay more attention to the results and to have a higher retention of the reported outcomes.

A poll was taken near Columbus Circle in New York City recently. The pollster, clipboard in hand, was seen approaching something on roller blades, with a Sony Discman plugged into his ears. The pollster tried to ask his questions, but it was obvious that he was not being heard. Finally, the pollster stuck his clipboard in front of the strange thing’s face, and it nodded, and thrusting out its hand, finger extended, pointed to his choices on the clipboard. The pollster smiled, as the person skated off, his head bobbing to the beat of the music echoing through his head cavity. The pollster went on to his next respondent, someone lying on a park bench.

A recent CBS News-*New York Times* poll shows that most Americans will accept the reduction of the world’s population by one billion people, reports Dan Rather on the Evening News. And “that’s the way it is.” Or is it?

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 8

### Here Now the News....

by L. Wolfe

Now we are ready to talk about the news programming itself, to show you how it is designed to brainwash you. Remember that we said the average American now watches one to two hours of news programming each night. That programming breaks down into three categories, and a supplemental category. Each network has its main nightly news broadcast, in prime time, usually around dinner hour, for approximately 30 minutes:

NBC's nightly news with Tom Brokaw, ABC's with Peter Jennings, and CBS's with Dan Rather. These news shows are supplemented by local news, which runs one to two hours over the course of an evening, usually divided between a dinner time broadcast and a late evening "wrap up" show. Such shows may repeat items from the network nightly news, but also include local stories and features, as well as sports and weather.

In addition, there are news feature and interview shows broadcast at various times during the week. We should include in this category shows such as *Meet the Press*, ABC's *Nightline*, *Face the Nation* and similar shows in a basic interview format. The *McNeil/Lehrer Newshour* on PBS falls into this category, even though each show has a five to eight minute news summary; the basic format of the show is interview and feature. A third category of show is the "news magazine," which features sensationalist stories of the kinds found in supermarket tabloids, with a healthy dose of titillation and bizarre subject matter. CBS's *60 Minutes* falls into this category, despite the fact that it sticks mostly to "hard news." All the other news magazine shows, such as ABC's *Prime Time Live*, more accurately fit the previous description.

Finally, this programming is supplemented by network news features and coverage of "news events," such as the political party conventions.

In all, approximately 10-15 percent of all network television broadcasting is occupied with the "news," as we have described it. That percentage has grown over the last 40 years. However, while some of the news magazine shows, including *60 Minutes*, may grab large viewerships with their muckraking stories, studies show that Americans don't consider them a *reliable* source of news. That is because the shows appear to be *advocating* something, or as your neighbor might put it, "they have an axe to grind." Such shows are judged as *entertainment*. Therefore, it should be no surprise that *60 Minutes* was once the top-rated show on all television.

### The Bland 'Truth'

It is the network and local news shows that Americans turn to, to find out the "way it is," as longtime CBS anchorman, Walter Cronkite used to say. Such shows, for the most part, display little in open advocacy of any *apparent* point of view. According to nearly every study done on the subject in the last 20 years, Americans in overwhelming numbers believe that they are being told "the truth" by Rather,

Brokaw, and Jennings, and local anchors around the country. In fact, they believe this so strongly, that they rarely question the content of news shows, rarely think that the news is distorted or slanted, and believe that they can distinguish between editorial content and news reporting easily enough so as to not feel that they are being “secretly” preached to.

These survey results reflect the success of the news format as brainwashing. As with other television programming we have discussed, the design of the format, which includes both the organization of material and the *language* used to describe that material, is the product of years of study of techniques of *mass persuasion* through the use of communications media. Let’s try to make some general observations about your nightly news telecasts. Think for a moment about what they have in common. Well, they each have what is called an *anchor person* who reads most of the news, and introduces the other reporters and stories. Those stories, both the ones he reads and the others he introduces, are all short, with most being under a minute and many under 30 seconds. A clip of a newsmaker speaking, for example, is never more than a few seconds long. Even when interviewed by a news reporter, what is shown is always a few short sentences. Now what about the *language* in the newscasts? Other than the names of individuals or places that might at first seem unfamiliar, do you ever have any trouble understanding what is being said, as you might for example, in a classroom lecture or even when reading a newspaper article? Not really: The language is extremely simple and direct.

And finally, consider the editing of the show: Is it ever apparent to you that someone is controlling what you are seeing and hearing, that it is being edited, scripted, and directed, as if it were a movie, or another television show? The newscast, despite its disjointed content, appears to you to be *seamless*, a natural flow of information.

Now, we’ll show each of these features of format—the anchor person, the short content and simple language, and the seamless editing—comes from the study of *your profiled weaknesses* and are designed to play into them.

Back during World War II, a group of Tavistock-linked brainwashers, called the Committee for National Morale, worked on profiling the American population. Among the things they analyzed was the War Bond sales drive, trying to discover what persuaded people to buy bonds.

Although the bonds were pushed by well-known celebrities, they found that celebrity alone was not sufficient motivation to persuade people to buy. Their polls showed that people had to sense that they were *not being preached to*, that the person asking them to buy bonds had to have *no apparent or obvious motive* other than his or her desire to do something good for the country.

This principle of *dispassionate, but sincere persuasion* was studied more extensively after the war. Irving Janis, who had worked on a study overseen by Tavistock’s Brig. Gen. John Rawlings Rees that profiled the responses of the Japanese and German populations to allied strategic bombing, the so-called Strategic Bombing Survey, helped produce a book, *Communication and Persuasion*, published in 1953, as television news broadcasting was getting underway. Examining survey data from before and after the war, the book concludes that the presentation of a message, to be effective, must be done by a person whose prestige cannot be challenged. The *Communicator* of opinion must give the appearance of *expertness* and *confidence*.

Most important, said Janis and his fellow editors, the *Communicator* must never give the impression that it is his intention to persuade others to his point of view. Quoting other brainwashers, he

wrote that the best delivery of opinion is in a *casual* and *nonpurposive* manner. This lowers the resistance of a listener or viewer, who would otherwise put up mental defenses once he knows a person is trying to “convince him” of something. To effectively communicate *opinion*, says Janis, the audience must be predisposed to accept those *opinions* as cohering with their expectations. Such effective communication does not challenge someone to think, as much as it persuades one to accept the viewpoint of the *Communicator* as *his own*. He further found that people were more apt to accept a message if it were presented in an atmosphere of heightened tension, in which the tension level was both *raised* and then *lowered* by the communication—if the message presented conclusions that appeared to lower the levels of anxiety associated with what was being reported. In that way the Communicator becomes the person who “makes what is confusing clear, who gives order to chaos.”

Even the communication of *negative* news or opinions will not harm the relationship between the Communicator and his audience. If there is a positive bond between the two, Janis says that the audience will tend to *dissociate* the source from the bad news he reports.

These observations have their foundation in *Freudian mass psychology*. The relationship established between the *Communicator* and his audience is an infantile emotional bond, in much the same way that a child relies on its parents for its judgment of what is correct in the outside world. As long as the relationship is kept on this infantile level, a Freudian or a neo-Freudian would observe, it will not involve a challenge to what is being presented.

What Janis discussed, as well as what was discovered in the earlier World War II studies, was incorporated into the formats of early television news broadcasts.

The *Communicator* became the *news anchor*, a person whose delivery of the news was to be reassuring and dispassionate, and who was, at least in those early broadcasts, someone who never offered his own viewpoint. Surveys of viewers of those early news shows most often used the word “trustworthy” to describe the *news anchor*. Others found the male anchor to be a “father like” figure, or even a “grandfather like” figure; that latter term was frequently associated with CBS’s Walter Cronkite in his later years.

In recent years there have been some attempts to vary this style. Local news, for example, tends now to feature multiple anchors, who chat with each other, and tell jokes. But even this has precedent, in the popular *Huntley-Brinkley Report* on NBC in the late 1950s and early 1960s, which became the first highly rated nightly news broadcast.

Dan Rather, CBS-TV’s replacement for “Grandfather” Walter, almost lost his job when surveys showed that audiences found him too hysterical and “preachy.” He came across as too intense, with people saying that they didn’t trust him. Network officials told him to “ease up,” or he would lose his multimillion dollar contract, at which point he started wearing sweaters under his suit jacket.

## The Origin of ‘News Speak’

“We try to keep it real simple,” said a local news producer of the language used in newscasts. “They want the news, not Shakespeare.”

News scriptwriters are told to load their sentences with nouns, to limit themselves to simple verbs, and to stay away from “florid” modifiers. The standard sentence form is the simple declarative statement.

“Dog bites man,” says the producer, “Details at Six.” Although the words used in the news broadcast have some *nominal* resemblance to the English language, what you hear on the nightly news is certainly not the beautiful English of Shakespeare, Shelley, or Milton, nor even the English of our Founding Fathers or Lincoln. It is a simplified language, which conveys greatly simplified messages.

It is through language that man communicates the ideas and principles of his culture from one generation to the next. In many respects, man himself is defined by the *quality of his language*, for it is the means by which the product of his creative reason, that which distinguishes him from the animal, is communicated and translated into effective action, on both an individual and societal level. It is through the proper use of language that man transforms his universe, coming to know what is Truth and then acting on that Truth according to man’s free will. In that way man willfully changes his world, in accordance with laws of his Creator.

Man requires a complex language, which can convey all the aspects of the Creation, all of man’s understanding of *universal law*. *To have anything less, is to make man less than man, limiting his capacity to know and to understand.*

The language of television news is a degraded language. It is *nominalist*, stressing the naming of things, because it seeks to render one passive, a receptor, the mechanical term Emery and the other brainwashers use to refer to the television viewer. There is no creative thought going on, no attempt to engage the mind, merely to *imprint an image in a person’s brain*. Language, properly used, can give man an understanding of thought-objects which reflect human knowledge of reality. Television news, using its simplified language, *names* things, and tells you that such *things*, are in fact all there is to reality. There is no ordering principle, no concept beyond the images and words. This simplified language of television news has its roots in linguistic work during World War II. Prior to the war, British linguist C.K. Ogden had created an artificial language from the English language. He called it “Basic English,” and many British intellectuals, including many writers, found it to be nonsensical.

Ogden proposed that classic literature, such as Shakespeare, Keats, and Shelley, could be “translated” into the new language, stating that the majority of people could not comprehend them in their present, complicated form. His opponents argued correctly that such an effort would trivialize the greatest expression of English language culture.

While this debate raged in intellectual circles, people at the highest levels of the British oligarchy saw the potential brainwashing value in what Ogden had done. He had collapsed the entire English language into a total of 850 words. By using “Basic,” coupled with the mass media, a large number of people could be given a *simple message* without *complicated thoughts* or thought-objects, getting in the way. Basic, its enthusiasts proclaimed, could therefore create a simplified reality: It was like placing a mental straightjacket on human creative potential. When the war began, Tavistock-linked people involved with the Ministry of Information, which controlled all broadcasting and news dissemination, decided to try some experiments on the effectiveness of the simplified language. The BBC was asked on an experimental basis to produce some newscasts in Basic, mostly for overseas consumption. The results of this experiment were to be carefully monitored.

Those involved quickly discovered, that, with some modification, the language was ideal to present a censored, edited version of the news. Since it lent itself to simple, declarative statements, those statements seemed to have the character of *fact*, even though the information being reported was heavily censored or even “propaganda.” Those involved with the experiments and reports requested only that Basic vocabulary be expanded to include certain “news terms” that were required to provide context for a story: “wire service reports,” “according to reliable sources,” “a close source,” etc., as well as various “news names and places.”

These experiments were run in a number of foreign sections of the BBC, including the Indian Section, which included among its operatives *1984* author George Orwell and his close friend, Guy Burgess, who was later to be involved in Britain’s biggest postwar Soviet spy scandal.

In September 1943, the “Basic experiment” was placed on the highest priority in the war cabinet by Prime Minister Winston Churchill. In a speech at Harvard, Churchill publicly announced his total conversion to the language, stating that it should become the *lingua franc* for the Allied war effort. “Such plans (as for the use and introduction of Basic) offer far better prizes than taking away other people’s provinces or lands, or in grinding them down in exploitation,” Churchill told his Harvard audience. “The empires of the future will be the Empires of the Mind.”

Churchill ordered that a War Cabinet Committee be set up to monitor ongoing experiments and to discuss ways to force the new language on an unwilling population. The War Cabinet Committee’s report stressed the importance of the use of *mass communications media*, in particular the BBC and BBC news. Among the recommendations in the report was that a substantial portion of BBC overseas output be translated into Basic and that regular lessons should be given over the air.

In the end, those involved directly with the Basic project found it impossible to strictly adhere to the 850 word vocabulary. They maintained that it had to be updated with words and expressions that reflected current usage. Memoranda from the Ministry of Information discuss the need to keep language “fresh,” to make people listening to reports connect. Above all, it must not sound too stilted.

Although Churchill never abandoned his public advocacy of Basic, studies of the British population revealed that people resented being *told* how they should speak. It is, they found, far more effective to alter people’s use of language by example, or, even more important, to continue to use the concept of a *reduced vocabulary language* in mass media, such as radio, without making a fuss about it.

The Basic craze tended to die out, at least publicly, quickly after the war. It appears, however, that those involved in control of mass media news dissemination took to heart the studies that found that one could sell the concept of a greatly reduced vocabulary without the rigid and sometimes stilted form of Basic. Radio newscasts, which had been made up of long descriptive commentaries before the war, took on the shorter formats that are featured today. The long sentences, with literary overtones, gave way to shorter, more direct sentences and simple vocabulary.

## Keep It Real Simple

From the very beginning, television news adopted this linguistic style: simple direct sentences, with a very, very limited vocabulary. This fit the new medium perfectly, since it had something that radio didn’t—actual visual images. Its producers demanded that news reporters and ultimately anchor people let

the visual images tell the stories. “We don’t want to overwhelm those images, do we?” said one of the producers. “We have to let them grab people.”

The simplistic *verbal* language of television is mirrored in the newspapers. To the extent that people still read, the average person can comprehend at no more than a sixth to eighth grade level. Excepting papers like the *The New York Times* or even *The Washington Post*, which still try to pitch to the ruling elites, the average newspaper contains the same simplistic vocabulary and sentence structure as the television newscast. If you don’t believe me, grab a copy of *USA Today* and look for yourself. This then is *News speak*. It’s become so pervasive that when someone seems to break out of the mould, when they speak about newsworthy matters in a manner befitting their importance, using a more literate language and sentence structure, the majority of you out there tend to “turn off.”

“We’re trying to make sure that people who watch the *Simpsons* understand what we are saying, while people who watch *Masterpiece Theater* (on PBS—ed.) are not too horribly offended,” said a news producer. “We strike a middle ground, but we err on the side of the *Simpsons*.”

Let’s turn our attention to the *format* of your nightly news show. It starts with a graphic and theme introduction, much like any television series.

That might not seem like an important point, but it is. The news program is treated like any regular *recurring* television program. It is as if you are being presented with a *serial* installment of the way the world is each day. There are recurring characters, such as the President or other “newsmakers,” there are “good guys” and “bad guys,” and there are recurring subplots—what’s the latest with that sensational murder trial? What are the new developments from the civil war in the former Yugoslavia? What about the economy?

In other words, you are conditioned to watch the news, just like you watch any television series. You look for the same kind of psychological *cues*—familiar characters, recurring subplots—to tell what is happening. In the end, it all blurs into a *picture in your head* of “the way the world is.” It isn’t the whole picture or even close: A few generalized comments and images, of lead stories, and little else. This concept of showing the news as serialization dates back to the early movie newsreels. If one wants to look for the real antecedent of the television news program, it is those newsreels, with their short items, with voiceovers. Starting in the late 1930s, the same brainwashers who were to work on the design of television programming started profiling audience responses to newsreel showings. They found that audiences remembered little about the stories if they lacked a highly emotionally charged visual image, no matter how many words were spent describing them.

Other studies were done of the *credibility* of a story. Not surprisingly, they showed that associating a person like President Roosevelt with a story tended to make that story more credible. What was surprising was that the *added credibility* could be achieved by merely showing a picture of Roosevelt with a given story, without either citing a quote from him or even making passing reference to him in the context of the story. This concept became known as *visual validation*: An audience could be led to believe something based on their preconceived notions of what is a credible source and the visual image carried more weight than the verbal message.

In the previously cited study of *mass persuasion* techniques edited by the Tavistock-linked brainwasher Irving Janis, Janis found that an opinion should, whenever possible, be presented as quotation or citation from authoritative sources, such as the government or other agencies which the



public holds in high esteem or regards as unimpeachable. Janis also discussed the effect of *negation* of contrary opinion; this is done by *omission*--i.e., simply ignoring other viewpoints—or by using sources that have a high degree of *negative* association with the public. The use of descriptive adjectives that are negatives, if done in a *matter of fact* way, can achieve the same effect. Another way to accomplish the same end is to place a story about a person whom you want associated with a psychological message near another story that conveys that psychological message. Studies found that a news item about a politician placed near a story about a murder, *cued* the audience to have *negative associations* about the politician, regardless of the content of the story about him.

All of these concepts have been incorporated into the *format* of television news reporting. It is designed to place certain images in your head about the world that may have absolutely nothing to do with how that world really is.

## Finding an Audience

But before you could be brainwashed by television news, they had to get you to watch it and watch it every evening. That last point is important. Studies show that people who watch the news every night, tend to think of themselves as less confused than those who don't. They seem to feel that they have a "grip" on the world; This leads, the studies indicate, to a *passivity*, to a willingness to accept the world "as it is," with all its problems.

People who don't watch the news, or who tend to get their news from other sources, tend to question more about what they are being told. In part, that is a function of the television medium itself: As we have said, television, in general, and the television news in particular, tends to cause one to *suspend judgment*. Since there is little specific, detailed memory of what you are being shown and told, it is hard to question it, or even reflect on it, at a later point.

So the first job was to get an audience. That wasn't all that easy. The vast majority of Americans read newspapers and listened to the radio for their news. The new medium seemed only to replicate existing sources of news.

Most of all, the early newscasts were *boring*. They were approximately 15 minutes long. They mixed reportage of international, national, and local events with weather and sports, and human interest stories.

The profilers probed the minds of those who did watch for an idea of what "worked" and what didn't. They found that the weather and sports were items about which viewers had the highest *expectation* that they were being told the truth. The human interest story, meanwhile, was viewed as entertainment, in which the question of truth was not important. Those items created a *predisposition* to accept the other news items without question—if only they could get and hold an audience.

In those early years, the news show was mostly a "talking head," a news anchor with a few graphic backdrops, usually the picture of a newsmaker being referred to in a story. Occasionally, there was some filmed information, with voiceover and an even more occasional remote. As such, the shows resembled a radio news broadcast with pictures.

Had television news stayed at this level of technology the nightly news might never have caught on. But, using poll information, the news producers discovered that they *did* have something over the

other media. They could, through remote live coverage, bring people almost instantaneous coverage of an event, as it was happening. This created a sense of excitement, especially if the event covered involved famous people.

The national party conventions in 1952 were the first such events that gave television a chance to show off. More than 50 million viewers saw the events unfold before their eyes, with network news commentators explaining what was happening. The events were handled as *serialized* spectacle—it wasn't that the audience really learned anything about what was happening as much as they participated in a "television" experience. News was shown to be *entertaining*. As a result, a new audience was created for network and local news.

With its audience expanding, the controllers of network news saw a new power: they could *create almost instant controversy* and then cover it as "news."

Both the live news event coverage and the confrontational "camera in your face" style, initially popularized in newsreels of sensational trials, created a bond between the audience and the new medium.

All the power of this early television "attack" journalism was deployed in 1954 against a set-up target, the red-baiting Senator from Wisconsin, Joseph McCarthy. The news programmers brought the final assault on this wretched fellow, the "Army-McCarthy hearings," *live*, to a large national audience, glued to the soap opera like drama, in their living rooms or in the local bar. But the television was not a passive spectator: It jumped in on the winning side, with interview and other shows aimed at castigating McCarthy. Leading the charge was CBS "star" reporter, Edward R. Murrow, the most famous of early television journalists and a direct product of the Frankfurt School networks. Television, through its news broadcasts and commentators like Murrow, boasted of its triumph and the service done the nation. They ignored the fact that the new medium, like all other mass communications media, had earlier helped to boost McCarthy's career, since, at that point, the powers that controlled the networks found him a useful tool. They helped create the *public opinion* that McCarthy was the leader of a glorious "anti-Communist crusade." Now, having outlived his usefulness, he became television news' first national "scalp." In the space of less than half a decade, the new medium had been the most important factor in altering the national image of a major political personage, and making television news a *national power*. During this same period, other stylistic tricks were used to lock in the news audience. One was the so-called "man-in-the-street interview." Here, someone just like yourself was being asked to respond to a poll-type question about an event of the day. That person's opinion was used as a yardstick for *validating* your own opinions. But even more important, such interviews helped reduce the apparent distance between the viewer and the news, by bringing the viewer, as it were, "into the story." These stylistic tricks changed the boring newscasts into something more immediate, more exciting. Polls in the mid and late 1950s started showing a preference for television news over any other form of news reportage.

