

71-30,938

SAKRI, Fred J., 1924-  
THE HARDENED BELIEF CONCEPT AS A TOOL OF  
POLITICAL ANALYSIS: STABILITY AND REVOLUTION IN  
AN ADVANCED CAPITALIST SOCIETY.

Northwestern University, Ph.D., 1971  
Political Science, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© 1971

FRED J. SAKRI

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

THE HARDENED BELIEF CONCEPT AS A TOOL OF POLITICAL ANALYSIS:  
STABILITY AND REVOLUTION IN AN ADVANCED CAPITALIST SOCIETY

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS

for the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Field of Political Science

By

Fred J. Sakri

Evanston Illinois

June 1971

## INTRODUCTION

This work introduces the operational concept of the Hardened Belief, and uses it for an examination of the stability of the socio-economic and political system of the United States. In most comparative political science, mechanical and cybernetics models have been used to study what has been referred to as system maintenance. These models, at best, may serve as heuristic metaphors, and, at worst, may distort our image of how a human system operates.

The Hardened Belief concept goes directly to the human elements, and, without the interference of any physical models, uses beliefs as its basic units of analysis. Based on socialization and communication principles, we start with belief formation in the individual, and from that we deduce probabilities of behavior for the society as a whole. One basic premise is that human behavior is guided by the way the world is reflected in the human, mind, and not directly by the real world itself. Stability of the system persists as long as people believe in its validity, regardless of its shortcomings, injustices, or contradictions. In this respect a social system is completely different from a physical system which follows simpler and more predictable laws.

In the first chapter the concept of the Hardened Belief is introduced, explained, and compared with other related concepts. The processes of belief formation and belief hardening are described. Suggestions are offered as to how Hardened Beliefs can be diagnosed, operationalized in order to measure their intensity, and how they can be used as predictors of probable social or political behavior, both individually and collectively.

In the second chapter, the Common Hardened Beliefs of the society are studied in the context of its class structure. The question of the

relationship between the ruling class and the type of beliefs that are allowed to harden on a massive scale is elaborated upon.

The basic assumption here is that a ruling class must maintain control over those valuables that are considered of top priorities in the society. In a capitalist society, such a control is mostly maintained through ownership of the means of production. By manipulating the distribution of these valuables, the ruling class is in a position not only to determine "who gets what," but also to harden people's beliefs as to who should get what. In a capitalist society, profit-maximization for a small minority ultimately determines the allocation of natural and human resources for the whole. A class concept, therefore, in order to be of any useful analytical value, must be based upon who owns the capital and who does not. In the last part of the chapter, the various agencies of socialization in the United States are introduced, but it is suggested that in spite of their plurality, they all propagate those identical beliefs supportive of the present class structure.

The theme is elaborated upon further in the third chapter where we move from the theoretical to the more substantive evidence. Here it is suggested that in order to preserve the present configuration of power, only one belief, a Basic Belief is required: the belief in the right to unlimited ownership. Once such a belief is hardened in the population as a whole, the present configuration of power will result automatically. To sustain the Basic Belief, it is suggested that a few other Hardened Beliefs are linked to it in a form of a "molecule." These are the Supportive Beliefs which are discussed in Chapter Five. These include nationalism, the religious creed, and anti-Communism. It is demonstrated how, in a historical perspective, all the socializing agencies have been

mobilized for the perpetuation of these Beliefs, while the challenge to them has been almost completely silenced. These Beliefs have been responsible not only for the stability of the internal class structure, but also have made possible American mobilization to fight alternative systems on a world-wide scale.

Chapter Four is mostly dedicated to a discussion of the role of the intellectuals as stabilizers. Intellectuals are likely to serve in the formal socializing agencies. Their importance, however, lies in the potential possibility of a few of them gradually subverting the Basic as well as the Supportive Beliefs, and perhaps eventually the whole power structure. But the focus here is mainly on those who have dedicated their talents to the preservation of the status quo, and the various methods - subtle or otherwise - used by them to serve that end.