As the audience expanded, the news coverage started having a major impact on politics. If you weren't *seen* on the news, if you were politically *invisible*, you didn't exist. In addition, if you *looked a certain way*, regardless of what you said or even what was said about you, your career was affected: People now expected their leaders to *look* a certain way and if they didn't, their prestige dropped and so did their vote totals. By the beginning of the 1960s, the news shows had increased to half-hours, while there were more and more "live" remotes of breaking news. The national news shows dropped weather and sports, except for breaking stories in those areas, leaving such coverage to local news. Other than that, the format stayed basically the same.

Most Americans were now watching at least one of the three major network nightly news broadcasts, as well as one or more versions of local news. Contemporary studies showed that people who were asked questions about current events now more frequently answered that they had “heard about something” on television. Few could answer questions about what it was they heard, but *they knew that they had seen it on the television news*. Most Americans could name one or more of the network anchors, who had by then become celebrities. In fact, more people could identify Walter Cronkite, Howard K. Smith, and Chet Huntley and David Brinkley than they could their congressman or senator!

## News Junkies

The pollsters profiling audience response to news broadcasts no longer even bothered to ask whether the viewer thought that what they were watching was true or not. The issue of truth was in fact no issue at all. Television news was creating *reality*, whether those images were *true or not mattered little, because people believed them to be real and immediate*. As the brainwasher Emery and others indicated, the more a person watches, the less he really understands, the more he *accepts*, the more he becomes *dissociated from his own thought processes*. By the mid 1960s, viewers never questioned the validity of what they were watching. To do otherwise would force them to *confront* the news, to think about what they were viewing; they accepted what they saw as coherent with *popular opinion* and therefore self-validating. But Emery and the other brainwashers *know* that the “reality” conveyed by television news is *myth*. “Television is much more magical than any other consumer product because it makes things normal,” writes Emery of news and similar telecasts, “it packages and homogenizes fragmentary aspects of reality. It constructs an acceptable reality (the myth) out of largely unacceptable ingredients. To confront the myth would be to admit that one was ineffective, isolated and incapable.... It (the television image) *becomes and is the truth*.”

Emery and others say that we have now become *information junkies*. We are hooked on the images and sounds that we’re told represent the reality outside our living rooms. We drink it like alcohol, he says, comparing it to drug-taking. We operate, he writes, from the basic assumption “that all we need is information....” The news broadcasts *inform* but by the nature of television viewing they can’t educate or make people understand. Instead, the medium *misinforms*, manipulating perceptions, to the point where people are *incapable of reasoning about the world they live in*.

Looking at this through the brainwashers’ prism of “information theory,” people like Emery describe two kinds of information being presented: the messages, or what are called the *true information* and the *noise*, the mental equivalent of static in radio broadcasts which tends to obscure or mask the messages. >From a brainwasher’s standpoint, the idea in presenting a news show is to provide enough noise to prevent the viewer from thinking about the *messages*.

Look at the *news entertainment shows*, the news magazines, as noise in this context. Their sensationalist character and banal stories, presented with movie like graphics, provide a sharp contrast to the more staid news programs. The studies show that few people believe most or even any of the stories on these shows, or believe that they are important to their lives. They watch them for *excitement*, a degrading form of entertainment similar to pornography.

Compared to the noise, the news programs are thought to be authoritative. Their *message*, their presentation of a “daily slice of reality,” is eagerly *consumed* by the audience. It is never questioned.

Emery and others predicted this development in the 1970s, stating that the nightly news could not afford to lower its image, to present advocacy or sensationalist reportage, without lowering its general credibility. Under no circumstances, would the powers that control the networks risk such a development. They were right.

But even the *noise* carries a message. Think about any one of those tabloid shows. The stories all revolve around sex and violence. Do the stories presented challenge any image of society that you have from watching other shows, or the news? The answer is no. Thus, they *reinforce* your opinion of what the world looks like outside your living room. It is the same image that you see on television. This fact, in part explains why when asked by pollsters, people say that they have not been told anything that they didn't already know by such shows as *Hard Copy* or *A Current Affair*.

Let's pull back a moment. The television news *shows* you that your fellow man is nothing but a violent and degraded beast, murdering, raping, and destructive. These images are intended to negate any higher moral sense of man, that man is created in the image of God and that all life is sacred. The violence in the news is not new. The early news shows always had a certain section of crime reports. But starting in the 1960s, the violence became more graphic and more shocking. Millions watched as Jack Ruby murdered the assassin of John F. Kennedy in November, 1963, Lee Harvey Oswald. Although he had no trial, and now evidence indicates that he may have been framed, at the time polls showed overwhelming numbers of Americans felt relieved by Oswald's murder.

Later that decade, we watched in color as blood poured from the head of Robert Kennedy as he lay mortally wounded on a hotel kitchen floor in Los Angeles. Again, polls taken immediately after event on June 6, 1968, showed Americans wanted vengeance against the man soon arrested for the crime, Sirhan Sirhan. Meanwhile, television news was bringing the bloody images of the slaughter in Vietnam into the living rooms. Again, it wasn't the first time that Americans had seen such images in the news. They had witnessed them before in newsreels during World War II. But it was the first time that you sat down and ate with your family, while watching young soldiers and civilians die before your eyes.

Now, we'll jump ahead to 1992 in New York City, one of the most violent cities in the country. The local news shows it in all its gory details. In the case of the local news, especially, there is little *emotional* distinction from the content of the most sleazy tabloids.

The news producers must "keep people happy," they say. They expect the violence, sex, and sleaze, because *that is the world*. Behind the push for such stories is a desire to keep them short and snappy, the kind that can hold the attention of people weened on 40 years of television or kids who are part of the "MTV generation." Make the stories simple: violence and crime are simple. "It is the murder du jour," says a former news producer. Every day, the fourth network, Fox, long thought to be the leader in this "sleaze journalism," has a half hour of news at 7 p.m., with 25 stories and three commercial breaks. The top story, the closing of Alexander's Department store, throwing 5,200 onto the unemployment lines, is long: it runs 2 minutes and 15 seconds. A drug bust in Newark runs 13 seconds. A feature on models over 40 years old received about the same time as a report on an organized crime trial. Sixteen pieces clocked in at under one minute. Then, came the weather. A Fox executive says that the newscast is trying to present "a comprehensive view of what happened in the world." He approved an *11 second* item on whether Boris Yeltsin might be an alcoholic. It's also important to have a "good news" story, to keep people happy, he says. He adds a story about a boy receiving a heart transplant; it runs for 41 seconds.

That's Fox. What about another network, say NBC? The 6 o'clock news on WNBC-TV was advertised with a four-second lead in: "Waterguns lead to a shooting in New York." The news began with a report on the actor Ben Vereen, being hit by a truck in Malibu, followed by a short piece on the number of children killed with guns. An update on a bus strike in Queens. Another update on the soap opera like saga of Amy Fisher, a Long Island teenager who is charged with the murder of her boyfriend's wife. The program closes with a piece on a Long Island pet cemetery and a *live* report about bear attacks in New Jersey.

Can anyone make any sense of such reporting? Does anyone even try?

"We run a ton of garbage," said senior WNBC-TV reporter Gabe Pressman. "The whole thing is can we be more outrageous and sensationalist than the next guy? Can we tease people into the 10 o'clock news?"

Is it really all that different on the nightly news? The blood and gore shifts to foreign settings for a while. A minute with pictures on the murderous civil war in Yugoslavia. A half-minute on a terrorist bombing in Italy. A bank holdup kills four. A fire in Baltimore kills five children....

The stories are all short, presented in a matter of fact way. The world has gone insane, but that is "the way it is," as "Grandfather" Walter used to tell us every night. Now Dan Rather says the same. So does Brokaw. So does Jennings. The muddle of so-called information explains nothing, teaches us nothing. The more "staid" news networks, such as CNN, merely report more of this muddle.

I want you to remember something that we discussed earlier. Recall the description of the deranged society in the novel *A Clockwork Orange*. There is unspeakable violence and perversion. *Nobody ever explains how things got that way; no one ever asks why.* People turn on their television set each night and watch who has been killed or raped on the news, and express thanks that it is not them or a loved one. They imagine that it is not their kids who are doing all these horrible things. It is a way of life, this *Clockwork Orange* world. "*That's just the way it is,*" says one of the violent young punks in the novel.

## Man, the Enemy

Now, concentrate on this for a moment. In every war, there is an image of the enemy, what the Germans call *Das Feindbild*. In World War II, it was Hitler and Japan's Tojo; they were the vile enemy that had to be defeated. In the Cold War, it was the Soviets and Stalin. In Vietnam, to the extent that an image was created it was Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Cong. For the last 30 years, you got those images of the enemy from watching the television news. They were pictures painted in your head, the popular opinion of what is to be despised, feared, or hated. Look at the news today. Who is the enemy? It is your fellow man. It is the *image of man* himself that television news is making into *das Feindbild*, the source of destruction of our society.

When you see the latest murder on the news, do you feel compassion for the murderer, do you see him as a fellow human who has gone wrong and committed an awful and sinful act? Or, do you merely associate with the image of the violence, and as a result, feel rage and hate towards your fellow man, especially if he is black or hispanic, because such people are what is *shown to be* "murderers?" The psychoanalyst Sigmund Freud, who believed man to be a beast, had said that the terror of everyday life would ultimately force man to give up the values of his religion and to see them as the cause of his

neurosis. The television news images, especially the violence, help create the terror that the followers of Freud and others believe will drive man to this end. Think for a moment:

Where is your sense of Christian love and charity as you watch the news? It is driven farther and farther from your *conscious* thoughts, as your rage and hatred of your fellow man is brought to the surface. We are losing the battle for man's soul to an evil worse than Hitler, the television set.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 9

### The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion

by L. Wolfe

We're back again for another dialogue. I'm sure by now most of you know the way this works: since watching television lowers your capacity to reason, we keep the set off while we have our discussion. So, if it's not already off, as I hope it is, go over and turn it off.

In this section, we are going to discuss the way you are brainwashed by spectator sports and the way television has facilitated that brainwashing. I have a sense that what we are going to say might anger some of you, but bear with me and see the argument through to the end.

We might as well get right to the point: those of you who call yourselves *fans* of one or more teams of any sport, be it baseball, football, basketball, hockey or of players in more individualized games such as tennis or golf, are *addicted to a mind-crippling infantilism that reduces your power of creative reason*. And it is that power and *only* that power of morally informed, creative reason that makes man different from the animal.

Let's make some preliminary observations to support our thesis.

As we have stated time and again in this series, man is created in the living image of God and has been given by his Creator the Divine Spark of reason. It is that quality, that Divine Spark, in each of us that makes us truly human. Anything that reduces our capacity to reason makes us less human, more like an animal.

Organized sports in this country, and especially professional and college level sporting events, are *mass brainwashing experiences*, precisely along the lines outlined by Gustav LeBon and Sigmund Freud in earlier parts of our report. They cause the individual personality to regress to a more infantile, more irrational state; while watching a sporting event, a person becomes part of a mass of similarly addicted infants who fixate on events taking place within the defined boundaries of a *playing field*, in a game whose rules are arbitrarily defined.

Each sporting competition is a thinly disguised celebration of what your brainwashers have called *instinctual human aggressiveness*, the same kind of aggressiveness that people like Freud say *proves* that you are an *animal* driven toward destruction. These aggressive, destructive drives, says Freud, are *part of man's animal nature*. Sooner or later, man must succumb to the power of such drives, Freud and neo-Freudians claim. The purpose of society, according to Freud, is to regulate and control through various forms of coercion, the outbursts of this innate bestiality against which the human mind is ultimately powerless.

Christian civilization is premised on a contrary view of humanity. Man, created in the image of his Creator, seeks to perfect his existence through use of creative reason in search of Truth; that is the only acceptable definition of perfection as a human process. Society is organized to provide man the means by which to accomplish this task, nurturing those powers of creative reason and affording the opportunity for man to act on that reason in an effective manner.

To the extent that one needs a fit body to serve the power of reason, exercise and sports can play a *limited* role in man's search for Truth. But muscular activity can *never* be a substitute for nurturing one's creative powers. Morally informed reason rules the body.

Modern sports, especially as organized as a mass spectator event, serve a contrary purpose. Besides acting as *ritualized* celebrations of aggressiveness, sports create an *illusion* of perfection, acted out within the measured boundaries of the *playing field* and according to the arbitrary rules of a *game*; perfection becomes something that is *counted*, a thing which is measured, that has been severed from man's relation to Truth and to his Creator.

Mass organized spectator sports, as presented and marketed through television, thus work to undermine the most basic concepts of Christian civilization. With their endless piles of statistics, with their arbitrary rules, with their mass spectacle, with their celebration of power of muscles and instinct over the human mind, and with their worship of heroic deeds in the absence of reasoned activity, they create a form of *pagan ritual*, that has become a *substitute religion* for most Americans.

So that's our thesis restated: sports is a *mind-destroying pagan religion*.

I warned you that it might be hard for some people to swallow, since I know how addicted many of you are to *your* sports. After all, if you are an American, and especially an American male, you have been raised in a *sports-dominated* culture. We're going to take a look at that. We'll first examine the penetration of spectator sports into our culture, before re-examining the psychological underpinnings of the mass brainwashing operation.

## The 'Sporting' War

As we have said before, the most effective brainwashing of Americans is the kind that they don't realize is happening, the so-called soft brainwashing.

I want you to think back to an image we referred to earlier. In February 1991, Gen. Norman Schwarzkopf gave an internationally televised briefing on the strategy and tactics of the ground war component of Operation Desert Storm. At the time, the press compared the general to a *successful Superbowl coach* giving a description of the *game plan* that had earned him victory.

Schwarzkopf had conceived the war *as if it were a football game* and had redefined a classic military flanking maneuver in *football terms* as a Hail Mary play. He had first explained what he was doing in those *football terms* to his staff; he reiterated that explanation to the American people. He was speaking a *language*--the language of sports--that *he knew* most Americans would understand.

In fact, most of the war was presented to the American public as *if it were a spectator sporting event*, complete with statistical analysis that measured every aspect of the fighting--the numbers of dead, the numbers of bombs dropped, the numbers of bullets used. This was the *scorecard*, as the Pentagon and other briefing officers called it, and as the press, and especially the television news, reported it.

In the end, the American people followed General Schwarzkopf as he tallied up the *score*: according to the numbers, our side had *clearly won*, just as the football team that scores more points wins its game. And just like with a televised football game, the U.S. propagandists, including Schwarzkopf, tried to keep Americans fixated on the events on the *playing field*, in this case the ostensible battle between "coalition" and Iraqi armies.



Left off the *scorecards* were the horrific casualties to innocent Iraqi women and children and the devastation to that nation's vital *civilian* infrastructure. Such pictures have for the most part even today been kept from the American people to preserve the image of the "clean war" fought within the bounds of *good sportsmanship*.

How well did this presentation work? Think about your own responses to the war and to the Schwarzkopf briefing. Didn't you find yourself rooting for the *home team*, the Americans and their allies? And didn't you feel elated when you were told and shown the results with maps and charts, in much the same way that you might feel if your favorite team won a championship like the Superbowl?

Around the country, in the same bars where the television sets feature Monday Night Football or the Basketball Game of the Week, there were reported to be raucous celebrations after the "victory" in the Gulf War, similar to what occurs when the home team wins such televised games. "I feel like we've won the Superbowl," one middle-age bar-goer told a reporter that night. "No, better, like we've won two Superbowls."

Remember our Hal Becker, the brainwasher from the Futures Group who disdainfully calls all of you "homo the saps." Back in 1981, he commented on the Vietnam War experience. America, he said, "wants a clear winner, like in a football game. *Our mythology of sports* demands it. When we didn't get a clear winner in Vietnam, support for the war fell apart.... We need to beat up on someone. Then our *sports psyche* takes over and we understand what happens. You win big and the score comes up on the evening news."

When a survey was taken after the war asking Americans to name a figure from history to which they compared General Schwarzkopf, few people named military leaders like General Dwight Eisenhower or General Douglas MacArthur. Instead, *many people* named the late Green Bay Packer football coach, Vince Lombardi, the winner of the first two Superbowls in 1967-68. Lombardi is, among other things, famous for a quote that General Schwarzkopf admires:

"Winning isn't everything. It is the *only* thing."

The *sports psyche* that Becker refers to is imbedded deep within American culture. It is why people understood what General Schwarzkopf was talking about with his "Hail Mary Play" and it is why *he himself understood what he was doing in that way*. It is reflected in that Lombardi quote about winning. It should more appropriately be called the *jock persona*, a mythical mass personality type, whose values are determined by the *lessons of the playing fields*.

## Our Sports Addiction

I want now to focus on the mass penetration of sports into our lives. And here television has played a critical role. While our sports-dominated culture did not begin with the television age some 40 years ago, it has been *transformed* and *universalized* by television.

For one thing, the sheer amount of sports has expanded exponentially in that period, as well as the ease with which one can *participate* in a spectator sporting event.

Let's take a look at some basic numbers. Of the 6-8 hours each American watches television a day, and the 42-56 hours he or she watches a week, it is estimated that at least 6-8 hours involve sports programming. Obviously, there are many people in the society who have less interest in televised sports;

women, for example, are more addicted to their soap operas than to sports, so the average viewing figure is misleading. Among a sizeable segment of the population, especially the male population, who are addicted to sports, the number of hours a week devoted to sports viewing will average well in excess of 16 hours. We'll put that another way. Among this segment of the population, which is demographically teenaged to middle-aged males, a person spends the equivalent of *one full waking day, every week* watching sports.

But the addiction is even worse yet, because among that segment of the population most addicted, the numbers can go even higher: as much as 30 hours a week or even more could be spent in front of the tube watching your favorite teams.

Sounds impossible? Think about this: You are a fan of your local basketball team and your local football team, and a fan of your local hockey team as well. Each of the games of these teams is carried on either network or other free television or on cable (most sports fans must have cable or satellite dishes that have access to cable channels for this reason). Your football team plays once a week during the season, in a game that lasts between 3-4 hours; your basketball team plays 3-4 games a week in games that average 2-3 hours; your hockey team plays a similar number of games averaging about 3 hours. The seasons themselves overlap. There will be some conflicts when games on a given day either occur at the same time as each other, or overlap, but it is easy to see that there are *at least 20 hours* of sports viewing *easily* possible just in what we are discussing.

But if you are a *real fan*, then you can't miss the Monday Night Football game, even if your team is not playing; and you might also want to watch an "important" college football game on Saturday afternoon and maybe even the second game of the professional football doubleheader on Sunday.

None of what I am describing is far-fetched for the "normal" sports addict. And when you total it all up, you come to about *30 hours a week during the seasons described spent in front of the television set watching sporting events*. We are excluding from these figures a person who attends a sporting event, since if he is in attendance he *probably* will not be watching the game on television—although there have been an increasing number who bring their Sony "Watchman" television sets to games.

Eliminating also extremely popular sports like golf, tennis, wrestling, and boxing, and concentrating on what are considered the major sports—baseball, football, hockey, and basketball—brainwashers profiling the American population have found that there is what appears to be a *universalized addiction* to all these sports. Most *fans* will watch all the sports named, with the possible exception of hockey, which still lacks franchises and therefore fans in many parts of the country. This universalizing process is the result of a proliferation of teams fueled by television revenues and a television-created mass audience.

## Sports and TV

At the dawn of the television age in 1950, there was only one truly national sport, baseball, which had a 152 game season, running from April to October, when the World Series is played, for 20 teams divided into two leagues. The National Football League had a schedule running from September to December, with a single championship game. The National Basketball Association had many fewer teams than it does today, playing a shorter season culminating in a championship series, while the six-team National

Hockey League, with teams only in New York, Boston, Detroit, Chicago, Montreal, and Toronto playing from October to March in a 50-game season, culminating in the Stanley Cup Playoffs.

Now, 40 years after the mass proliferation of television and 15 years after the start of the mass penetration of pay cable networks, football and basketball have joined baseball as truly national sports, with hockey expanding its regional base.

There are now 28 baseball teams playing a 162-game season, extending from April to October, with a spring training from February through April that features some televised games; the season culminates in playoffs, which in turn end in the World Series. The NFL now has 28 teams in two conferences playing a 16-game schedule running from September through the end of December when playoffs are held which end in the single-most viewed sporting event, the Superbowl in late January. The NBA has 27 teams playing an 82-game schedule, which runs from October to the beginning of April, with playoffs that can run until May. The NHL now has 24 teams in an 82-game season running from October to mid-April, with playoffs that can run until early June.

There is now a total, year-round brainwashing immersion of huge numbers of Americans in televised spectator sports: As the sports' leagues expand, as the seasons enlarge, the addicted are becoming *more addicted* and the television set is the major source for their *fix*.

Before television, the four mass spectator sports under discussion had a total yearly attendance of 30 million (1950 figures, approximate). Now, their total in-person attendance is more than triple that figure.

However, well over *1 billion* people watch such events on television. The television audience for the Superbowl *alone* is more than 100 million in the United States and another more than 200 million worldwide! According to some estimates, by the turn of the century, with the further penetration of America by wired cable systems, viewership for major sporting events will almost double. And remember, we haven't even included college football or other popular sports in our figure!

We are not talking here about so many billion viewers who each watch a single, different sporting event. We are talking about the *habituated viewing* of several hundreds of events by a segment of the population that numbers in the several *tens of millions* and the viewing of a hundred or so events by another population segment double or triple that figure.

## The Psychology of a Fanatic

As we learned in the previous sections of this report, the soft brainwashing process that alters or creates social values relies on *habituated* viewing habits. And this brings us to the first point of our thesis, which many of you sports addicts may have challenged when we first offered it. Your repeated habituated viewing of sports, especially televised sports, has altered the way you think. In fact, the more you watch sports, the less capable you are of morally informed reasoning. You are losing your mind to your *fanaticism*, to your addiction to sports.

*Sports are totally unimportant and meaningless activity for human existence. Whether one team or another wins a particular game, whether it be a minor league baseball game or the Superbowl, it is totally and absolutely meaningless for the present and future existence of human civilization on this planet.*

The problem is that most of you don't really believe this. Oh, you can accept it in the *abstract*, all right. You know that whether the Redskins or the Cowboys win won't make a bit of difference as to whether the depression is ended. But sports are a part of your *private mental life*, they are like a *personal possession* that has little objective real value, but to you has a great deal of subjective, emotional value. And you really don't like someone telling you what to do about these *personal parts* of your life. You sort of resent it, don't you?

But now take a good look at yourself.

It's Sunday afternoon. You sit in front of the television set, your hands sweating, as your favorite football team is locked in a tight game with their bitter rival. The clock is ticking down. One more good play, and they'll be in range of the winning field goal. The pass is completed. You thrust your fist in the air, as the home stadium crowd roars its approval through the television set's speakers.

Your hands are wet with sweat; the crowd is cheering. They line up for the field goal. You can't sit still; you rise from the chair. Now, you can't even watch and you look away from the screen. The kick is up. "It's ... it's goooood," says the announcer and you jump up and down, as the fans in the stands are shown celebrating. They've won, you think, and you *feel* great.

If the kick had missed its mark, and *your* team had lost, you would have *felt* bad and dejected and so would all its other fans, both in the stadium and watching on their television sets.

For the three or so hours of that game, the world outside the television set *did not exist*. People were dying in Bosnia. Others were starving in Africa. Within a few miles of the stadium, youth were destroying themselves with drugs. The economy continued to go to hell. But for those three hours and especially those last few moments, that world, *the world that matters*, did not exist.

*Emotionally* this game and all other games, to one degree or another, do *mean* something to you. This is the infantile *emotionalism* that we are talking about. It does not involve your reasoning capacity at all; it bypasses it completely, putting you into a state of emotionalized fantasy, disfiguring your creative reasoning power in much the same way as an intense sexual fantasy.

If someone should try to deny you your *fix*, to turn off your 7-30 hours of sports on television a week or reduce your viewing hours, you'd scream bloody murder and maybe even physically assault whoever tried to enforce such an unwanted change in your addictive behavior. That is how *addicted* you are to your *emotional fix* on sports. And this is one of the ways in which you are *brainwashed* by television.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 10

### The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion (continued)

by L. Wolfe

The same theoretical outlook that was behind the mass brainwashing of Nazi Germany is found in the mass crowd phenomenon of spectator sports. Sigmund Freud's principal point in *Mass Psychology and the Study of the I* was that masses of people can be organized around appeals to the emotions. Mass rallies, for example, appeal not to reason, but to the emotions, for the appeals to be successful. The most powerful such appeals are to the *unconscious*, which has the power to dominate and throw aside reason.

"The mass has never thirsted for truth," he writes. "They demand illusions and cannot do without them. They constantly give what is unreal precedence over what is real; they are almost as strongly influenced by what is untrue as what is true. They have an evident tendency not to distinguish between the two."

Freud further states that under this condition, with man's reason dominated by *emotionalism* and unable and *unwilling* to look for Truth, the individual in a mass or crowd loses his moral conscience, or what Freud calls his *ego ideal*. This is not necessarily a bad thing for the individual, the evil Freud claims, since the moral conscience which he later named the *Over I* or *superego*, causes man to "unnaturally" repress his basic animal instincts; this, Freud claims, produces neuroses.

In a crowd organized around people's emotions, the individual will exhibit a tendency to "let himself go," to free himself of all moral and social inhibitions: "Isolated, he may be a cultivated individual; in a crowd, he is a barbarian—that is a creature acting by instinct.... Nothing about it [how a person behaves under such crowd condition] is premeditated...."

"It [a crowd] cannot tolerate any delay between its desires and the fulfillment of what it desires," writes Freud, stating that this is why the individual is so willing to let himself become a part of a powerful mass experience which can gratify those emotional desires.

Such crowds, observes Freud, have regressed to the mental life of children. They operate, not according to reason, but according to irrational, emotional desires. In this mindless, emotional state, individuals are easily manipulated by leaders who can shift the values of the masses to coincide with the crowd's infantile fantasies.

We'll take a look at a typical sports crowd.

*You're watching a professional hockey game. Sitting next to you are an accountant and a school teacher, each in declining middle age. Below you is a teenage couple; over to the side is a banker, and just behind you are a couple of lawyers, with their young sons.*

*It's a close game. "Knock that bum down," screams the lawyer, "Don't let him skate like that." "Kill him," screams the lawyer's young son. "Put the body on him."*

*A fight breaks out on the ice between two players. The crowd rises, cheering wildly as the home team player lands punch after punch, bloodying his opponent. The lawyers cheer the loudest. The*

*announcement of penalties is greeted with more cheers for the home team combatant, as the referees escort the players to the penalty boxes.*

*Finally, the action begins again. A home team player breaks in for a clear shot on goal. The little black puck shoots into the net behind the opposing goalie. A goal. Lights flash all around and pandemonium breaks out in the crowd. The banker gets so excited that he spills his beer all over the teenage couple.*

*Everyone is laughing. Everyone is happy, as they celebrate the home team's goal.*

Was there any difference in the behavior in that crowd of the adults and the children? Not really. What has been described is a common example of the *mass infantilism* that we have referred to.

Now think for a moment about the televised football game we described earlier. The person described was not in a crowd per se, but was watching a televised game in his living room. *Yet he displayed the same kind of emotional responses as if he were present at the stadium.* This demonstrates the power of televised sports to induce behavior in what the brainwashers call an *extended crowd*.

In the television era, there are two audiences for every sporting event: one that is present at the event and one that is viewing the event, usually, as it happens, on the television screen. The first audience is limited by the size of the stadium, and even the largest stadiums are limited to well under 100,000 people. The television audience, especially for a major sporting event like a football game, numbers in the millions.

The spectator in the stadium, as well as the viewer in the living room, are linked by the common perception of the events on the *playing field*. They are aware of each other's existence:

The fanatic at home hears the crowd noise on the television set and sees shots of the packed stands. The fan in the stands knows of the massive television viewership *through his own and his fellow fans' habituated viewing habits*. "If I were home, I'd be watching," he thinks. If he is at the game, he hopes to attract the attention of the television camera crews, so that he might be seen by the fans at home.

The television brainwashers like Fred Emery of Tavistock have noted this phenomena. Someone watching his favorite show is only *vaguely* aware that others are watching as well, giving rise to a sense of isolation. The viewer of a sporting event is *keenly* aware of the existence of others, the brainwashers say, and therefore participates in a common, *mass experience of enormous perceived importance*. The perception of importance is self-validating: If one million people are doing the same thing, at the same time, it *must* be important.

Each sporting event, therefore, takes on a *psychological significance* to the viewer. It becomes a common, emotional bond between him or herself and *one million or more* other people. Some recent psychological surveys of Americans between the ages 15 and 50 found that when they were asked to list significant events that occurred within their lifetimes, an extremely large number listed *sporting events*, and many listed several such events.

Similarly, among American males especially, this *co-participation* in spectator sports, creates a sense of *identity* with fellow *fanatics*. A Mets fan walking down the street seeing another person wearing a baseball cap with a Mets logo develops a sense of *comradeship* with this unknown other. He gives him a wave, and maybe a raised fist, signifying solidarity with "the cause." The same person will routinely avert his eyes from the gaze of a homeless person and even another person dressed the same as he. Thus,

the *mass spectator experience* extends beyond the timeframe of any single game or even season, to become a part of the personality, a process of childlike *identification* with objects and feeling states.

The point to be made here is that viewing spectator sports in a habituated way, over an extended period of time, does alter a person's personality because it causes him to respond to situations from an emotionally determined set of reference points. As we said, it makes you stupid and more animal-like.

This is not something that can be turned on or off like a television set. Just as we have explained previously that the *hidden messages* of the television stay with you even when the set is off, *playing back* even years later, so does this pattern of *emotional, non-thinking response*, caused by habituated viewing of sports, stay with you.

## Playback

Now, think back to what we had said about the Gulf War and the briefing by General Norman Schwarzkopf on how the plan of attack against Iraq secured military victory. Try to remember *your response* to this briefing, that so openly and consciously was made to resemble a football coach's victory press conference. Didn't it call up the same kind of emotional response that you had when *your team* won an important game? Didn't you want to raise your fist in the air and say: "We really knocked the crap out of the Iraqis, didn't we. We really took it to them." *This is your sports mentality playing back, on cue.*

The people who organized that press conference *knew* that you had been programmed to respond that way. By using the *language* of sports to describe the war, they were triggering a *playback* of infantile emotions associated with spectator sports, limiting your critical reasoning capacities.

A month earlier, the 1991 Superbowl between the New York Giants and Buffalo Bills had featured a halftime spectacular, staged by Hollywood producers, with the "nothing-should-be-spared" cooperation of the U.S. Department of Defense, *celebrating the dedication* of the game to the war effort, then in its savage aerial bombardment phase. With 80,000 people in the stands wearing yellow ribbons for the troops standing and cheering, waves of military planes flew over the Orange Bowl. More than *150 million* people in this country watched the halftime extravaganza end with rock singer Whitney Houston screeching her way through the National Anthem. (Her rendition, complete with fireworks, was turned into a rock video and was soon the number one song in sales in the United States.)

As several commentators noted, the Superbowl had been turned into *the largest war rally in the history of the world*. It was the *spirit* of that Superbowl *war rally*, that "coach" Schwarzkopf evoked, quite consciously, with his briefing.

## Be Like Mike

Let's shift focus slightly. *You and your son are watching a close basketball game, in its final seconds. The clock ticks down, as Michael Jordan, the superstar of the Chicago Bulls, takes the ball at midcourt. "It's all down to one play," says the television announcer. "It's all up to Michael. They're clearing out the lane for him."*

*Then the announcer is silent, as the clock ticks off the time in tenths of a second. It's under ten seconds now. Jordan starts his move toward the basket. Suddenly, near the foul line, he feints to his left,*

*then twists around to his right, launching himself into the air. Somehow, he is propelled through a maze of arms, to the rim and he slams the ball through. The clock reads no time left.*

*“He’s done it,” screams the announcer. “Or should I say, he’s done it again! Amaazing!”*

Did you ever think about what goes on in your son’s mind as he watches the game? On the one hand, he is *fixated* on the screen, taking in the action as it happens. But something else is going on as well: He is fantasizing that he could “Be Like Mike,” as the ad for the sports drink says in its jingle, that he could be famous and spectacular like Jordan or another athlete. He will try to act out this fantasy, perhaps by trying to practice and copy some “move” or mannerism of the superstar athlete, or under certain circumstances by buying some product the athlete endorses. In such ways are sports *heroes* copied by the young.

But what about you? How do you watch the same events? You’re in middle age or slightly younger. Superstardom has passed you by. In your heart of hearts, you know that you can’t really “Be Like Mike,” in that 35 to 45 year old body of yours. But the “dream” dies hard: You still can connect with fantasies and times of your youth, through the sports viewing experience. *You could have been like Mike, if only things were different, you fantasize.*

*You have been “transported” to an infantile state, through associations and identifications with experiences of youth.* This is made possible by the now-universal mass culture of sports and especially television sports; you remember some game that you may have seen or even played in, some experience akin to what is taking place on the screen in front of you. It is this power to make associations with an infantile, fantasized past, that is a key to much of the power that spectator sports has over you. *It is a way to shut off the reality of the current world, by calling forth a fantasy world in which your infantile self participates.*

Often, the habituated viewing of spectator sports will have the effect of creating a *false past* for the individual, in which he or she has so strongly imagined some fantasy from his childhood, that he now believes it to be true. Many males who never made it close to a football field will tell their friends that they actually played for their schools.

The habituated viewing of spectator sports calls forth the most infantile part of a person, and that infantilism often leads to a distortion of one’s true self and past, further crippling creative reason.

None of this started with television; it has been going on far longer than that. But, as we have said before, the mass proliferation of sports through television has universalized this *neurosis* throughout much of the adult male population.

## **Brainwashing by Numbers**

We have also noted that fanatics have their unique way to communicate with each other. The **language** of sports, meaning the terms used to describe various actions, rules, etc., of the major sports, have become a part of popular language. It is for this reason that the Schwarzkopf briefing could be understood by those watching it.

A major portion of the *sports language* is *numbers*--the endless amount of statistical information used to quantify and therefore analyze the events taking place on the playing field. These numbers are totally useless for the conduct of human affairs on a day-to-day basis. They tell people nothing about the



real world or things that might truly matter in their daily lives. Yet, it is a simple fact, that more people can tell you what the records of the starting pitchers are in today's Yankee-Orioles baseball game, than where the dollar closed in Tokyo.

My father once tried to impress on me the frivolity of sports "numbers." He told me that when he was a young clerk in a shipping firm he was riding the elevator with a friend. He and his friend were rattling off a comparison between the batting averages of the then-Brooklyn Dodgers and New York Giants starting teams, arguing furiously over the merits of the players.

Later that day, my father was called to the office of the president of the company to bring some price quotes on brass valves. There was one missing.

"What's the price on this?" the president asked him.

"I don't know," my father replied. "I'll have to go look it up."

"I was on the elevator with you a little while ago," said the president, quite angrily. "I'd have gotten an answer immediately if I asked you Willie Mays' batting average. That you know by heart, but what I pay you to know you have to look up!"

But aside from creating useless and meaningless clutter in the minds of millions of sports fans, the statistical explosion around sports has had another, more important mind-destroying effect. It has tended to cause people to try to judge everything by numbers, by *counting* and in so doing, it has made them more prone to brainwashing through *public opinion polls* of the type we have discussed in previous sections of this report. The pollsters themselves have noted this. They say that Americans have been conditioned by sports statistics to accept the statistical results of polls as *inherently true*.

It is easy to see why from a typical sports argument. "Listen," says one fellow. "I say that Conesco isn't half the player that Cal Ripken is."

"Oh yeah?," says the other guy, "Well just look at his numbers.

He has more career home runs, more runs batted in..."

"Right, but Ripken has a higher lifetime batting average and he has played in 1,730 consecutive games," the first fellow answers. And so on.

These "debates" take place *millions* of times, every day. In each, statistics are used as *accurate measurements*. They are accepted as *facts*, to be used in argument.

Poll results are presented in the same way. As a result of your brainwashing by sports and sports statistics, you never bother to question whether such results are fraudulent. "Hey, just show me the numbers," says the sports fan. "If it's a statistic, it's a fact."

Such *statistical reasoning*, with everything placed into neatly, counted categories, with "facts" represented as columns of counted objects, is coherent with an *Aristotelian* representation of the universe. It leads to a linear interpretation, to a fixed reality.

*Truth*, as we have been discussing Truth in this series, can *never be defined from such arrays of statistically presented facts*. Truth is located in the *process* of creative reason that determines the hypothesis governing the means by which hypotheses *change*. The *Socratic method*, as practiced by Plato and the great Christian thinkers, like St. Augustine, seeks Truth in *what cannot be counted*, and in the

rejection of a fixed, counted universe. It is *a quality of mind*, the same quality of creative reason that allows man to participate in God's creation and that distinguishes him from the animal, that alone determines Truth.

Habituated sports viewing leads to a fixation on *numbers* and the statistical representation of Truth. This fixation *neurotically* reduces the ability of the mind to reason in the *Socratic* manner necessary to discover Truth.

## The Gambling Disease

The fixation of the sports fanatic on numbers also leads to another addiction: Gambling. Sports gambling, both legal and illegal through an organized-crime controlled network of betting parlors, is a *multi-hundred billion dollar annual business*. Like sports itself, it is controlled and encouraged through the oligarchy's Dope, Inc., the international drug cartel which uses the betting process to launder dope monies.

The sports fanatic turned serious bettor, begins to associate *only* with the numerical content of the games, reduced to the so-called *odds*. According to studies, they care little about actual teams and tend only to have a "favorite" team if it wins money for them. To do so, to "win" money for the bettor, the team *need not win* its games, only "beat the point spread," to lose by fewer points than the odds had predicted.

In the end, the sports gambler gets his *fix* from the thrill of putting himself at the *mercy of the gods of Fate*. He may pretend that there is science to what he does, that there is a "system" by which one carefully places his or her bets to beat the "odds." But any gambler knows that what drives him to continue to bet is the sensation that when one has won, that he has somehow defeated the gods of Fate.

Figures show that the number of people afflicted with the *sports gambling neurosis*, a variant of the overall sports neurosis, is growing. While some government officials profess concern about this, the fact is that it is the government itself which is increasingly directly sponsoring the growth of sports gambling. Several states, such as Washington, have now legalized betting point spreads on football and other games; it is justified as a means to generate revenue, with the argument being that if the state didn't tap the gambling cash flow, the monies would simply be bet elsewhere.

Some preliminary studies have revealed, however, that well-advertised, state-sponsored sports betting *encourages* gambling among people *who would not have thought to bet otherwise*.

## Learning to 'Root'

This leads us back to a discussion of *who* is responsible for the growth of the mind-destroying sports addiction in the United States and the role that television has played in that process.

As we have shown, before the advent of television, there was only one truly national sport, baseball, and its brainwashing effect on the population was limited. Not surprisingly, it was found in that pre-television period that sports fanaticism within a given population was dependent on the ability to attend games, be they at a "major league" or "minor league" level. The highest-penetration mass media of the time, radio, provided a means to maintain fan interest when it was impossible to attend games, but the

effectiveness of that medium in promoting fanaticism depended upon the *possibility* of attendance at games.

This brings us to an important observation about how the brainwashing process works. The process by which someone becomes an obsessive sports fanatic is culturally learned. You are taught by American culture how to *root*, how to respond to the *cues* that bring forth the *emotional, infantile* responses from the individual.

A few decades back, I was in attendance at a Mets game at the old Polo Grounds in New York. By baseball standards, it was an “exciting” game, with the cheering crowd very much “into” the events on the field.

I couldn’t help notice one fellow in our section of the stands who seemed quite “out of it.” He sat in silence as fans all around him rose to cheer a home run by the home team. At first, I thought he was rooting for the other team. Then, I saw him sit in the same stoney silence when they, too, hit a home run. I decided to ask him if something were wrong.

“I’m from England, you see,” he said. “I thought if I read some books about your baseball, I could follow what was happening. But I just can’t get what you chaps are all so thrilled about.”

Such examples tend to disprove LeBon’s contention that crowd behavior is based on what he called *contagion*, or simple “copy cat” type responses to what fellow crowd members were doing. Freud’s observation that a crowd must be *cued* to respond to events, or directed by a *leader* is more to the point. The baseball crowd is *culturally led*, conditioned by a mass sports culture to make the “proper” infantile emotional responses to the events on the playing field.

The Englishman, whom I learned was quite a sports fanatic within his own culture—cricket and soccer were his obsessions—was completely “lost,” looking for *cues* in baseball.