The last chapter treats the topic of revolution in the light of the Hardened Belief concept. How can a revolution occur in an advanced capitalist society where Stabilizing Beliefs have been forced to harden for generations? Though, contrary to Marxist predictions, revolution here becomes least likely, it cannot be ruled out. It can happen when the previously homogeneous messages, for some reason, lose their congruity with each other, and the reinforcement of the Basic and Supportive Beliefs ceases to take effect. With the increase of revolutionary forces and the gradual softening of the Stabilizing Beliefs, revolution can take place successfully. The Hardened Belief concept, as postulated so far, can serve as a guide as to which individuals or groups can become revolutionary, and the peculiar way in which a revolutionary movement has to proceed under the circumstances. It is suggested that in the American situation, a revolution cannot happen but in a world context, and cannot succeed without the breakdown of the

Basic Belief. It is not viewed as simply a clash of arms between two antagonistic classes pitted against each other, but primarily as an attack on the Hardened Beliefs produced by the class structure.

The reader will soon discover that I have my value preferences. All through this work I did not make the least pretense to hide these preferences. On the contrary, on several occasions, intentionally and with full awareness, I try to persuade the reader to adopt my values. I see nothing wrong in so doing. I am confident that the keen reader will easily differentiate between my value preferences and my scientific propositions (which were not formulated on the basis of my values), and will not automatically reject the latter in case his value preferences are at the opposite pole of mine.

## CONTENTS

<b>Chapter One:</b>	<b>SOCIALIZATION AND THE HARDENED BELIEF CONCEPT</b>	<b>1</b>
	Socialization vs. Individualization	3
	A Socialization Model	4
	An Individualization Model	6
	The Hardened Belief Concept	8
	Authority	11
	The "Image" Concept and the Hardened Belief	12
	The Collision of Beliefs	15
	Belief Content and the Hardening Process	16
	The Hardened Belief and Some Other Related Concepts	17
	The Usefulness of the Hardened Belief Concept	19
	Chapter One Footnotes	27
<b>Chapter Two:</b>	<b>THE RULING CLASSES AND THE COMMON HARDENED BELIEFS</b>	<b>32</b>
	The Marxists and the "Superstructure"	35
	Who Is The Ruling Class In America?	45
	The Economic vs. The Political Distribution	53
	Economic Interest vs. Human Behavior	58
	The Socializing Agencies	65
	Chapter Two Footnotes	73
<b>Chapter Three:</b>	<b>THE BELIEF "MOLECULE" OF STABILITY</b>	<b>80</b>
	The Basic Belief	82
	The Basic Belief in the American Milieu	88
	The Civil War	96
	The Fittest of the Race: The Robber Barons	97
	Solution a la Carnegie	99
	The Populist Movement	102
	The Progressive Era	103
	Climax and Anti-Climax	104
	The New Deal	109
	The Nourishing of the Basic Belief	112
	The Basic Belief and the Mass Mind	118
	Chapter Three Footnotes	122
<b>Chapter Four:</b>	<b>THE INTELLECTUALS AS STABILIZERS:</b>	
	<b>THE TRIUMPH OF MATTER OVER MIND</b>	<b>126</b>
	Freedom of Speech vs. Censorship	129
	The Co-Optation of Social Science	134
	The Cultural Mobilization	142
	When the Millenium was Here	144
	The Art of Obfuscation	146
	The Corporation	147
	The Class Concept	149
	The Industrial Society	153
	Racism	155
	The Critics	156
	Chapter Four Footnotes	165

<b>Chapter Five:</b>	<b>THE SUPPORTING BELIEFS</b>	172
	Nationalism (Patriotism, Americanism)	173
	The Extension Beyond the National Lines	181
	Anti-Communism	193
	The Content	198
	The Hooverian Weltanschauung	201
	Anti-Communism In Action	204
	The Belief in Religion	206
	Religion in The American Milieu	207
	Some Studies on Religiosity	213
	Chapter Five Footnotes	217
<b>Chapter Six:</b>	<b>THE SEEDS OF REVOLUTION</b>	222
	Revolution in an Advanced Capitalist Society	223
	The Awakening	225
	The Concept of Revolution	230
	The Salesmanship Culture	235
	Who is Revolutionary?	245
	Violence and Revolutionary Strategy	251
	A Note on the "Youth Culture"	259
	The Establishment's Dilemmas	260
	Chapter Six Footnotes	264



## Chapter I

### SOCIALIZATION AND THE "HARDENED BELIEF" CONCEPT

It has been widely known\* that in order for any ruling class to preserve its position of power and to maintain a reasonably stable social and political structure, it must see to it that certain common beliefs be held by the overwhelming majority of the population. Such a population need not be of one race, language, religion, or ethnic group. Actually it can be a most confusing combination of all of these and more, but still maintain a well-cemented entity that can weather away the severest forces aiming at its dissolution. Put simply, what is needed is a core of common Hardened Beliefs whose number may be minute as compared with myriads of other beliefs peculiar to particular groups or individuals within the system. In extreme cases all that is needed is a consensus that the existing structure is desirable or at least unobjectionable, a general agreement on the rules of the game, rules which may allow a great deal of disagreement and conflict.

At the present stage of social science, with its extreme awareness of multi-variable causality for every social phenomenon,<sup>1</sup> when independent and dependent variables are collected by the dozens for every social science project, it would appear that I am committing the gravest of all sins, namely the mono-variate type of analysis.<sup>2</sup> In reality this is not the case. First, it must be pointed out that the number of variables does not depend on the number of labels we assign them. Second, beliefs in this context

---

\*More on this in the following chapter.

should not be thought of as something like Sorel's "myths", i.e., an image or an illusion that exists only in the mind. Beliefs should also be taken to mean the mind's reflection of reality, any reality, whether physical or social. Such a reflection may correspond accurately to the real world or it may be completely illusory. Using beliefs as the basic units of analysis is an attempt to study the social system as differentiated from the physical system.

In the social system the external variable (any physical or human variable outside the human mind) will vary in its effect on the system depending on the way it is perceived by the various minds within that system. Since any human behavior is a result of a process within the nervous system whose center is the brain, any human action cannot be viewed as independent of the individual's previous experiences that constitute his current beliefs. The social system, we must emphasize, is not a clock, not a Newtonian solar system, not a thermostat, not an organ or an organism, nor a cybernetic model.<sup>3</sup> One reason we can predict with great accuracy the trajectory of a rocket if we take into account all the variables involved in its launching is because the rocket does not have any memory, and thus any beliefs, to interfere with its present response to the physical forces acting upon it. Humans are more complex. Any attempt at understanding (much less predicting) their behavior can be achieved through taking account of the external world only as it is reflected in their mental images of it, which simply means studying their beliefs of the real or imaginary world. And with that we can hope to obtain enlightening probabilities for their behavior, which is probably the best we can hope for in studying the socio-political systems.

Such an approach does not deny or ignore the non-conditioned reflexes, the basic unlearned and instinctual drives of the human organism. But,

perhaps with the exception of the most elemental reflexes (as the knee jerk), man's most instinctual urges can be satisfied in a great variety of behavior, shaped, and sometimes continuously modified through a continuous learning process. After all, the need for sex and food can be satisfied in myriads of ways. Even something as powerful as the survival instinct can be suppressed, and reversed as when an individual willingly sacrifices his life for his nation, or to save his honor, etc.

Socialization vs. Individualization:

In order to study the political system through the eyes of its members, we have to be concerned with the process of belief formation. For the purpose of our discussion, neither the specific term, 'political socialization,' nor the general term, 'socialization' will be satisfactory. Socialization has been used to describe the process through which the individual learns and internalizes the values, norms, beliefs, etc., of his own society or culture. This is the way the term has been originally used by psychologists,<sup>4</sup> or later adopted by sociologists and political scientists.<sup>5</sup> The usefulness of such a concept becomes limited when we begin to consider the possibility of contacts (particularly through the modern means of communication and movement), on the part of certain individuals, with influences originating outside their own society, culture, or nation. While the socialization concept can still be usefully applied to the masses all around the world (including most of the economically developed communities who still live in their parochial isolation), it can no longer be applied accurately to certain strata of "cosmopolitans" and intellectuals, who, though may be small in number, may well be the most important strata within any society in so far as breaking the rigidity of traditional beliefs, and opening the door for revolutionary change.

The 'foreign' influences are introducing new dynamic social forces which are subverting and agitating the old established order of many societies. In other words, the socialization process of the members of many societies can no longer go as smoothly as it used to in the past. To the distress of older generations, chances of molding their children as duplicates of themselves have been drastically lessened in modern times. Human relations have reached a stage where the boundaries between societies have become blurred and confused. Now, more than ever before, we have to transcend the community, the society, the culture, or the nation-state, and develop a world outlook, an international perspective, if we are to understand the social forces shaping the belief system of the individual.<sup>6</sup> What I will refer to as individualization in this context will be taken to mean the formation of units or composites of beliefs to produce a particular and unique individual, regardless of the sources or nature of belief ingredients that constitute such composites. In other words, such beliefs may have a socializing or counter-socializing effect. Since no socialization can be identical for any two human beings, (but can only transmit those common beliefs), all socialization can be considered individualization, but not all individualization can be considered socialization.