The *intensity* of a person’s connection to the sports experience--*how deeply you are addicted*--has some relationship to a *visual* experience, not just reading about them or listening to radio broadcasts. Stated another way, *spectator sports must be watched to “hook” you*. The more you watch, the more intensely you become hooked, the more infantile your potential responses, and the more impaired your creative reasoning powers, for the reasons previously discussed.

Television provides the perfect vehicle for the mass promotion of spectator sports brainwashing. It fixates the mind on the images on the *playing field*, totally immersing the brainwash victim in the sports experience. As studies done by media analysts have shown, television recreates the excitement of being at the event, while it is happening, establishing an identity between all those who are watching and all those present in the stands, in a way that even the most skilled radio sports announcers could only approximate.

Think for a moment about how you learned to root for a sports team. Isn’t it true that your first memory of spectator sports is watching a game with your father or brother? You learned that it was alright to respond emotionally to what you saw at the stadium or on the screen. You followed the *infantile* behavior of your elders in rooting for your team. Isn’t it also true that among your first discussions about seemingly adult events centered on the exploits of one of those teams that your brothers, sisters, or parents were interested in?

This pattern of behavior is true even for areas where in-person attendance is not possible or only possible in a very limited way. It is true because of the widespread availability of spectator sports on *television*.

## Who Controls Your Pusher?

As we have shown elsewhere, everything that you see and have seen on television is a result of decisions by a small elite. This elite controls the major television networks, the cable channels and the major production studios. This elite is in turn controlled, both directly and indirectly, by oligarchical banking and financial interests centered in New York, London, and similar financial centers.

These are the people who deploy the brainwashers at such places as the Tavistock Institute and the networks of the Frankfurt School. They were patrons and promoters of such people as Sigmund Freud and Carl Jung, and were ultimately responsible for putting Hitler into power. As we have shown, they have promoted *television* as their principal means of mass-brainwashing control.

It is this *oligarchical elite* who have sanctioned the massive proliferation and promotion of spectator sports on television to brainwash you, in much the same way that their factional ancestors used the *Roman spectacles*, with their gladiator and other sports competitions, to control the masses. With the approval of this elite, billions of dollars in television money was channeled into the promotion and expansion of the National Football League (NFL), the National Basketball Association (NBA) and the National Hockey League (NHL), as well as major league baseball.

Starting in the late 1940s and continuing through much of the 1950s, sports programming on television represented the single largest block of any programming type, enabling sports to achieve a saturation of the population as had never occurred before in history.

The sports teams themselves, until the most recent period, were owned by powerful families, many of whom had connections to either the *oligarchical elite* itself or to organized crime networks, sanctioned and controlled by this oligarchy and the organized crime-linked Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith (ADL). The Mara family—which owns football's New York Giants—and the Yawkey family—which owns baseball's Boston Red Sox—are examples of this. Sports teams were often passed on as possessions from one generation to the next in these families, much as the oligarchs transfer their other possessions.

In the beginning, much of the money came from brewery-linked interests, who were in turn connected to criminal organizations during the Prohibition period, such as the Rupert interests that formerly owned the New York Yankees. Some of these “beer” connections remain today, for example between the Busch family and baseball's St. Louis Cardinals.

In the more recent period, there has been a growing interlock with interests associated with Dope, Inc. and its propaganda and defense arm, the networks of the ADL. Often these interests are included within financial groupings that own teams; for example, George Bush's family involvement in the Texas Rangers baseball team. Occasionally, they appear undisguised, as in the form of organized-crime-connected George Steinbrenner, the once and future owner of the Yankees.

## Overlap With Media Elites

There is now also a direct overlap between media and sports elites. One example is television mogul Ted Turner, the owner of Cable News Network and the Atlanta Braves. Another example is Time/Warner's ownership of Madison Square Garden, along with the New York Rangers hockey team, the New York Knicks basketball team, and the MSG sports cable network.

At the behest of the oligarchs who control our political establishment, professional sports has been given important exemptions from anti-trust provisions, enabling the major sports teams collectively to operate *as if they were a trust*, in the worst robber-baron tradition of that term. Sports team management rigs ticket prices, establishes television contracts, sets salary and compensation rates, etc.

This has created a pool of *billions of dollars* for the massive promotion of the nation's sports addiction; as is usually the case with mass addictions, the *addicts*--the sports fanatics themselves--fund both the profit and the expansion of their own addiction. At this point, sales within the U.S. economy alone related to consumer *sports purchases*--tickets, equipment, cable services, literature, but excluding the costs of the salaries of players, television contracts--are estimated in the *several hundreds of billions of dollars* annually.

## Getting Your Daily Fix

If sports are a mind-destroying addiction, then television is your *main pusher*. It is the principal means by which the majority of the nation's sports addicts get their *daily fix*.

On any given day, no matter what the season, there will be approximately 30 million *different* sets tuned to sporting events, according to an industry study. Obviously, on certain days, with "special" games like the World Series or basketball playoffs, those numbers will double, triple, or even quadruple. For an event like the Superbowl, the figure might go higher still.

While early television sports programming helped expand interest in mass spectator sports, it also helped *hook* our population on habituated television viewing. In the early 1950s, when Americans first bought television sets in large numbers, more than half the purchasers listed *sports programming* as their main reason for the purchase. That was not surprising: More than 30 percent of all people buying newspapers say that they do so for the sports pages and well more than half say that they read the sports pages first and longer than any other section of the paper.

The sports seasons are to be compared to a *serialized story*, whose conclusion is unknown, lasting over a period of several months. Thus, each sports contest has a *past*, a history that involves the teams in the event and their records and deeds prior to the game. It has a *present*, in the events of the game itself. And, it has an *anticipated future*, the implication being that even though the result of a particular contest might be final, the outcome of the season, as a whole, remains in doubt.

When the season concludes, there is always next season: "Wait 'til next year" is the refrain of the fans of losing teams. A variant of that for a person who roots for *many* teams in the same area, is "Wait 'til *the* next season," when he hopes that a team in another sport will do better than the one that has just "failed" him.

In this way, the viewer is *programmed* to move from game to game, from season to season, without leaving his couch. Sports contests, especially major sports contests, are thus the perfect *soap*

*opera television serial* and as such encourage habituated viewing. It should not surprise anyone that the brainwashers who profiled response to television knew this from their earliest studies.

None of this would work if television couldn't bring the mass-brainwashing experience to the subject in an effective way. The television camera limits the field of view. It can create isolation from the common crowd experience described by Freud and others in his mass psychology.

Early television, while capturing the excitement of seeing a sports event as it was happening, often underplayed the sense that millions were watching as the viewer was watching. In part, this was because of the limits of the new technology: The single camera tended to fixate on the prime point of action in each game and the crowd miking was poor. In part, it was because early announcers tended to chatter too much. Having come from a radio experience, they described the events on the field, thus duplicating what the camera could see.

Much of this has since been corrected, from the brainwashers' standpoint. New camera technology has made available an explosion of *viewpoints* of each game, with the development of slow-motion instant replay and multiple camera angles. The first games featured a single camera; Now there might be as many as 10-15 at a single football game for example. Crowd miking and modern sound mixing bring the action closer to realism and directly into your living room. And importantly, the improvement in the quality and size of the images on your screen draws the mind deeper into the audiovisual event.

There are still some problems with announcers and commentators, who, from the brainwashers' standpoint, don't know when to allow the images and sounds from the *playing fields* to speak for themselves. The balance is still being "fine tuned," so to speak. If the mix still offends the true sports fanatic, there is always the mute button on the remote control.

Roone Arledge, the former head of ABC-TV Sports, and the man who developed the format for "Monday Night Football," talks about sports programming needing to capture the full sense of the "spectacle." The idea, he says, is "not to bring the game to the viewer, but to bring the viewer to the game." There are variations on that theme but the concept is the same: You must *grab the mind of the fan* and then hold it within the fantasy world being projected on the screen. If successful, your efforts will succeed because the *infantile emotional connection* to the event will be made by the viewer: He will get his *fix*.

By the way, Arledge no longer heads ABC Sports: He now heads ABC News!

## **And Now to the Videotape**

Before we move on to the last section of our report, we should make some observations on the role of television news in promoting your sports addiction.

The sports slot is usually the longest single slot in the local evening news program. It features highlights of the local teams' games, as well as highlights from other games of sports in season. According to profiling information, the local sportscast is most often given as a reason for watching a particular station's local news programming. Such surveys found that viewers cared most strongly about how their sports news was reported.

In addition, while, as we have reported elsewhere, viewers had trouble remembering details of news stories reported, studies have also shown that most sports fans *will remember the major sports story of a given night*. They will also remember the scores of their team's games.

In large part, this is because much of the language of sports is *numbers*, and the *scores* are the major content of sports news programming. Sports addicts are like idiot savants; they have a surprising memory for otherwise useless numbers. The more television gives them such numbers, the more they will clutter their minds with them, and the less they will be able to exercise their power of reason.

Instead, they will use them to communicate the next day with their fellow brainwash victims: "Hey, did you see McGuire's 40<sup>th</sup> homer on the news last night? 475 feet over the left field wall. Some shot, huh?"

"I know how to make everyone go crazy, completely nuts," the brainwasher Hal Becker said a while back. "Just have a phony highlight tape of a big football game. It's easy to do. Then run the wrong score. People will go crazy. They won't be able to figure out what happened. They need the television sports news to *confirm* the results of what they saw with their own eyes in the afternoon. If they don't match, they'll go into a loop."

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 11

### The Making of Sports Into a Secular Religion (continued)

by L. Wolfe

Now we are ready to look at our national sports addiction—an addiction *pushed* through habituated television viewing—from another vantage point.

Let's set the scene, again. It is the last game of the World Series. The last inning, the last chance for the home team, *your team*, and they trail by one lone run.

Two men out. Men on second and third. A two-strike count on the batter. Another strike and it's all over. A hit will win the game. The camera brings you a shot of the pitcher, as he gets ready for the pitch. Another camera shoots the batter, as he cocks the bat, waiting. The score, a reminder of the proximity to an outcome, flashes on the screen.

The palms of your hands are wet with tension. You think to yourself, "Come on, you can do it. Just a hit. That's all we need."

The pitcher winds, and as he does *you cross your fingers and say a little prayer*. The ball is delivered, and *you pray a little stronger, a little harder* in that instant before it arrives at its destination.

Now let's freeze that for a moment.

Who, or better yet, *what* were you praying to? To God, the Divine Creator of all the universe? Not really. A religious person would hardly think that God should waste his time on such trivial matters. A less than religious person would not think to ask for Divine intercession.

No, at that moment, in the bottom of the ninth, with two outs and two strikes, you were probably asking for help from *the gods*, those mystical forces who control the *Fates*, which we are told by those who study such matters, play such an important role in sporting contests.

The sports fanatic believes in such things as the *Fates* and the control of events by mystical forces outside the laws of the Universe. Sports and sporting events, in the minds of these fanatics, exist, to use a sports term, *out of bounds* of normal religion, and most decidedly *outside* Christianity.

The religion of sports is a *mystical cult*, based on the infantile emotions. It posits a universe outside that which is governed by the laws of the Universe that can be known by the powers of creative reason. It is a cult which has its *rituals and celebrations of that which can never be known*. It teaches man that he is ultimately helpless against *the Fates*, the mystical gods of *irrational emotions*.

Judeo-Christian civilization has taught us that man is made in the image of his Creator and that what distinguishes him from the animal is his power of creative reason. By that power, man can discover the laws of the universe and participate in the Creation.



Most importantly, all men are created equal—not in the corporeal sense that their bodies are equal, but equal in the *potential of their creative capacities* at birth. It is the responsibility of society to assure that each individual is given the maximum opportunity to fulfill that creative potential and thereby to contribute to mankind’s search for perfection of its knowledge.

The *pagan cult* of sports preaches the opposite: Man is a two-legged animal, whose reason must ultimately fail him before mystical gods of fate, and who is driven by a brutish, animal-like aggressiveness. Such “men” are decidedly unequal, with some men created more equal than others as evidenced by the god-like athletes of the various playing fields.

While such views most clearly undermine Christian thinking, they are promoted by many sports ideologues as the celebration of the highest good of human culture: an organized, ritualized competition, in which men submit to arbitrary rules. This, we are told, represents the essence of human beauty and ethical conduct. American sports, we are told, as represented by the major spectator sports, are the best of American culture and contain all the basic truths that America needs to impart from one generation to the next.

Such a sports ideologue is Michael Novak, a failed seminarian, who has become a “theologian” within conservative American Catholic circles. Novak fashioned himself into an apologist for the degenerate American conservative culture of the Reagan-Bush years. Novak sees Anglo-American capitalism as the highest form of Christian culture and sees sports as a necessary component of that culture.

Given who Novak is, we shall argue that his thinking represents the outlook of that pagan, oligarchical elite responsible for your sports addiction. When he speaks of an *ethics* of sport, he is speaking of an Arisototelian ethics, a mere set of arbitrary rules and codes. In his many writings, Novak alludes several times to his affinity for the work of Aristotle. Novak’s repeated attacks on the concept of the *infinite* as being inferior to what he calls the *ritual limits* of sports are a denial of the possibility of the existence of universal truth.

Novak’s views on these matters and his *image of man as an animal* are identical to those of the evil brainwasher Sigmund Freud. Much of Novak’s theology of sports is derived from Freudian notions of repression and sex drives.

Novak’s moral outlook is the same as that of the Spartan state, which also idealized and promoted sports and competition. His *mystical gnosticism* is akin to the outlook of the *Nazi state*, put into power by the same oligarchy that sponsors and promotes American sports, through its brainwashing tool, television.

Novak’s 1975 book *The Joy of Sports*, from which we will quote extensively, therefore provides us with some insight into how your brainwashers and their controllers view the effect of sports on your mind and society.

## A Secular Religion

In this book, Novak lays out the thesis that American sports, especially since its mass penetration into the population with the advent of television, have become a *civil or secular religion*, holding sway over the

masses: “In the study of civil religions, our thinkers have too much neglected sports.... Sports are a universal language binding our diverse nation, especially its men, together. Not all our citizens have the gift of faith. The religion, even so, is an ample one, and it allows great freedom for diverse interpretations, and mutual dissents. Our sports are liturgies—but do not have dogmatic creeds. There is no long bill of doctrines to recite. We bring the hungers of our spirits, and many of them, not all, are filled—filled with a beauty, excellence, and grace few other institutions now afford. Our sports need to be reformed--*Ecclesia semper reformanda*. Let not too much be claimed for them. But what they do so superbly needs our thanks, our watchfulness, our intellect, and our acerbic love.

“The institutions of state generate a civil religion,” writes Novak. “So do the institutions of sport. The ancient Olympic games used to be both festivals in honor of the gods and festivals in honor of the state—and that has been the classical position of sports ever since. The ceremonies of sports overlap those of state on one side and those of the churches on the other.... Going to a stadium is half like going to a political rally, half like going to a church....”

But Novak is not saying that sports are mere *symbols* for religions. They satisfy “religious needs” of the masses of the population, needs which he claims the churches are unable to satisfy or at times even grasp: “I am saying that sports flow outward into action from a deep natural impulse that is radically religious: an impulse of freedom, respect for ritual limits, a zest for symbolic meaning, and a longing for perfection. The athlete may of course be pagan, but sports are, as it were, natural religions....

“They do serve a religious function: they feed a deep human hunger, place humans in touch with certain dimly perceived features of human life within the cosmos, and provide an experience of at least a pagan sense of godliness.

“Among the godward signs in contemporary life, sports may be the single most powerful manifestation.... Sports drive one in some dark and generic sense ‘godward’....

“Sports are religious in the sense that they are organized institutions, disciplines, and liturgies; and also in that sense they teach religious qualities of heart and soul. In particular they recreate the symbols of the cosmic struggle, in which human survival and moral courage are not assured. To this extent, they are not mere games, diversions, pastimes.... To lose symbolizes death, and it certainly feels like dying, but it is not death.... If you give your heart to the ritual, its effects on your inner life can be far reaching.”

Novak sees sporting contests as teaching man of the existence of death through the concept of *losing*. In assigning such importance to death, Novak is mirroring Freud, who argues in several locations that life is the struggle between two opposing instincts, Eros, or the sexual drive for perpetuation of the species, and *Thanatos*, or death, a drive toward man’s own destruction. The death instinct, claims Freud, is diverted from the individual toward the external world, and manifests itself as human *aggressiveness and destructiveness*--two qualities of the *human animal* which Novak says sports “joyfully” celebrate!

## The New Priesthood

Arguing against a concept of sports as *mere* entertainment, Novak says that the relationship between the individual fanatic and the athlete is psychologically the same as that between a priest and his disciples. But the priesthood being described is a gnostic and pagan priesthood, not that of Christianity. The priests

are elevated into a god status: “Athletes are not merely entertainers. Their role is far more than that. People identify with them in a much more priestly way. Athletes exemplify something of a deep meaning—frightening meaning, even....

“Once an athlete accepts a uniform, he is in effect, donning priestly vestments. It is the function of the priests to offer sacrifices. As at the Christian Mass, in athletics the priest is also the victim: he who offers and he who is offered is one in the same. Often the sacrifice is literal: smashed knees, torn muscles, injury-abbreviated careers. He is no longer living his own life only. Others are living in him, by him, with him. They hate him, they love him, they berate him, they glory in him. He has given up his personal persona and assumed a liturgical persona. That is, he is now a representative of others. His actions are vicariously theirs. His sufferings and his triumphs, his cowardice and his courage, his good fortune and his ill fortune become theirs. If the Fates favor him, they also favor *them*. His deeds become messages from the beyond, revelations of the favor of the gods....

“Being an active player is like living in the select circle of the gods, of the chosen ones who act out liturgically the anxieties of the human race and are sacrificed as ritual victims. The contests of sports ... are the eucharists.”

Novak is describing *cult* practices, and he knows it: “A religion, first of all, is organized and structured. Culture is built on cult...”

Americans, Novak writes, have little connection to the Renaissance traditions of European civilization and the values it places on man and the power of creative reason. Turning our Revolution on its head and ignoring the Declaration of Independence, he claims that America was born not in rebellion against the British Empire, but against *the Renaissance tradition of man*. As such we need a new ethos and have found it in sports: “The streets of America, unlike the streets of Europe, do not involve us in stories and anecdotes rich with a thousand years of human struggle. Sports are our chief civilizing agent. Sports are our most universal art form. Sports tutor us in the basic lived experiences of the humanist tradition.”

Having broken with that Renaissance tradition of man created in the living image of God, Novak says that sports present the true image of man: an aggressive beast, the most powerful and pernicious of animals.

“The human animal is a warlike animal,” he writes. “Conflict is as near to truth about human relations, even the most intimate, as any other feature. Sports dramatize conflict. They help us visualize it, imagine it, experience it...”

“Play [as in sports] is part of the human beast, our natural expressiveness. It flows from inner and perennial energies, and needs no justification....”

Football, for example, teaches reality in a way that no church or Renaissance thought can, Novak claims. It shows us that “human life, in Hegel’s phrase, is a butcher’s bench. Think what happened to the Son of God, the Prince of Peace; what happened in the Holocaust; what has happened in recent wars, revolutions, floods, and famines....

“What is human?” asks Novak. “What has human experience been in history? A fully humanized world, gentle, sweet and equitable has never yet been seen on this earth.... One of [football’s] greatest satisfactions, indeed, is that it violates the illusion of the enlightened educated person that violence has been or will be exorcized from human life....”

Thus, Novak is telling us that sports teaches us that man cannot perfect his existence beyond that which is most animal in him, that the best that can be done is to celebrate his animal nature as his *Aristotelian true self*: “There is no use despising part of our natures. We are of earth, earthly; descended, so they say, from other hominids; linked by neurons and cells and organisms to the teeming chemical and biological life of this luxuriant planet. We are not pure minds, nor rational animals, nor separate individuals.... We are part of the earth. And sports makes visible to the human mind the great struggle of being and nonbeing that constitutes every living thing....”

Here, Novak displays a Freudian disdain for the Judeo-Christian concept of *imago viva Dei*. Freud states in *Civilization and Its Discontents*, that Christians, in particular, behave like “little children” who refuse to face a harsh “reality,” when “there is talk of the inborn human inclination to ‘badness,’ to aggressiveness and destructiveness, and so to cruelty as well. God has made them in the image of His own perfection; nobody wants to be reminded how hard it is to reconcile the undeniable existence of evil—despite protestation of Christian doctrine—with His all-powerfulness or His all-goodness.”

## All Men Are Unequal

Since it teaches us that man is nothing more than an aggressive animal, Novak claims that sports also *must* teach us to discard as meaningless the concept of all men being created equal; it teaches the precise opposite, he claims.

The athlete, especially the professional, is clearly not the equal of the average man: He is a superman, a godlike figure, with qualities that the average man can only dream about: “Life is not equal. God is no egalitarian. Prowess varies with every individual.”

Aristotle, says Novak, teaches us to perceive value and beauty from this inequality. On this basic and fundamental principle of *human inequality*, says the pagan Novak, all sports and all life are premised.

Men are not equal, according to Novak, nor are they capable of loving humanity. Sports teaches, he says, that aggressiveness and the drive for dominance are the most basic of animal-like human instincts. In life as in sports, love, especially Christian love or *agape*, hardly matters. Certainly such a universal concept does not provide us with motivation to live a certain kind of life, Novak claims.

“But we are not infinite... The human imagination, heart, memory, and intelligence are finite. The nature of the human psyche is to proceed from what is close to us outward; we cannot without self-deception begin by embracing everything. To claim to love humanity is to carry a very large and thin pane of glass toward a collision with someone you can’t abide.”

Here we find Novak in total agreement with Freud. In his *Civilization and Its Discontents*, Freud argues that the concept of universal love, on which Christianity is premised, causes a neurotic distortion of Eros, the libidinal instinct of man. It does so because it is based on a false and deluded view of one’s

fellow man: “A love that does not discriminate seems to me to forfeit a part of its own value, by doing injustice to its object; and secondly, not all men are worthy of love....”

It is wrong “to love thy neighbor as thyself,” says Freud, unless there is some purpose as defined by Eros, for this. “For my love is valued by all my own people as a sign of my preferring them, and it is an injustice to them if I put a stranger on a par with them. But if I am to love him (with this universal love), merely because he, too, is an inhabitant of this earth, like an insect, an earth worm or a grass-snake, then I fear that only a small modicum of my love will fall his share—not by any possibility, as much, as by judgment of my reason, I am entitled to retain for myself. What is the point of a precept [love thy neighbor] enunciated with so much solemnity if its fulfillment cannot be recommended as reasonable?”

But it is the Christian command to “love thine enemies” which Freud finds even more abhorrent to his brand of anti-humanism.

He recognizes that both commands emanate from the same principle: that man is more than an animal and that he is governed by universal laws more powerful than his instincts. For those, like Novak, who attack this principle, Freud finds “the element of truth behind all of this, which people are so ready to disavow, is that men are not gentle creatures that want to be loved, and who at most can defend themselves when they are attacked. They are, on the contrary, creatures among whose instinctual endowments is to be reckoned a powerful share of aggressiveness.... Who in the face of all his experience of life and history, will have the courage to assert this assertion? As a rule, this cruel aggressiveness waits for some provocation or puts itself at the service of some other purpose, whose goal might have been reached by milder methods. In circumstances that are favorable to it, when the mental counter forces which ordinarily inhibit it are out of action, it also manifests itself spontaneously and reveals man as a savage beast to whom consideration towards his own kind is something alien....”

As we have seen, this is precisely the view of Novak, who sees sports as putting man into contact with his true, bestial nature. For Novak—and for his oligarchical masters, the same people who promoted Freud and put Hitler into power—in sports one finds negation of the principles of Western Christian civilization and the *affirmation* of a pagan, gnostic religion based on Freudian concepts of the innate destructiveness of the *human animal*. To be a sports fanatic is to worship Novak’s pagan gods of Fate and to *celebrate* what is *inhuman*.

## A Pagan Rite

The word *fan* is derived from *fanum*, which is Latin for a local temple. To be a fan is, for Novak, to participate in a pagan rite of passage and sacrifice. He sees the process of *rooting* as putting man in touch with himself and his species, in a way that no religion can offer: “A human goal more accurate than enlightenment is ‘enhumanment.’ Sports like baseball, basketball, and football are already practiced as expressed liturgies of such a goal. One religion’s sins are another’s glories. Some ‘enlightened’ persons feel slightly guilty about their love for sports. It seems less rational, less universal, than their ideals; they feel a twinge of weakness. The ‘enhumaned’ believe that man is a rooted beast, feet planted on one patch of soil, and that it is perfectly expressive of his nature to ‘root.’ To be a fan is totally in keeping with being a man. To have particular loyalties is not to be deficient in universality, but to be faithful to the laws of human finitude.”

Much of this is restatement of Freud's analysis of mass phenomena. Freud too claims *rootedness* is a natural expression of man's basic aggressiveness. He likens it to ethnocentricity and xenophobia, which he claims reflect an instinctual identification with one's *own kind*. For Freud and Novak, universal man, the man of the Renaissance, is a neurotic. Man is more appropriately organized into animal-like formations, which act in their own, narrowly defined interests, rather than for the "good of mankind." The emotions of rooting coincide with the desire to be loved in a mass. The psychosis produced, which Freud calls "the narcissism of minor differences," becomes at once an approved outlet for man's basic aggressiveness, which one must be careful to regulate so as not to allow excesses in either the individual or the mass. While he is making a more general point, the applicability of such brainwashing formula to sports *rooting* is obvious.

Novak also "warns" that sports rooting can be carried to excess, which he cautions against: "Of course, there are fanatic fans, fans who eat and sleep and drink (above all, drink) their sports. Their lives become defined by sports. So some politicians are devoured by politics, pedants by pedantry, pederasts by pederasty, drunks by drink, compulsive worshipers by worship, nymphomaniacs by phalluses and so forth. All good things have their perversions, good swollen into Good, idols into God. Every religion has its excess. Sports, as well." (One wonders whether Novak thinks pederasty "good" if not overdone.)

## Undermining the Church

Novak sees the *pagan, secular religion* of sports as enhancing the other established churches, providing something that they do not. But a *pagan religion*, whose teaching and practice is opposed to Christian doctrine, as he describes sports, can *only undermine Christianity*.

To be sure, sports and religion in America are wedded together. Churches sponsor sports teams, even offer organized prayers for the outcomes of important games. Perhaps the most famous of all football teams, the "Fighting Irish" of the University of Notre Dame have a loyal following in the scores of millions around the country and have made millions for the university in television monies each year. Novak himself commented that the most important thing that the University of Notre Dame ever did, its most important contribution to humanity, is "the *myth of Notre Dame football*."

The relationship between religion and mass spectator sports is that of a victim and a disease. It is a failing of the church—all churches—that they have not seen how sports has become a powerful counter pole to Christianity, one whose dogma is irreconcilable with Christian teaching.

Through mass spectator sports, our population is being brainwashed that man is an animal, that universal truth and love are meaningless concepts. A large section of our population is reduced to a state of infantile emotional obsession with the sports fantasy world, such that it is incapable of comprehending profound ideas. Our churches do nothing to fight this. As Novak says, churches have the "good sense" to have their Sunday sermons over in time to allow people to get to their television sets for the afternoon football games.

Some of you may argue with what we have just presented. I warned you that you would find some reason to disagree. "I don't buy this stuff about an addiction and sports being a pagan religion," I can hear some of you saying. "I just watch it to be entertained."

You may *think* that is the case. As we have said repeatedly during this series, the best brainwashing victims are those who most loudly claim that they cannot be brainwashed. Think back to that example of the ninth inning of the last World Series game. The last at bat, two outs: one strike and it's all over; a hit wins the game for *your* team.

The pitcher winds and releases the ball towards the plate. The batter cocks the bat. Your hands are wet with tension. You offer a silent prayer, thinking to yourself: *Please, just let him get a single. Please, that's all we need. That's not too much to ask.* To whom did you offer that prayer, if not to Novak's *gods of Fate*?

"Ya gotta believe," was the rallying cry of pitcher Tug McGraw as the 1973 New York Mets came from way back to win the National League pennant, only to lose in the seventh game of the World Series. "Believe what?" he was asked. "Just believe," he replied. "Believe in destiny, in Fate. Just believe, without question, without thinking. Without any reason. To *will* victory. That's the power, man. That's the force. That's our magic...."

Our boys were well prepared, "Coach" Schwarzkopf told us in the famous briefing on the Gulf War. They had the best "game plan" and they executed it perfectly, he said, as we beamed our approval, as we sat glued to our television sets.

Was it a just war? Did we fight for a morally defined principle? And what about all those innocent women and children that were slaughtered in this "best of all game plans?"

"Who the hell cares," says the man watching the television set, his beer cans piled at his feet. "We won, didn't we? That's all that counts. You know what they say about winning...."

Our brainwashed people, their eyes buried in their television sets, know little that cannot reduce to the rules of the *playing field*. As the statesman and political prisoner Lyndon H. LaRouche has warned, a people so debased is in danger of losing the moral fitness survive.

The next time that you find yourself watching a sporting event on television, and you get that sense of being totally caught up in the *game*, remember what you have read here. When your hands start to sweat, when you find yourself starting to pray to Novak's god of Fate, try to *pull yourself out of it*. Go over and turn off that set. Believe me, you'll feel much better in the long run going cold turkey on sports.

And if you live with a sports addict, show him this article. Don't give in to his or her addiction. When you recognize the symptoms, go over and turn that set off. Be prepared to duck a flying beer can or two. But at some point, an *adult* must put his or her foot down.

## **The Cult of Physical Fitness**

If sports, and especially spectator sports, have been turned into a pagan religion, then a large number of our fellow citizens are members of a *sub-cult*, the *cult of physical fitness*.

Let's be precise about what we are talking about. The human body requires a certain amount of *exercise* to remain healthy. To the extent that one is not hampered by illness, a *moderate* amount of daily exercise, in consultation with one's physician, is both useful and necessary to keep the body healthy and

to deal with the stress of daily life. Such exercise is as necessary for the young as it is for the old, but again, the operative principal is the goal of maintaining a healthy and vigorous body. By so doing, a person maintains his body in a state of readiness to act as directed by morally informed reason. In that sense, to be physically fit, is never an end in itself: it is subordinated to reason, and the program for fitness is so designed by reason.

A person who acts to keep his body as fit as is *reasonably possible*, who, if his or her daily life does not contain sufficient exercise, designs a *reasonable* exercise program, is clearly acting in his or her best interest.

From this type of *reasonable* physical fitness goal we must distinguish the current *obsessive neurosis* of many Americans with physical fitness. In these neurotic cases, physical fitness becomes an end in itself, severed from reason. One becomes *obsessed* with one's own body and the perception of that body as a manifestation of one's *identity*.

While there are examples from history of physical fitness being used in cult practices on a mass scale, such as in the Spartan state or more recently, in the Nazi state, the current fitness craze dates back no more than 15-20 years. It is intrinsically linked to the degenerate moral outlook of the so-called *Me-generation* of the 1970s, with its obsessive, infantile fixation on the gratification of sexual desires.

The emergence of the "Me-generation" is the result of the brainwashing—the first "rinse cycle," if you will—of the "baby boom generation" by television, as we have described elsewhere in this series. The concepts of morally defined right and wrong, the bedrock of western Christian civilization, were given a modern "neo-Freudian" twist through television programming and popular culture: It told us that we must have no *guilt* or *remorse* for our actions, even if they violated Christian morality. This *moral imbecility* lit the fuse on an explosion of hedonism.

The erotic component of that hedonistic explosion, pushed, in part, through the "sexual revolution" of the 1960s counterculture and its infusion in the popular culture, led to a fixation on the body as an expression of one's fundamental identity. Mass or popular culture had always ascribed a disproportionate value to how one looked, but now Americans were told that "image is everything." The drive for an improved personal appearance, and enhanced carnal gratifications, pushed the Me-generation into their jogging shoes, onto their bicycles, and into fitness and health clubs in record numbers in the 1970s and early 1980s.

The key recruiter to the cult was television. From the 1970s through the 1980s, the fitness message was inserted into television programming. Stars of shows, including the daytime soap operas, were shown at fitness clubs, or jogging, or in some other form of exercise. There was a heavy sexual content to the message:

Those exercising were usually dressed in revealing exercise outfits, and clubs and other places were shown as a place to flirt and attract members of the opposite sex.

The association between sex and exercise was made early on in the creation of the craze with the promotion of the now-famous and enormously profitable Jane Fonda "workout" videos. Fonda is credited with recruiting more males to the fitness cult than any other person; marketing studies show that her videos, as well as the other exercise videos which, like hers, feature women in tight-fitting and revealing



exercise clothes in various provocative positions, sell in huge numbers to middle-aged men. As one reviewer commented, such videos represent “socially acceptable pornography.”

But more was being “sold” than cheap voyeurism. The fitness cult has helped with the promotion of the *disease* of environmentalism within the American population.

From the beginning of the 1970s, television and other media associated “fitness” with the concept of man, as a part of nature, being in harmony with the laws of the kingdom of *Nature*: all members of the fitness cult were “initiated” into regimens of “healthy diets” and spiritual concepts relating to “natural ways of living.” Perusal of any of the many fitness magazines reveals articles with this message.

The not-so-hidden message of such magazines and related television programming and advertising was that man did not have dominion over nature, but that he was merely “nature’s steward.” Nature, or so we were told, dominated man, and if its laws were not obeyed, even in the realm of the body, man would pay the price with his “health” and “wellness.” (Before some of you jump down my throat, let’s again clarify that we are not talking about medically proven facts about healthy eating habits or moderate exercise programs, conducted under supervision of doctors; we are dealing with *obsessive behavior* and are here talking about an *ideological outlook* that became a justification for that obsessive behavior. So stay in your seats, will you, and read on.)

According to this *spiritual* message, exercise brought man into closer communion with his animal nature; this was even said to have a “therapeutic” effect on man’s consciousness, giving him a sense of inner peace. In the counterculture of the late 1960s, this same nonsense was contained in the preachings of “holistic medicine,” “transcendental meditation,” “EST” and other cults. The operative concept was a “high without the drugs” or a “natural high.” This was being played back in a slightly altered context, winning some old and many new recruits.

By identifying man as part of nature and by focusing him on his least-human aspect, his corporeal body, the proponents of the fitness cult created people with sympathy for environmentalism. Television programmers inserted characters into shows who are both fitness nuts and radical environmentalists.

At first, the ads and the television shows imprinted these images subtly, through the infusion of shots of people on bicycles or jogging within other action or with people eating “healthy” cereals, etc.

Now, the message is more literal. Ads openly pitch to this fitness-environmental market: “I exercise to take care of my body. I eat the right food. And I want to make my town environmentally safe for my children,” says a young mother in an ad for a laundry detergent in a crushable, recyclable container. That string of predicates seems totally “natural” to you, doesn’t it? That’s how well brainwashing works.

It works so well that most people don’t even remember that they used to associate Jane Fonda, prior to her workout videos, with the word “kook” or “nut” for her various leftist or environmental stands in the 1960s and 1970s. She’s still a nut, but a recent survey found that most people now associate her name with “exercise” or “fitness.”

## Pain and Agony

As we said earlier, a properly defined exercise regimen can help an individual maintain his health. More often than not, for a member of the physical fitness cult, an exercise program driven by *infantile* obsession with one's body and appearance can be destructive to one's health; it can even threaten one's life.

Doctors involved with sports or fitness related medical practice have noted a large number of debilitating and even crippling injuries directly attributable to obsessive exercising. They note that in the last few years, the numbers of such injuries are rising.

In many cases, typical of obsessional neuroses, the individual *cannot* stop exercising, even when injured, even when he is told to by doctors. The person is driven by the obsession, which overpowers his reason. The similarity to a "programmed" brainwash victim has been noted by some clinical observers. In the worst cases, those obsessed with their exercise are unaware of their destructive behavior, and even when it is pointed out, cannot halt it themselves.

But lest someone say that these are only extreme cases, the majority of those involved with the fitness cult subscribes to the oft-repeated credo: "No Pain, No Gain." While this *masochism* has been soundly denounced by medical authorities, it has been reinforced by popular culture, including television programming. According to one doctor, "Nothing we say seems to matter. People believe what they see and hear on television. They believe that people should exercise beyond the point of physical breakdown and pain."

Pain is often the subject of boasts and discussion among members of the cult. Even agonizing injury becomes a cathartic experience, to be greeted with both sympathy and awe by the cult members.

In part, this fixation on pain reflects the mass brainwashing of the population around the Freudian concept of the *pleasure principle*: that pleasure is inexorably linked to unpleasure, and that a pleasurable experience is merely the absence of unpleasure or, in this case, pain. By this twisted logic, one derives pleasure from the end of a painful experience; hence, the pain leads to one's pleasure.

This outlook has its political and economic correlative in the demand for economic austerity and suffering. The same kind of Freudian logic is summarized in the famous call for sacrifice of Lazard Freres's ersatz Hjalmar Schacht, Felix Rohatyn; the choice, he told New Yorkers during the New York City bankruptcy crisis of the mid-1970s, was between "Pain and Agony."

But the problem is even worse than that. The cult of physical fitness, or more precisely one of its subcults, is going to kill or physically destroy millions of our young people.

Over the last half of the 1980s, there has arisen a vast teenage subculture driven by an obsession with the size of muscles and "pumped up" with bodybuilding drugs. Experts who have profiled and studied this trend estimate, on the conservative side, that there are *at least* 5 to 10 million young people involved with this obsession. Of that figure, somewhere between 500,000 and 1 million adolescents are involved with the use of black market, or illegal, steroids.

The numbers are even more startling since recent widespread publicity campaigns have identified steroid and other bodybuilding drug use as potentially harmful and even fatal. Studies have shown that

the majority of users do not dispute the medical claims. They are using the drugs anyway, and even welcome the perhaps fatal outcome. The credo of this *death cult* is “*die young, die strong*,” according to a recent article in *U.S. News & World Report*.

In part, this usage is attributable to images in recent popular culture of “pumped up” heroes, such as Rambo or Terminator, as well as football players and others, with their enormous paychecks. But these images alone, and their mass-brainwashing effect, cannot explain the existence of this cult. The deeper psychological impetus for this phenomenon lies in the *infantile nature* of adult society as a whole, with its own obsession with *physical fitness* and carnal desires. It is not the drugs that drive the obsession, but the other way around. The obsessive behavior of the youth mirrors adult society, with its own *infantile* desires for gratification of the flesh, at the expense of creative reason, and as a subfeature of this, a fixation on sports and the human body.

In our youth, that fixation leads to a destructive *narcissism*, with a focus on the size of the body muscles. It starts with an insecurity about one’s body; it is followed by an attempt to correct this insecurity through regimens of weightlifting and diet. But when that fails, and the insecurity continues, the drugs become an alternative.

In the case of young athletes, the hyper-competitiveness of high school and other organized sports creates the insecurity that drives this cycle. The driven athlete turns to drugs as a performance enhancer or to “bulk up” to meet the challenge of intense competition. It must be stressed, however, that the majority of steroid users are white, middle-class males who *have never been* serious about an athletic career and more than one-third have never even been on a high school team.

It had been hoped that publicizing the dangers of the drug use would deal with the problem. It appears instead to be having an opposite effect. The athletes who have used steroids have merely become “anti-heroes,” who are revered by the hard-core of this *death cult*.

The growth of this subculture has been promoted vigorously by the mass media, especially television. One of the most popular shows among young adolescents is *American Gladiators*. It features competitions among “pumped up” men and women in tests of endurance and strength in a futuristic setting.

Adolescents are the largest number of 7 million regular readers of so-called muscle magazines, as well as wrestling magazines, which are promoted through television advertising. This same age group helps make huge box office successes of movies featuring “pumped up” heroes like Arnold Schwarzenegger, Sylvester Stallone, and Jean-Claude Van Dam.

Again, it is wrong to look at those figures and conclude that such programming is *only* directed at kids. The Me-generation, now middle-aged adults, also watch *American Gladiators* and go to see the Terminator movies or rent them for home viewing. There is no possibility of breaking this subcult in our youth, without adults breaking from the much larger, but equally mentally destructive, physical fitness cult.

Think about that as you leer at your next exercise video or watch with great interest those commercials for various health foods. Try to imagine what the *next* generation is going to be like—or, if there is going to be a next generation, at all.

That's all for now. When we return, we'll talk to you about Satan's own television network, MTV, and what it and similar fare are doing to our children.

## Turn Off Your TV: Part 12

### MTV Is the Church of Satan

by L. Wolfe

There's no need to remind you to turn off your television. From what we have told you so far, you know it is impossible to follow what we are about to say if you have your television on.

But I want to add a new precondition: I want you to turn off your radio, especially if there is popular music on. In this section, we are going to discuss the relationship of music, in particular popular music, to your brainwashing by television. You are going to need your head clear of all background noise, so that you might concentrate on what we are going to present and reflect on it. So turn off the radio also.

Over the last forty years, *television* has helped organize popular culture into a *Satanic cult* whose values are the direct counter-position to Judeo-Christian morality.

Man is distinguished from the animal by the fact that he is made in the image of his Creator, the living God, and that each human being has been given by the Creator a divine spark of reason, enabling us to carry out God's will. To the extent that we act toward our fellow men through the wisdom of morally informed reason, we act more like humans, less like animals.

Society is now organized around a popular culture dominated by Freud's god of Eros and the pursuit of hedonistic pleasure as a goal in itself. Reason and beauty have given way to mass celebrations of ugliness and anarchistic infantilism. We have lost our ability to love other human beings, in the Christian sense of the word, *agape*.

At the current epicenter of this mass hedonistic culture is what the political leader Lyndon LaRouche has called the "one-eyed church of Satan"—music Television Networks or, as it is more commonly known, MTV. It bleats out a non-stop, 24-hour message of sex, violence, and hedonism to a daily cable television audience of more than *25 million* people in the United States alone.

Starting out 11 years ago, MTV has now become a total expression of youth popular culture, featuring its own news programming, pop culture news, a fashion show, a comedy hour, and its rock music video segments for every perverted taste. It has branched out to a second channel, VH-1, which features music videos designed for the "older folks," the 25-50 year olds, with a special emphasis on "oldies"—songs from the 1960s and 1970s. Meanwhile, MTV music video spinoffs proliferate on network television.

In less than a decade, MTV has "hooked" America, especially its youth. Through the power of television, MTV's values and methods have infected *all* aspects of American popular culture. The music video is now the standard form of television advertising, with the images and sounds tailored to fit individual products; news shows have "music video" sequences; sports shows and sporting events use music videos; almost all television now employs what producers call "MTV production values," incorporating one or another form of MTV "music" into their shows.

Thus, *the anti-Christian youth culture as depicted by MTV has become the dominant cultural force of the late twentieth century.*

In this section of our report, we are going to try to explain in more detail how that happened in the course of the last three or so generations, before giving a more detailed look at the MTV evil web itself.

## Evil Reaches Out

On Oct. 3, 1992, Irish rock singer Sinead O'Connor appeared on national network television on NBC's *Saturday Night Live*. In the middle of a live version of her a cappella song, "War," the singer, known for her shaved head and shrill voice, displayed an 8 inch by 12 inch color photo of Pope John Paul II; shouting "Fight the real enemy," she methodically ripped up the picture of the Pontiff.

Within minutes, NBC was flooded with more than 500 phone calls expressing outrage at what had happened. The next day, Catholic leaders and others announced a boycott of O'Connor's records, including the new song "War," which had already been made into a music video, without the open attack on the Holy Father.

But, over at MTV, there was no boycott of O'Connor. MTV's "news" discussed the furor and indicated that O'Connor's millions of fans worldwide would hardly bat an eyelash or drop a nose-earring at her behavior. Said one youth interviewed on a local television news program, "It's a free country. She's an artist. She has a right to express herself anyway she sees fit."

So far, O'Connor's record company reports that her sales remain steady. They don't expect them to change.

The power of the one-eyed church of Satan, MTV, now openly challenges the Church and all religion. Reaching more than 50 million homes through cable networks in the U.S.A. and another 200 million in 70 countries on five continents, it offers preachers like Sinead O'Connor a means to reach their youthful flock.

As shocking as O'Connor's behavior was on national television, it is mild fare for MTV. For example, a performer of the genre called "dark metal," which routinely features Satanic symbols such as upside-down crosses and skulls in their videos, as well as anti-clerical, anti-Christian lyrics, by Glenn Danzig, has what the *New York Times* describes as "scholarly interest in the problem of evil: If there is a loving, all-knowing, all-powerful God, why does He allow so much pain and suffering?"

According to *The Times*, "Mr. Danzig has said that he perceives church and state as evils that have co-opted the image of righteousness. If church and government are good, Mr. Danzig seems to say in his songs, he is more than willing to be branded as evil."

Danzig and his group of the same name are among numerous MTV-featured groups and artists, like Sinead O'Connor, who actively seek the destruction of the Church and all organized religion as a precondition for a new, society based on a *Satanic*, anti-Christian order—the so-called "New Age." His group's second album, titled "Lucifuge" featured a song titled, "Snakes of Christ." Religion itself is corruption that man must reject, screams the vile Danzig, accompanied with appropriate video imagery:

"Serpents of the Lord crawling to the will of God/ Serpents of your Lord crawling, all evil."

*The Times*, the newspaper of record for the Eastern Establishment, elevates this evil to “high art.” In its erudite “criticism” of MTV culture, *The Times* terms such songs as Danzig’s “thought provoking” and his album assault on religion as “one of the most accomplished and absorbing rock albums of the year.

“The darkness in the music holds up a mirror to the darkness in society—the empty pieties and alienating double-speak of politicians and self appointed spiritual guardians,” wrote *Times* critic Jon Pareles. “The best dark metal bands may be an anathema in some quarters. But there can be no question of their artistic intent.”

To attack God as evil, to preach for the destruction of religion and the “false” moral values of Judeo-Christian civilization, is both the implicit and explicit content and intent of MTV brainwashing. That is what is being “blessed” by the Establishment through its mouthpiece *The New York Times* and countless other media outlets that have given their blessing to what is known as “the MTV experience.”

This is the network that has entrapped your kids. But before it entrapped them, this web of evil snared *you*. And that is an important point to remember, because if you, the adult population of America, were not brainwashed, there would be no way to successfully recruit your children to the evil that MTV preaches, no matter how many powerful people support it or what the media says about it.

## **The Freudian Paradigm Shift**

In a previous section of this report, we referred to what your brainwashers call a *paradigm shift*--the changing of sets of beliefs and values that govern society. We explained that such *paradigm shifts* do not occur overnight, but take place across several generations.

One marker for this change in social paradigms are the values embodied in popular youth culture. One’s moral outlook or social conscience (what Freudians call the *super-ego*) is shaped by youthful experience. It is assimilated, learned from one’s family members and from the institutions, such as the church and schools, that act as parental surrogates. If you want to shift social values, then it is easier to do so by targeting youth, *before* those values are reinforced by the society as a whole.

That is precisely what is being done with MTV. The brainwashers of your children have set up a counter-institution, that preaches values contrary to those of the church and society as a whole. But for such an effort to be successful, they must neutralize the positive influence of parents and church and schools, or at least weaken such influences.

For the last 40 years, as we have explained, the principal vehicle for mass brainwashing has been your television set. Television, through its open promotion of *rock music* and the sick culture that surrounds it, was the major recruiter for the youth counterculture; those who were not active participants or even offered nominal opposition, nonetheless participated *vicariously* in the mass brainwashing experience by watching television in that period.

Thus your toleration of the rock-drug-sex counterculture, in television programming, has weakened your ability to influence your children. This is what “opened the door” for MTV.

## The Power of Music

Since the advent of moving picture technology and sound recording technology, the mass brainwashers have organized popular youth culture around movies and music, especially as disseminated by radio, television and films.

Music, in its classical form, has the power to bring the human soul into a reasoned dialogue with the laws of the universe. Contrary to popular opinion, the great classical music of a Mozart or a Beethoven is not an act of mystical and unknowable genius, but the product of a scientifically discoverable method which can be taught and reproduced. As such, great classical music is a celebration of that which is most human about man, that which is most connected to the divine spark given him by the Creator.

Romantic or other forms of banal music appeal to the emotions, and seek to have one's emotions dominate the intellect and reason. Romantic music degrades man, reduces him to a more bestial state.

Freud, who saw man as an animal, understood the power of music to manipulate men into acting like animals. Implicitly recognizing its connection to brainwashing, he stated that music plays upon "the instrument of the soul," in much the same way that his psychoanalysis did. He and neo-Freudians also saw the special power of *romantic* music, either in the form of Wagnerian pieces in "high culture" or more banal popular songs, to appeal in a most direct fashion to that which is *most infantile and animal-like* in man, what they called the *it* or the *id*.

Several Freudians even studied the effects of this so-called music on "primitive people," observing that it drove them into a frenzy, unleashing orgies of sex and even blood sacrifice. This, they said, proves the power of musical sounds to unleash man from his inhibitions, from the control of his moral conscience, *super-ego*. This "freedom" returns man to a natural state, and, they observed, if properly regulated, can remove him from the hold of false ideology and prohibitions created by western Judeo-Christian religious teachings.

The evil witch, Margaret Mead, and other so-called social anthropologists, further observed the relation of drugs in primitive culture to music; such natural hallucinogens as peyote "enhanced" wild, uninhibited behavior.

It is around these studies and observations that the rock-drug-sex counterculture was hatched by the networks associated with the Frankfurt School and the Tavistock Institute.

We explained previously how images and messages in television shows watched by young people are *played back* in behavior later in life. Several studies have been done that show that a song or piece of music associated with one's childhood, when heard later in life, can call forth memories and associations of that earlier period. This is the marketing appeal of what MTV and radio stations call "classic oldies," songs from 15-25 years ago which are targeted at the adult population. Popular music *encodes* memories in the listener that are recalled by hearing the same piece of music, thereby triggering *an infantile emotional state*.

Think for a moment and you'll see what I am saying is true. If you are in your 40s, then you had vivid memories of the 1960s, most of which are associated with the youth culture of the day. When you hear a song by the Beatles from that period, or the Rolling Stones, or the Beach Boys, what happens? You have an emotional *flashback*. A feeling state is induced that brings you back to that time.



Let's give a more precise example. You are walking in a store with piped-in rock music. All of a sudden, a song from the sixties comes across the music speakers: "Sweet Judy Blue Eyes" by Crosby, Stills, Nash and Young. Your mind drifts back to that time, now more than 20 years ago. You start free associating, remembering a girl that you were with and a time when youthful hormones were running a bit out of control. The song lasts only a few minutes and the whole experience seems to pass without anything but a warm memory of some distant time and place.

But then, without even realizing it, you start looking with a strange look and even stranger feeling at some of the young girls passing by. You are *fantasizing*, in a sort of *day-dream*. Your mind has been brought back to the *infantile emotional state of 20 years ago!* Just by hearing a certain song.

Be honest now: Hasn't something like this ever happened to you? The more frequently you hear this "golden oldies" music, the more time you spend fantasizing, the more you tend to live in an infantile feeling state, in a sort of emotional time warp.

During the height of the counterculture, it was estimated that more than 50 million Americans experimented with drugs of all kinds, the majority between the ages 10-25 years old. Much of that drug usage was associated with the performance of or listening to rock music.

Not surprisingly, recent studies reveal that the playing of those 1960s-1970s rock songs today can *bring back memories of drug experience* for large numbers of older Americans; in the most extreme cases, usually involving people who heavily used psychedelic drugs such as LSD or mescaline, hearing certain rock songs can cause *drug flashbacks*, identical to or mirroring the drug experiences themselves.

On the surface, this may not seem to effect individual daily behavior. However, it establishes an emotional tie between the "baby boomer" generation and their *infantile and irrational* past. It makes the adult population in general more tolerant of the MTV generation and its cultural habits.

"Hey, you guys have your music," says the MTV addict to his "golden oldies" parent, not seeing any reason why he or she should not be allowed to have "theirs."

Over the last 40 years, television brainwashing has so weakened the moral stamina of each succeeding adult generation, that each has been incapable of passing on the values of western Judeo-Christian civilization to their children. Instead, social values are transmitted through surrogate authorities, as they appear in the popular culture on television.

The brainwashers who ultimately control the content of television programming have made sure that it *maintains* several generations in their moral imbecility and infantilism. There has been a recent rash of nostalgia programming, appealing to the infantile baby boomer; such programs feature the popular music of the period.

This programming both establishes and then reinforces the *emotional authority* of MTV, creating the climate for its acceptance by our multi-generational, infantile youth culture. MTV returns the favor by continuing the pattern of television addiction for new generations of youth. And the doors to this church of Satan are always open, non-stop 24 hours a day, 365 days a year.

## **The Assault on Reason**

Imagine yourself sitting alone in a semi-darkened room. In front of you is a television set, with MTV programming turned on.

There are bright colors, flashes of light, dream-like images blending into one another, all accompanied by loud sounds of amplified, electronic rock music. As the images flash, there is a steady, driving, pulse-like beat to the music.

Then suddenly, there is silence. The images stop flashing, and the voice of an announcer comes on. It is just his face on the screen, then it dissolves. A pulsing, loud noise rises in the background, as his voice is overwhelmed by the sound of the next “song.” More and even louder noises, more bright colors, flashes of light and images, ultimately dissolving into the gaze of the so-called artist. A pulsing beat accompanies the images, which rapidly change and again dissolve into the gaze of the artist, apparently mouthing the lyrics.

Within four minutes or so, this next segment is over, and there is another, brief moment of silence. Then, within a few seconds, the process begins all over again.

This cycle of lights, colors, and noise is repeated in segments of approximately four minutes each; the four-minute segments meld into a longer sequence of multiple segments varying between 16 and 30 minutes. The sequences are broken only for commercial messages, which are almost impossible to distinguish from the musical segments.

As you continue to watch, you find yourself unaware of anything outside the images and sounds emanating from the set. You lose your sense of time and develop a sensation of being *inside* what is being projected on the screen. Your mind is completely “turned on” to the sensations coming from the screen. You *feel* a sense of excitement, eagerly awaiting the next audiovisual assault on your senses.

When the set is finally turned off, *the music and images keep replaying in your mind*. For the first few moments after such an experience of a moderate duration is over, you feel confused and disoriented. It is hard to concentrate on anything and even harder to pay attention to a complicated discussion. You find yourself, *unconsciously*, humming one of the songs you heard; as you do, some of the images are recalled.

This is what watching MTV does to your mind; it is even worse for younger, more impressionable minds, who have been brought up on television. Over time, with habituated MTV viewing, one’s attention span *will tend to collapse into the “four minute” segment of the music video*.

*All* television, if habitually viewed over a long period of time is cognitively destructive. The visual image tends to shut down the central nervous functions associated with human reason, as the brainwasher Fred Emery remarked twenty years ago. Emery stated that there was a simple way to “detox” from such a state: Stay away from television for a few days.

But Emery wrote before the era of MTV. The MTV format induces a hypnotic trance-like state in its habituated viewers, it becomes much more difficult to “turn off;” add to that, the *playback* effects—the images and videos—playing back in one’s head, even while the set is off, and you have created one of the most mind-numbing tools for mass brainwashing.

The brainwashers realize the power of MTV. In a book on MTV, titled *Rock Around the Clock*, by E. Ann Kaplan, the director of something called the Humanities Institute at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, writes that MTV “hypnotizes more than other [television] because it consists of a series of short texts that maintain us in an excited state of expectation.... We are trapped by the constant hope that the next video will finally satisfy, and lured by the seductive promise of immediate

plentitude, we keep endlessly consuming the short texts. MTV thus carries to an extreme a phenomenon that characterizes most of television....”

Kaplan, using the terminology of the Frankfurt School’s philosophers who speak of “a postmodernist outlook,” says that MTV viewing produces a “decentering experience” which challenges normative values as they are logically represented by moral social conscience. MTV, she says, has no single point of view, no philosophy, only a negation of reason as its outlook, in favor of expressions of “desires, fantasies and anxieties,” which she calls a “postmodern” consciousness.

Kaplan indicates that the willingness to accept heavy doses of sex and violence in music videos is reflective of the power of the medium presenting them. By overwhelming reason with audiovisual sensations, there can be no “reality check,” no effort to separate the experience from reality. The habituated viewer of MTV becomes a mental captive, a prisoner of the non-rational, animal-like world being presented in the music videos.

Using a metaphor from Michel Foucault’s *Panopticon*, Kaplan supports the observation that watching television, and especially MTV, is the equivalent of being an observed prisoner. The brainwashed viewer has only an illusion that he controls his choices, which are in fact fed to him, 24 hours a day, by those who observe his behavior—the programmers of MTV. They profile viewer responses through polls, and adjust the programming to increase the brainwashing effect. MTV, Kaplan remarks, is built upon “an ever increasing knowledge of psychological manipulation.”

The combination of *sound* and *video* image by MTV is an effort to abort reasoned thought by appealing directly to the sensory apparatus. The music video represents a mode of *literal, non-thinking* that substitutes for thought *perception and sensation*. For the four minutes of the music video, an artificial reality is created, much like that of a drug-experience.

Freud and the brainwashers that have followed him understood the power of music to reach directly into the emotion. However, music, even the most romantic music, in and of itself is not *literal*. It requires some cognitive activity to *relate* the sounds and words to thought-objects. The combination of music with images, however, helps to *short-circuit any thought* by providing a literal representation of the musical message.

The majority of music videos do not lend themselves to rational analysis. That is intentional: They are operating on the *emotional level*. In that state, the dissociative power of television comes into play. Habituated viewing produces a trance-like stare, through which one *receives* messages and images without question.

Under normal social conditions, a youngster, especially one brought up in a family steeped in the moral values of Judeo-Christian civilization, might recoil at the vulgar and licentious actions of rock stars, both men and women, as they are depicted in the videos. One’s first reaction would be to turn one’s eyes away or to cover them.

But when this material is presented on MTV, the aberrant behavior is not questioned by its young audience. The viewer, in his or her trance-like state, receives the images and accompanying sound without a sense of shame. There is no time for reflection, no time for thought, as the perceptions overwhelm the senses. *Where there is no reason, there can be no morality.*

In the terminology of Freudian mass brainwashing, the viewer of a music video is in an induced state most resembling a *dream*. He is “helped” or coaxed into this state through the repetitive flashing of colors and images, overwhelming the visual apparatus, while the pulsing, throbbing of the rock beat, has a similar effect on the auditory apparatus.

In this dream-like state, the moral conscience, or in Freudian terms, the *super-ego*, is pushed aside and there is direct access to the most infantile emotions of the *id*. Anti-social rage and erotic desires, kept in check by one’s moral conscience, can now be brought to the surface.

The connection made between the viewer and music video, in terms of Freudian brainwashing, is that of a *wish fulfillment*, an expression of the *desires of the infantile id* to express itself, without the constraint of social conscience.

What is left from this experience, especially if it is repeated many times, is a sense of anxiety and conflict between *reality* and the *images* in the music video. This creates a *moral confusion*, especially in young viewers whose conscience lacks both development and strength. It produces a *moodiness* that further increases a tendency to non-rational emotional responses to situations of everyday life.

Does the viewer of a music video *understand* what he has seen? Not really, because understanding is a function of reason. The emotions cannot *understand*, they can only *react*. Studies of MTV viewers have found that they can recall only certain grotesque images, and some striking phrases that may accompany them. They cannot recall whole songs, but can remember rhythms and beats. These same studies also show that while they cannot *explain* the content of a music video, they can describe *strong feelings* that they associate with it.

It has been noted that playing a given song without the video images can cause an habituated viewer to replay those images from the music video, as if on a slide screen in the mind. There is no flow, no continuity, in the images: It is as if they were mental snapshots, associated with particular sounds, which in turn are associated with particular feelings.

Brainwashers would say that the *visual images have been imprinted on the memory*; they are *encoded* by the *sounds*. When those sounds are played, even in the absence of the images, the images are *played back*, reproducing the sense of being enveloped in the music video experience. This is how your children are being programmed.

The more someone watches MTV, the more one will tend to “think” with this emotional imagery. The former student leftist and current social critic, Todd Gitlin, now a professor of sociology at Berkeley, told *Time* magazine, that MTV has “accelerated the process by which people are more likely to think in images than logic.”

Those who created MTV were quite conscious of this effect. Robert Pittman, the person who is given most credit for its creation and operated MTV until 1986, stated: “What we have introduced with MTV is a non-narrative form. As opposed to conventional television, where you rely on plot and continuity, we rely on mood and emotion. We make you feel a certain way as opposed to walking away with any particular knowledge.”

The TV-reared generations, says Pittman, form their impressions of things from *images* and *pictures* and not from words.

Pittman saw MTV as establishing a new form of consciousness, the type of mental dissociation that the brainwasher Fred Emery identifies as the “The Clockwork Orange” paradigm: “You’re dealing with a culture of TV babies.... What the kids can’t do today is follow things for too long. They get bored and distracted, their minds wander. If information is presented to them in tight fragments that don’t necessarily follow each other, kids can comprehend that.”

“Image is everything,” says the punk tennis superstar Andre Agassi, in a camera commercial made with music video production values. And, concentration, reason and morality are out the window.

## They Look So Bad

If there is one thing that truly marks the youth culture of MTV it is *ugliness*.

Have you taken a good look at your kids or their friends lately? Maybe you should keep your eyes open when you walk around the malls. The first thing you notice are the weird hairdos, often done at beauty parlors that specialize in what is called “rock and roll hair” or that “MTV look.” It looks like their heads have been stuck into an electric outlet and then placed in a vat of brightly colored printers’ ink.

And the clothes: tightly fitting, but sparsely covering garments, with bright colors and rips. They frequently wear the skins of animals, such as snakes, lizards and cows. Occasionally, they wear what appears to be underwear as their outer garments, parading around in leather bras and the like. And they wear so much jewelry and so many chains that one might think that they need to lift weights to be able to carry it all.

This extreme taste has infected even the so-called high fashion houses of Paris and New York. It is common to see such styles in clothing being shown by the glitzy design houses, draped over the highest priced models. Ugliness is the “in thing.”

MTV now has its own fashion show, *The House of Style*, which, typical of MTV format, has no scheduled time slot and is shown at random with approximately six different shows a year. Its host is supermodel Cindy Crawford, and covers the fashion scene with a non-stop MTV soundtrack, wild color, and fast cuts and wide camera angles. Fitting the MTV version of the “counterculture,” the show stays away from the normal fashion glitz of Paris, etc. to feature lower priced “in” clothes, celebrity interviews, and discussions with younger designers.

Those of us old enough to have memories of the 1960s or earlier might see nothing too odd about what is happening. After all, popular performers have always seemed to establish fashion trends. But those who control our brainwashing and the mass brainwashing of our youth through the MTV experience have noted a difference. *The New York Times* style section remarked recently that “MTV videos have made musicians more conscious of their images and have trained audiences to expect a new look every album.” MTV and its “artists” have usurped “the vacuum of authority” in setting style trends for the masses.

This is especially true in the volatile children’s clothing market. “Rock video is driving the children’s market right now,” said J.C. Penney’s children’s fashion adviser. “Whatever the rock stars are wearing, kids are trying to emulate them.”

And that includes very young children. “Preschool children know fashion,” said another department store official. “They are exposed to MTV and Madonna even before they can walk and talk.”

Citing the power of MTV and its superstars to create style, Elizabeth Saltzman, the fashion editor of *Vogue* told *The Times*, “It’s not like wearing underwear outside your clothes was the next thing. Madonna made it happen.”

When Madonna ended her 1986 tour in New York, Macy’s sold out of such garments, all licensed by the “Material Girl,” in two days.

And MTV, in the 1980s, “made” Madonna, as it made numerous other people popular stars through its mass exposure. In a certain sense, MTV functions like all advertising does to attract consumers to a product. Its music videos, seen from that perspective, are self-promotions, created at a cost of anywhere from \$35,000 on up by recording companies to sell, in the last decade, first albums (vinyl) and audio cassette tapes and then CDs and video cassettes. According to the format, a popular video, slated for heavy play, will run as many as 4-7 times a day, depending on its slot; less heavily played videos, or ones from newer artists being “broken in” will run four or more times in a week. They are kept in the “rotation” usually for at least a month cycle.

There can be no doubt that as an advertising medium MTV is one of the most successful in history. At the point of its creation in 1981 by a subsidiary of Warner Communications, Warner Amex Cable (it has since been sold to the huge media conglomerate, Viacom, which in turn has been taken over by the billionaire, Sumner Redstone), all record sales were in doldrums.

MTV, in the words of one record industry executive, “saved our ass.” It returned the “single” or the pop hit song to its former role as the major means of marketing other recording products, giving it a prominence that it hadn’t had since the days of the old *American Bandstand* (now itself a video rock show).

People who focus on its effect on the multibillion recording industry, are taking a far too narrow view of MTV as an advertising medium. It has *sold American youth on a new level of degenerate culture, while crippling their powers of reason.*

Freud’s nephew Eduard Bernays was one of the first people to apply his uncle’s mass brainwashing principles to advertising. In his early writings, Bernays indicates that the best advertising appeals “above the mind,” directly to emotions and instincts. Such appeals bypass rational thought and work on *unconscious desires*, especially *infantile* associations involving sex and power, for example.

Bernays ushered in an age of psychologically sophisticated advertising featuring movie stars and other beautiful people to induce target audiences to *copy* what they *perceived* to be emotionally desirable behavior.

MTV carries this mode of brainwashing to new technological levels. Its audience is already in a trance-like, non-critical state, ready to receive copyable images. MTV’s effectiveness can be measured by how much your son might resemble the lead singer in Megadeath or your daughter looks like Madonna.

## **Behavior Modification**

Beyond the sales of black leather panties, garter belts or leather bras, or ripped tee-shirts, MTV also sells *patterns of asocial, non-rational behavior*, for consumption by our young people.

Writing in the 1950s, Dr. Frederic Wertham, one of the first people to warn of the destructive power of television programming on the minds of young people, described how the young mind accepts

*images* of behavior obtained from sources outside the family and social institutions like the church. Dr. Wertham waged war against the comic book industry and later, television, because they presented young people with violent and other non-rational, emotionally based solutions to problems.

Dr. Wertham explained that it is impossible to statistically correlate any one to one relationship between an image in a comic book and the violent act of a teenager, as some people have tried to do. The mind, he said, does not work so simply.

For example, the image of a colorfully presented comic book character beating someone with a lead pipe will stay buried within a person's memory. It is recalled in a stressful situation, such as a street fight, in which the emotions involved with the comic book representation, in this case rage, are also present. Under such circumstances, the young person will *copy* what is in the comic book, picking up a lead pipe and beating someone to death.

The courts and others may never see the connection, Dr. Wertham says, but it is the role of adult society to make sure that such images are not transmitted, uncritically, to the impressionable minds of our youth.

With MTV, *the presentation of the images itself is addicting*. The most important product being advertised and consumed is the television brainwashing itself. Kaplan, in her previously cited work, says that all television and MTV in particular is "seductive precisely because it speaks to a desire that is insatiable," promising fulfillment of that desire in "some far distant and never to be experienced future. TV's strategy is to keep us endlessly consuming in the hopes of fulfilling our desires."

In the case of MTV, its self-promotion feeds on the infantile desire to possess objects. Its former advertising slogan, popularized internationally, is the scream of an infant for its mother or surrogate, "I want my MTV."

Another of its self-promotions shows an image reference to Aztec temples, then shows the MTV logo toppling those temples. In that way, MTV announces itself as the new heir to the Aztec culture—a culture based upon bloody human sacrifice that saw no value in human life.

Dr. Wertham, in one of his many cogent clinical observations, based on case studies, noted that habituated comic book reading had prepared a whole generation to accept the non-reasoning, often violent fare of television. He observed that *all* comic books, with their emphasis on *imagery*, presented in colorful ways that were attractive to young minds, discouraged creative reasoning.

Even more important, Dr. Wertham countered some of the arguments that were made by the comics industry and its defenders that they were getting people who would otherwise not do so, to "read." Comic books created mental barriers to reading, preventing children from developing a mastery of language and the ambiguity contained in great literature and poetry precisely because words were associated with their pictures. The mind, he said, was being turned off and the emotions turned on. Comic book readers, he said, were not reading because they were not thinking: they were merely passively looking at pictures, with silly dialogue.

He disputed classical Freudians who claimed that a young child's personality was set in stone by Oedipal developments between the ages three and five. Dr. Wertham asserted that the cornerstone of man's identity is his moral conscience and that this is shaped by young children's interaction with society.

It is something that is learned and to learn it one must be able to think. Comic books were thus making America immoral; later he was to say the same about television and its programming.

For the purposes of this report, let's concentrate on one aspect of Dr. Wertham's observations. To get someone to accept MTV programming, there must be a certain *preconditioning* that takes place. Some of that preconditioning is obvious. MTV is a television event, thus the general acceptance by adult society of television helps prepare a child to accept "the MTV experience." Then, there is the pervasive effect of the counterculture and its music on society; rock and similar music is everywhere, so why shouldn't there be a television channel devoted to it?

But, such a channel could have simply televised shots of groups and singers doing their songs, as if in concert. MTV does do some of that; but the core of MTV programming is the music video, which people like Kaplan and others already writing the history of MTV describe as if it came from nowhere, as something totally new. If that were the case, then it would seem to contradict Dr. Wertham's clinical observations.

Well, it isn't the case. There are mass media precedents for the combining of music with visual imagery to produce the kind of non-reasoning emotional appeal we have previously described. We have already talked about one such precedent: television advertising.

For more than 40 years now, people have been watching ads which, through the clever use of music and image, have attempted to manipulate subconscious drives and instincts to sell products. Most run less than a minute, but contain numerous images and quite often a catchy jingle.

Starting a little less than 20 years ago, rock music became a staple of television ads. At first it was only a few products aimed at a younger target market. By the end of the last decade, rock-laden advertisements were the dominant mode of television advertising.

This preconditioning of the MTV audience by television ads was so effective that one of the first things that the new network had to do was to convince people it wasn't simply one big advertisement. To do this, the brainwashers and profilers of public opinion helped push MTV into the "avant garde," to provide bizarre images that were beyond the ken of "normal" television. This meant pushing "new music" or socially outlandish music, such as heavy metal, and performers who outraged, such as Madonna, Prince, and Michael Jackson.

The image of Madonna, clutching her breasts and crotch, wearing leather bras and panties as outergarments, helped define the image of MTV well apart from the television mainstream, and its tame, by comparison, advertisements.

But it is important to remember that Madonna, herself, was and is not what is being marketed or sold through her MTV and other promotion. "I am selling a point of view," she once told an interviewer. And what is her point of view? In another interview about a previous video, "Express Yourself," in which she appeared chained to a bed, writhing luridly for the camera, she stated, "I have chained myself. There wasn't a man that put that chain on me.... I was chained to my desires. I do everything by my own volition. I'm in charge, O.K.?"

The video promoting this self-crippling emotionalism won an award from MTV, that institutional authority of the popular culture.



## Turn Off Your TV: Part 13

### There Was Disney

by L. Wolfe

Even before there was television advertising, even before there was television itself, there was another mass media phenomenon that preconditioned young people for the non-rational, audiovisual experience of music videos: the cartoon features of Walt Disney, especially his features such as *Snow White*, *Cinderella*, *Sleeping Beauty*, *Pinocchio*, the evil *Fantasia*, and more recently, *The Little Mermaid* and *Beauty and the Beast*.

For more than 50 years now, parents have taken millions of their young to see Walt Disney productions, believing them to be wholesome representations of “American values.” All the while, they have been subjecting their children and themselves to some of the most vile and effective mass brainwashing in modern history. It was Disney who perfected the combination of music and literal imagery, that eventually evolved into the music video of MTV; many of his early cartoons and the various musical numbers in his animated features should be properly considered as the first “music videos.”

Between 1935, when *Snow White* was issued, and the present, more than a billion children worldwide have seen *one or more* Disney animated features in movie theaters or on television; tens of millions more have seen them at home through purchased or rented videos in the last decade.

### Sound and Color

Disney was the first person to wed sound to cartoons, and the first to have cartoon characters sing. These innovations took place in a series of animated shorts, starting with the invention of his most famous character, Mickey Mouse, and his first sound cartoon, *Steamboat Willie*. Others had tried to coordinate sound with animation. Disney demanded absolute synchronization:

His characters had to *be* real.

He further demanded the *rhythmic* synchronization of action, images, and music—something that no one had ever tried before. Picture and sound were to create a *mental image* that would seem real, he said, to give his characters an *emotional dimension*. I want people to relate to that mouse as if he were a relative, he told his animators. They must cry when he is hurt and laugh when he is happy, Disney said.

Disney was also an early advocate of the use of color to achieve emotional effect and a hyperrealism. Color was not merely an add-on, something to throw in as a gimmick to amuse audiences, as some people on his own staff had claimed. It was essential to produce a sensation that overwhelmed, where the sense of reality is suspended. In such a *dreamlike state*, people were more willing to accept the vivid imagery of his cartoons as real.

Disney found a 1931 short, *Flowers and Trees*, which featured sequences of dancing trees and daisies, “dead” and even “stupid” when he looked at the black and white rushes. He ordered color added, for the first time in a cartoon, and “everything came to life.” It was a smash box office success.

Having “seen the light,” he pushed for more use of intense, bright colors, and dramatic lighting, using flashes of color. In the making of *Pinocchio*, Disney drove for bolder and bolder use of colors to achieve psychological “shock effects.” The bolder the colors, the more intense the images, the more people would remember the images and the longer they would retain those memories. His view, he indicated, was that the images first seen in early childhood should make such an impression that they should be *retained for life*.

Central to each of the Disney animated films are carefully crafted song sequences. Each contains highly colorful images that accompany the song’s lyrics.

As his animators have explained, the idea was not to simply *illustrate* the words in the songs, although there is an element of that in what they did. They were told by Disney to create *images that conveyed the emotional content* of those words and music. The images were a *guide* to what he wanted people to remember about the song-idea. If the song were sad, for example, little animals would be shown crying, so that the young people watching would thus be effectively told to be *sad*. If there were a happy moment, then the visual images were to convey simple happiness. If it were a love song, animals would be shown acting lovingly toward a mate. If it were about something frightening, then the images were to convey terror in other creatures in nature. All this was to be done, while flashing back and forth between the character singing, and *emotional representation* of his song.

In this way, through combination of the music, words, and images, Disney sought to relate to people directly on the *emotional*, non-reasoning level. His cartoon features were not to make people think, but to feel, something that he said would “unify” his audience of parents and children at an infantile emotional level. Disney’s concepts were completely coherent with those of the brainwashers of the Frankfurt School like Theodor Adorno, who spoke of using the media and its power to convey emotion-laden images to force a *retardation* of adult society.

“If all the world thought and acted like children,” Disney once said, expressing his lifelong credo, “we’d never have any trouble. The pity is that even kids have to grow up.”

## Romantic Music

With a very limited training in music playing the violin, Disney, unlike many who worked with him, recognized the similarities between romantic classical music and the *romanticism* of the more popular musical forms, such as the songs of Bing Crosby or Frank Sinatra. Through much of his career, he struggled to insert classical romantic themes into his works, because he understood that they were a more powerful vehicle for carrying emotional messages.

One of his first popular cartoon series was called *Silly Symphonies* and its first installment was an eerie representation of skeletons dancing to Saint Saens’s *Dance Macabre*. Later, parts of the series previously mentioned included the Technicolor *Flowers and Trees*, in which classical themes were used to help bring natural objects to humanlike forms and actions. His later *Sleeping Beauty* used Tchaikovsky’s ballet score, adding words which are now imbedded in the memories of several generations.

Disney’s most famous experiment in this “classical-romantic” form was his full-length feature *Fantasia*, which, in its most famous sequence, depicted Mickey Mouse as an apprentice to an evil sorcerer, in control of the universe, in an apparent pact with the devil. The film, whose music was

conducted by Leopold Stokowski, also contained a version of Stravinsky's *Afternoon of the Faun*, which the composer praised. To Disney's great disappointment, it was a box office failure on its release in 1940. It did not achieve major success until its rerelease into the middle of the 1960s counterculture, when it became a pop-cult item.

## A Sick Mind

Disney was, if nothing else, an egomaniac, who hated his fellow human beings whom his own insecurity demanded he see as his inferior. In his most egotistical moments, he boasted about how he had created eternal life, through his cartoon characters. His ego was so great, that he refused to allow anyone to take credit for their work at his studio, to the chagrin of his staff. All his animated pictures gave credit to him as their sole inspiration and creator. This egoism built up his popular image, causing him to boast that he was better known and more popular than any other American, living or dead.

As is the case with such egomaniacs, though an outwardly self-confident person, Disney was tremendously insecure. At least once, in a bout of insecurity, he attempted suicide, only to have his life saved by his wife. It is unclear whether he ever sought psychoanalytic help, although he was fond of offering his pompous psychoanalytic opinions, using Freudian terms, of other people.

Disney once remarked that he much preferred the company of little animals, whom he drew and identified with, to humans. The human race, he stated, is inherently bad, containing within itself the seeds of its own self-destruction. Having no sense of Christian love, Disney admitted that he found himself unable to love other humans and had trouble relating to women.

Brought up in a fundamentalist Protestant home, by a cold and remote father and a weak, overly emotional mother, Disney developed a worldview which saw a simplistic battle of wills between Manichean categories of good and evil, with a remote God having little or no effect on its outcome. No one ever remembers him praying to God, and although his family went to church, when he did so, it was apparently in order to be seen in church by others.

For Disney, things happened by force of Nietzschean will, with the intervention of fate and magic. It was in these forces, and his own will, that Disney believed in, if he believed in anything at all but the utter wretchedness of his fellow man. His anthem, which he chose as theme for his popular ABC and then, later, NBC, television series, was the smash hit from his film *Pinocchio*, "When You Wish Upon a Star."

Mickey Mouse, several people have remarked, *was* Walt Disney, and the scenario developed by him for the Sorcerer's Apprentice sequence was a statement of Disney's own self-image. Disney saw himself as a modern-day version of Goethe's Faust character, who mortgages his soul to the devil to achieve his desires; only Disney saw himself cheating fate through his guile and will, winning his egoistic battle with his personal devils of insecurity, guilt, and self-hatred.

In that regard, the *Fantasia* sequence involving *Night on Bald Mountain*, with its terrifying Faustian images and Mickey's eventual victory over the devil character, is a representation of Disney "beating the odds," something that he prided himself in doing, even if the risk was great.

If Disney, as the modern mythology of our popular culture tells it, was the symbol of the American dream, then that dream is an anti-Christian nightmare.

A supporter of right-wing causes, he would have been at home in an earlier time with the Freemasons or the Ku Klux Klan, who had fallen out of favor with popular opinion in most of the country during the New Deal. Like the Klan, Disney hated minorities. He wanted nothing to do with either Jews or Blacks; if he had any working for him, it was only out of “necessity” in his movie-making business. Under pressure, he would routinely launch into a diatribe against “those filthy Jews.” (And though his anti-Semitism was common knowledge in Hollywood and would frequently flare up in public, he was never once the target of attack by the Anti-Defamation League).

He despised working people and trade unions, calling them “communistic rabble.” He never allowed a woman to have any position of authority and saw them only as “baby-making machines” to keep the affairs of the home straight for the menfolk. And although he was celebrated as the maker of antifascist war propaganda cartoons, before the war he had made a special trip to Italy to receive an award from Benito Mussolini, whose policies he admired and who was a fan of Donald Duck.

This is the twisted man to whom America entrusted the minds of our impressionable youth. His cartoons present the world as a mirror of his distorted anti-Christian outlook. It was through Disney images, often conveyed by song, that young people in this country and around the world were first presented concepts of morality which were most notable for their absence of a concept of God.

The simplistic notions of good and evil presented by Disney resonated with the general *perceptions* of American popular culture and ideology. Americans called themselves religious, but as Disney understood, most knew and cared little about the profound religious ideas that had shaped Judeo-Christian civilization. They preferred simplistic moralism to profound ideas. But though they could see nothing different or wrong in Disney, America’s already weakened moral sense was under new attack.

In *Pinocchio* for example, children see the concept of a conscience developed in the character of Jiminy Cricket, sitting apart from the wooden puppet character of Pinocchio. One’s conscience has no relation to any higher Being, to God, or Judeo-Christian teachings. God and religion are too complicated for children, Disney, who sent his family off to church every Sunday, is said to have remarked; adults don’t even understand them.

This separation of the conscience from the self is a projection of the Freudian antireligious outlook then being popularized. Jiminy Cricket is an illustration of Freud’s *super-ego*, with his admonition to “Stop! Think! Don’t Do It!” If these same ideas had been presented as mere Freudian claptrap, they would have been attacked by various religious institutions. Presented to millions of young children by Disney, it was praised by various church groups.

Throughout his animated films, there are images of young and highly vulnerable animals, who are victimized by humans, often with tragic consequences. Disney said that he thought that a powerful emotional bond could be made between the child viewer and the animal on the screen, since children will *feel* the vulnerability. As we have explained in our discussion of Mickey Mouse, this bond, established when very young, helps make an adult susceptible to the brainwashing of the environmental movement.

Children are also shown as victims of scheming adults, often relatives; when they are not being victimized, they are shown being unfairly restrained in experiencing the joy of childhood. This is in part projection, since Disney thought himself victimized as a child by his overbearing father. For all his stated concern with what he was among the first to call “family values,” there are few, if any, representations of a whole family unit, and depictions of strong, loving fathers interacting with strong, loving mothers. In

fact there is very little Christian love at all, only romantic love and love for little animals and similar creatures.

Again, presented in a different context, in a different way, such views might appear extreme. In Disney features, those who might attack them are disarmed by the “charming” or “cute” presentation.

And, there are the repeated references to fairies, both good and bad, and the intervention of their magical powers to shape reality. A standard Disney plot has a vulnerable character, like Snow White, caught in a battle between good and evil spirits; in such battles, good usually won out in the end. This happy ending (with the exception of *Bambi*, which failed to achieve box office success) was the hallmark of Disney, and caused many to see in his movies a “force for good” and a “positive outlook.”

In discussing the effects of comic book culture, Dr. Frederic Wertham said the creation of heroes whose powers were magical and who had no relationship to God undermined the belief of young people in religion and in its moral principles. It is not enough to depict forces of “good” and “evil,” he said, because there is no basis for moral judgment of what is good and evil without God, because there are no Universal Truths without Him. Why should we replace moral values of 2,000 years of civilization with some representation in a comic book? Dr. Wertham asked.

Or in a Disney film, for that matter.

## Music Video

For Disney, music was key to creating his powerful illusions. In each film, starting with his 1931 *Three Little Pigs* and its “Who’s Afraid of the Big Bad Wolf?” he tried to create one or more “hit tune” music video-like sequences. Even if they don’t like the movie, he said, they’ll remember it because of the song sequences.

Songs like “Whistle While You Work” (sung by the dwarves in *Snow White*), “When You Wish Upon a Star” (sung by Jiminy Cricket in *Pinocchio*), and countless others became smash hits. Disney, in his time, sold more records than the Beatles, with the relationship between song and movie similar to what we have described between a music video on MTV and a CD.

I want you now to think back to when you were a child, to when your parents took you to see your first Walt Disney animated film. It was a big event, that first viewing of *Snow White* or *Cinderella*, in a darkened theater, surrounded by many children your own age. Try to recall the bursts of bright colors and the sounds of the movies, their musical scores and songs. Without too much effort, you may even be able to start humming one of the tunes. As you hum, you can recall, rather vividly, the image of the cartoon characters, or at least the colorful ambience, in which you first heard that song. It is a seemingly pleasant memory, taking you back to a time in your life when there were few cares.

Now, if you are my age and have had some experience in the counterculture of the 1960s, think back to that troubled period. Think back to your own experiences with the drug culture or to your friend’s recounting of a “drug trip” on LSD or a similar hallucinogen or even an intense experience with marijuana.

The first thing that comes to mind in such a description is the *colors, the bright colors*. They were *cartoonlike, hyper-real*. But where did that sensation and perception of bright color come from? From the

drugs themselves? Not really: The drugs could only enhance the perception of those colors which were in your memory.

*I shall suggest to you that those colors came from Disney's animated films, that they were encoded in your memory at a very early age, in part by their combination with emotionally charged musical-visual imagery. They have stayed there in the recesses of your mind. Drug experiences merely caused those sensations to be recalled, along with the sense of infantile, emotional pleasure associated with them.*

I am not saying that Disney, who died in 1966, was directly involved in promoting the drug culture. I am saying that *his non-rational, brightly colored emotional imagery helped create the preconditions in large masses of Americans for the creation of the drug-rock-sex counterculture, beginning in the 1960s.*

When you passed through puberty, you started to look at Disney movies, especially the animated films, as corny and sentimental. They were “kid’s stuff” and you were a young adult. But, nonetheless, buried in your memory were those images and more importantly a way of thinking--“think with your heart” as Jiminy Cricket says in the song.

That emotionalism stays with you today, as your principal mode of thinking, which is why some of you may be very uncomfortable about what we are saying in this series.

Now as you grow into middle age, Disney and his “heartfelt thinking” remains all around you, thanks in part to television.

Disney was the first major studio to use television for the promotion of its product, starting in 1953; his “Walt Disney Presents” on ABC and later the “The Mickey Mouse Club,” helped “make” then-struggling network. Disney now uses the television to market and promote the mass distribution of videos of those early animation features, including new animated films such as *Beauty and the Beast*.

Americans, still mindlessly believing the myth of the “wholesome” Walt Disney, lap up the cassettes by the tens of millions, place their children in front of the sets and turn them on. The children stare blankly, dissolving their young minds into the flashes of color and music. They often watch the same cassette hundreds of times. Think what must be happening to their cognitive powers!

“I don’t ever want to grow up,” sings Peter Pan, as he flies through the air. Generations of Americans cling to their childhoods, while their children cling to their MTV.

In an appreciation of MTV on its tenth birthday in 1991, *The New York Times* pop “critic” Jon Pareles wrote of successful music videos: “As a form, music video is closest to advertising and cartoons, hence the brightly garbed cartoonish images of many hard-rockers, rapper and pop singers....”

Welcome to the “Wonderful World of Walt Disney!”

## **The Children of Sesame Street**

In an earlier section of this report, we described the mind-damaging effects of the popular children’s show on public television, “Sesame Street.” For our purposes here, let’s focus in on one aspect of that show to indicate how it, like Disney, helped prepare a generation of kids for MTV.

From its inception more than 20 years ago, a central feature of the daily “Sesame Street” fare is the use of music, usually rock music or rap, as a form of “teaching” mechanism. Have you ever taken a good look at one of those sequences?

Take for example the ones that “teach” simple addition. There’s a shot of a “live” person singing; then the background changes colors, and a number appears on the screen. The number, itself a bright color against another bright color, starts to move and otherwise take on some human form, with legs and arms. More color, and another number, also in this semi-human form, appears. The two numbers start dancing together to a pulsing rock beat, one that you can clap your hands to. The screen flashes another color background.

Then some live people and/or puppets appear, also dancing; they count their numbers and start dancing, as if in a club or disco. The number that is supposed to represent the addition of two previous numbers now appears over the screen.

The same combination of video music, color and video-animation are used in most so-called teaching segments. Sometimes numbers dance; other times its letters or words.

The child sits at the set, clapping his hands to the beat of the rock music. The colors grab his attention and keep it focused on the screen.

This brainwashing has received awards as an “innovative” educational process. But for our purposes here, just concentrate on the description of the video presentation. It is a *music video*, using the same forms and principles developed by Disney and later enhanced by modern video technology, as modeled on MTV. It is only one small step removed from the so-called “Kid-Vid,” music videos designed for young children, featuring rock and kid-rock entertainers. In fact, PBS produces and distributes a series of “Sesame Street” music videos, featuring rock music and the show’s characters, such as Big Bird. The numbers featured in the videos have become part of the very successful “Sesame Street” concert tours.

By the way, there really isn’t anything all that innovative about “Sesame Street” and its dancing numbers, accompanied by live performers. Walt Disney, when he was first starting out back in the 1920s, produced the first animated shorts using numbers and letters in motion, even using them with live actors, as advertising promos.

“Sesame Street,” which was viewed by tens of millions of children during the decade prior to the creation of MTV in 1981, was a feeder to the new mass brainwashing channel, placing the music video in front of children’s eyes and establishing a mode of thinking in video imagery in their young minds. In that way, “Sesame Street” was and is a recruiter for that one-eyed church of Satan, MTV.

## **A Little Bit of History**

It’s just a little more than a decade since MTV was launched on July 31, 1981, with the words of one of its originators, John Lack, “Ladies and Gentlemen: Rock and Roll!”

As was the case with Disney, a popular mythology has been developed to both tell the history of MTV and explain its success. Its common elements are that it was the brainchild of Lack, the aforementioned Robert Pittman, and others who forced it on a reluctant entertainment industry, including its parent company, Warner-Amex Cable Communications. By dint of the will of these *Wunderkinder*

(most were in their twenties and thirties), the industry was forced to stay with the bold and dangerous experiment until it caught on towards the middle of the 1980s. Through it all, they resisted attacks from conservatives and from competitors, and even from reluctant cable providers, who were at first unwilling to sign on for the 24-hour music channel.

As with the case with most mythologies, there is an element of truth in what is being said. It is true that Lack, Pittman and several of their cohorts made MTV happen, so to speak. But that “happening” was all carefully pre-planned.

Before there was MTV, there was a target audience: teenagers. Demographic studies had shown a marked decline in national television watching, per capita, in the United States, and it was primarily because teenagers weren’t watching as much as in previous decades. *We shall maintain that the creation of MTV was rooted in the desire to “hook” that age group--12- to 20-year-olds—on a television brainwashing format, using popular music to do it.* That it cohered with the interests of record companies to rescue themselves from financial losses was a fortunate coincidence; it made the provision of free “video clips” for the new channel possible, thereby cheapening the cost of the venture. But even if there had been additional costs, even if the costs of the music videos had to be paid in part by the so-called music channel, the creation of MTV or a similar channel would have taken place to achieve the desired effect of addicting teenagers to television.

As it was, the channel was started after significant profiling of the target population to determine what would “hook them.” Even before Pittman became involved, Warner was experimenting with a new children’s cable network, Nickelodeon, which would feature a music video show, “Pop Clips.” Pittman, bringing his expertise as a veteran of radio programming and marketing, employed “psychographic” research to determine what the format of a possible new music network should be. It included using Warner’s experimental interactive cable system, QUBE, in Columbus, Ohio to obtain responses to music video programming *before* the launch of the new network.

*Prior* to MTV’s introduction, its creators had sufficient test and profile data to *prove* that the effort would ultimately succeed. The 24-hour format was selected from the results of this brainwasher’s profile. MTV’s initial mass promotion and even the development of its famous symbol, with its large “M” overwhelming the smaller “tv,” was a product of such research and feedback.

Pittman understood that his cable channel could not compete with prime time television, nor was it desirable to try to do so. More than 70 percent of all television viewing takes place outside prime time. MTV, armed with the profile of its youthful audience, specifically sought to reach people outside the “7 p.m. to 11 p.m. prime time,” especially aiming for “after school hours” and late-night viewers. That is one of the reasons that the network was launched with a 24-hour format.

An early criticism of the MTV format by some media “experts” was that it lacked “coherence,” that it was preferable to “block” various types of videos (punk, pop, hard rock, etc.) into coherent segments, perhaps even shows. Those creating MTV, with their psychographics in hand, saw this as ineffective. MTV would be “rotational,” it would have a playlist, like a radio station, but there would be no effort to “block” the music into coherent groupings. Pittman argued that this would attract *any* potential viewer, who would know that his favorite groups were likely to be played in the course of an hour or two, but wouldn’t be sure exactly when. The young people were to be “hooked,” on their expectations and kept viewing by the brainwashing quality of the music video format.



“When you are dealing with a music culture,” Pittman told *The New York Times*, “music serves as something beyond entertainment. It is really the peg that people use to identify themselves. It is representative of their values and culture.”

To appeal to what the psychographics indicated was the broadest range of the target audience, MTV chose an album-oriented rock (AOR) format. This was later to draw fire from various African-American artists and others who saw a tinge of racism in the choice, but Pittman argued that he was indeed going for a white, teenage, rock-addicted audience and that the so-called forms of urban or black music did not appeal to them, any more than country and western did. To distinguish MTV from radio, the format was to include a high percentage of new artists or new songs, rather than simply “top 40.” All format decisions were based on poll results.

MTV has never significantly altered that format. It has allowed some more black music, including allowing popular rappers onto its playlists. Its target is still mostly white teenagers; African-Americans can get their dose of video brainwashing from the many “black oriented” video music shows in syndication or on cable.

After its main channel was already well entrenched, MTV branched out to set up a separate channel in 1986 for the 35- to 50-year-old rockers, VH-1 (Video Hits-1), which some people call “old folks video.” It keeps that generation, the older baby boomers, living in their infantile past, featuring clips of artists from the 1960s-early 1970s, as well as “soft rock” songs now popular. As one MTV spokesman said, “we have avoided polluting the image of our main channel. It’s still young and vibrant, and full of the wilder things.”

VH-1, like MTV itself, was set up only after extensive “psychographic profiling,” which showed that it “couldn’t miss.”

## Why Previous Attacks Failed

Much has been made of how MTV “made it,” despite being ignored by much of the establishment media when it started. *The Times* for example was conspicuously absent from the “kickoff event,” even though MTV was then headquartered just across the Hudson River in New Jersey. But, if MTV were to succeed, it had to *appear* to be antiestablishment, or at least outside the “mainstream.”

There is absolutely no question that MTV is about as Establishment as you can get. It’s money came first from Dope, Inc.-linked Warner Communications and American Express, and more recently from the international media giant Viacom and its billionaire owner, Sumner Redstone, who has pushed MTV into a global network. Every step of the way, its operation was subsidized by New York and other money-center banks, who financed the operations of these companies.

It’s run as a business, and has always been so. It has never lost money, and continues to rake in substantial profits and returns for its investors and owners. In 1991, the last year for which figures are available, MTV had revenues of \$243 million and an operating income of \$88 million, with a rate of profit increase of more than 20%; profits are expected to be even higher this year, despite the depression. And, as we have said, it has made *billions of dollars* for the record industry.

The approach of Pittman, Lack, and their successors to keep MTV in its “narrowcast” mould, trying to reach the largest demographic teenage audience and keep them hooked, has drawn fire for “elitism” from within some of the more “avant garde” elements in the pantheon of rock.

Such criticism never concerned Pittman and his bosses; the only “critics” they cared about were those young people who were being addicted to MTV. And the polls showed that the majority of young viewers thought MTV was what they wanted.

For the first few years, MTV seemed immune to the attacks launched, mostly by the religious right, on satanism, sex, and violence in the youth culture and popular music. It wasn’t until the middle of the decade, after nearly four years of its continuous broadcast of such videos, that the attacks began to coalesce in the national media. But by that time, the various opponents of MTV were dealing with an *established institution*.

Some of these opponents, most notably the National Coalition on Television Violence (NCTV) and its head, Dr. Thomas Radecki, make cogent observations about the evil teachings of the one-eyed church of Satan. “MTV and Warner push violent sadist and hate programming into the American home...,” Dr. Radecki stated in the early 1980s. MTV’s message to American youth, he said in a newspaper interview, is “violence is normal and okay, that hostile sexual relations are commonplace and acceptable, that heroes engage in torture and murder for fun.”

“I have already seen several cases of young people in my psychiatric practice,” said Dr. Radecki, “with severe problems of anger and anti-social behavior who are immersed into a subculture of violent rock music. They each own several tee-shirts with violent images of various heavy metal groups on them and wear types of metal studded jewelry and barbed wire necklaces. It is plainly obvious that they are heavily immersed in fantasies of violence that are affecting their way of thinking and their behavior in an anti-social direction.”

But, despite these statements, Dr. Radecki and his group see nothing wrong MTV youth culture *in general*, restricting his comments to only the most openly violent and Satanic of rock forms. They never talk about the promotion of non-rational, anti-Christian thinking by the music video form. In fact, his group has given awards to various rock groups and their videos for promoting “pro-social themes.” He has called for MTV to air more of such videos, though they promote the counterculture, and equally anti-Christian values of environmentalism.

In the middle of the decade, as well, “Tipper” Gore, the wife of the Vice President Al Gore, then the senior senator from Tennessee, became involved in a crusade against pornographic and violent rock lyrics. This ultimately led to an industry-accepted system that merely labeled certain CDs and videos as containing objectionable material, which appears to have *increased* their sales.

But Gore and her other so-called Washington Wives, never really attacked MTV. She once told a congressional hearing that she found nothing wrong with most of what was on, but complained only of some of the more lurid items, like Prince’s videos. She recently told *The Times* that she actually likes rock and roll and was a “big fan” of the Rolling Stones and Greatful Dead!

It is the moral and mental weakness of its opponents that assured MTV that it could ultimately do as it pleased. By failing to attack the underpinnings of the MTV ideology, the right, both religious and otherwise, has merely helped feed the mythology that MTV is antiestablishment. Recent polls show that

American youth are more firmly wedded to that idea now than at any time since MTV's inception; the more it is impotently attacked, the more converts and power it gains.

MTV, the church of Satan, is winning the fight for the minds of America because no one has challenged the brainwashing ideology behind the concept of the music video. Instead, one finds even some nominal religious groups *adapting* MTV's methods to their ends.

"Besides being the strong silent type, Jesus is a hunk in an Armani-like jacket and tee-shirt," reports *The Times* style section. "Or at least that is how he appears in 'Out of the Tombs' a video that translates Mark 5:1-20 into liquid sights and sounds of MTV style imagery. For nine minutes, Jesus and man tormented by evil and bad dental work drift in and out of a hip (and hypnotic) wash of rock tracks, gentle-as-a-breeze narration and quick scenes of graffiti-marred urban landscapes, sunburst skies and the bowels of a gritty tenement.

"It's all late 20<sup>th</sup> century stuff, flashy, urbane, and executed with sophistication. The demon even wears a turned-around baseball cap and high tops."

"We wanted to reach teenagers and perhaps young adults with this translation of the story," *The Times* quotes Fern Lee Hageborn, the project manager for the American Bible Society's multimedia project, which produced the video. They had reached the conclusion that a video in the style of MTV was the most appropriate way to do this. Satan must be laughing at us.

## The Brave New World

"We made a conscious decision not to grow old with our audience," says Robert Pittman, now a Time-Warner, Inc. executive, "So we decided to change for change's sake."

Pittman was referring to the decision this year by MTV to enter, in a big way, the political election news fray with a multimillion dollar coverage of the election campaign and an effort to mobilize voters in the 18-24 year old segment of its audience with a get out the vote campaign called "Choose or Lose."

MTV was not simply adding some more political news to its nightly and weekly "rock news show," that sparse political news coverage that the network deemed of interest to its viewers—abortion issues, censorship, racial strife, sex scandals, etc. MTV was to try to cover the campaign *as if by a series of music videos, posing as news coverage*. Its segments featured sound and music, and music video-like camera angles and cuts, aimed at achieving maximum emotional impact.

"We are trying to speak a language that our viewers understand," said one of the news producers. "We are going to reach people who speak the language of MTV."

Interspersed with the *image* reports, were interviews with political newsmakers, mostly done by the network's 25-year-old political reporter Tabitha Soren, who speaks and ask questions in a short clipped style, almost like a rapper, and who likes to dress in men's clothes. For political "floor" reporters for the staid GOP convention, MTV hired Ted Nugent of the heavy metal band Damn Yankees and Treach, a black rapper from the group Naughty by Nature, who roamed the floor, seeking out fundamentalists and others who were more than willing to appear on Satan's network. At the Democratic convention, Megadeath's Dave Mustaine could be seen interviewing delegates from the deep South.

Soren, who had commentaries from New Jersey Senator and former basketball star Bill Bradley at the Democratic Convention and House Minority leader Georgia Rep. Newt Gingrich at the GOP convention, was herself the subject of enormous media attention. All this helped build the credibility of MTV's coverage.

"We were trying to make people *feel* things," said one MTV person. "We wanted them to connect some images and faces with some ideas, so that they could relate to those ideas. We weren't trying to preach." It was best the tradition of music video.

The average viewer of MTV watches for only 16 minutes at a time. The network's executives plan all programming with the foreknowledge that this limited attention span is what they have to work with.

MTV says it plans to continue this type of new coverage, offering its young audience a "full service" network. Meanwhile, the major networks have already taken to producing MTV-like music videos within local news, and even an occasional national newscast or news magazine show to deal with political issues.

MTV doesn't change, said Pittman, but as the young MTV generation grows older "society is going to become more like MTV."

On June 16, Bill Clinton became the first presidential candidate to submit to MTV's "Choose or Lose" interview show. (Later Ross Perot would do the same; President Bush refused the offer.) It was a thoroughly stage-managed affair, with a carefully pre-selected young audience that would make both MTV and Clinton look good.

MTV received both the praise and the promise of the man who was then President-elect of the United States that he would "stay in touch" with both the network and its audience. "I like MTV," he said, praising the work it was doing in getting young people to register and vote with its "Choose or Lose" campaign.

Cut to commercial for the "Choose or Lose" campaign, one that aired hundreds of times on MTV: The screen explodes with a flash of blinding light and a riff of hard rock music, with words over-dubbed, about the Bill of Rights. The band is the rock group Aerosmith.

"Freedom," declares lead guitarist Joe Perry, "is the right to use handcuffs for friendly purposes." As he speaks, he licks whipped cream off the chest of a buxom blonde. He continues:

"Freedom to wear whipped cream as clothing." Two blondes, scantily clad in American flag suits, hold up the rim of a giant condom. As the rock music blares, a voice off camera intones:

"Freedom to wear a rubber *all day*--if necessary."

"Hey," yells lead singer Steve Tyler, "Protect your freedoms—Vote!"

"Even for the wrong person," adds bass player Tom Hamilton laughing.

MTV and its VH-1 will be available in the White House in 1993, as well as in 250 million homes worldwide. Satan is laughing so loudly that you can hear him. Just turn down your television set and listen.

That's all for now. When we return, we'll show you how your brainwashers intend to put you into your own, personal "virtual" world, where you will no longer merely watch, but become a part of an interactive fantasy more real and powerful than any drug experience. Welcome to the brave new worlds of "virtual reality."