#### A Socialization Model:

A convenient socialization model for our purpose would be to think of societal beliefs as units (or clusters of connected interdependent units which we will refer to as belief systems) forming a pyramid-shaped hierarchy. At the top section of the pyramid are those beliefs shared by almost all the members within a society. These are the beliefs which give the society its common features, its peculiar personality so to speak, and also its stability.

At the second level of the hierarchy is a section whose belief units are divided among the various groups within the society (i.e., religious sects, nationality or ethnic groups, etc.). The units within each division are shared only by the individuals within that division.

The next lower level is divided into more subdivisions than the one above it, belief units being shared by smaller groups than the ones above. This way we can go down the pyramid with each level subdivided more than the one above it until we reach the level above the bottom where the units of belief are numerous, and so are the divisions. The beliefs at this level are peculiar to a few individuals who are constantly in contact with each other (i.e., a family).

At the lowest level at the very bottom of the pyramid the units are divided among as many individuals as there are in the society. This lowest level is justified because of what we referred to as the individualization process.

Needless to say, such a model is a simplification of reality. There is definite overlapping in these divisions and subdivisions. Belief units at an upper level may or may not be concomitant with those at a lower level. Also, as was hinted earlier, those beliefs at the top of the pyramid are not necessarily equally shared by every individual or group in the society. Such a situation can be tolerated, and stability can still prevail as long as the dissidents remain a non-vocal, politically inactive, and disunited minority (under exceptional circumstances such a group may even be a majority). On the other hand, we must keep in mind that what gives a society a peculiar personality is more the whole composite of its beliefs rather than the peculiar nature of some of its belief units, for many of those beliefs, taken separately, including those at the top of the pyramid, may have their counterparts in other societies or nations.

With these model deficiencies in mind, the reference to this pyramid may prove useful as we proceed in our discussion.

In the following chapters we shall be mostly concerned with those beliefs at the top of the pyramid even though occasionally we shall have to concern ourselves with some other beliefs at the lower levels, including those at the bottom, or the individual level.

It is usually beliefs that start at the lower levels that are the revolutionary ones. They spread out gradually, horizontally at first, and then vertically, until eventually they reach the uppermost level after they have permeated the whole society, thus becoming a new ingredient of its national ideology.<sup>8</sup>

#### An Individualization Model:

Since the maintenance or disintegration of a socio-political structure is dependent upon the beliefs of the individuals, beliefs that determine their attitudes or actions toward such a structure, it is essential that we formulate at least a rough sketch as to how an individual's beliefs are formed.

Without denying certain inborn differences (i.e., intelligence, temperament, etc.) among individuals, our basic premise is that the individual's beliefs (attitudes, values, norms, etc.) about the physical or social world around him are the outcome of a continuous learning process (dependent upon punishment and reward in the loose sense of these terms). While intelligence may allow a better cognitive grasp of the complexity of certain beliefs, the fact remains that a person's beliefs can be constructed only from the stimuli or messages that he encounters throughout life. True, an individual has the capacity to synthesize, and it is not unusual that two different individuals may each construct a different synthesis if

exposed to the same set of stimuli, it remains doubtful that such a difference is more likely to be due to what has been vaguely called intelligence. What seems more probable is that usually the difference in synthesis is more affected by previous beliefs and mental patterns developed in him in the past. While intelligence may set a limit to learning, it remains true that an individual's beliefs, and particularly his political beliefs (or at least the basic ingredients of which these are composed) are to be found in his biographical contacts. In this regard the eternal argument of nurture versus nature becomes irrelevant.

The following propositions are suggested as general principles for the individualization process. It is believed that these propositions will not conflict with the generally accepted theories of socialization, personality, or learning:

1. Individualization (as well as socialization) is a continuous learning process which results in the formation of sets of beliefs, attitudes, mental habits, patterns of thought and action, etc. The structure of clusters of previous patterns will determine whether new messages or stimuli will be accepted, rejected, synthesized, or distorted.<sup>9</sup>

2. Such learning takes place through the individual's contacts with his social and physical environment. The latter must be underlined so as to emphasize the fact that an individual may formulate beliefs directly through his own experience with nature; i.e., without the media of language. Nature does punish and reward, and the individual would certainly learn all on his own. This is a simple fact, and yet it is usually overlooked by those who seem to think that the power of man's manipulation of other men can be limitless.<sup>10</sup> This is not to deny, however, that man's power over man is remarkable, and that almost all social and political beliefs are likely to be a result of human influences. It must also be recognized

that much of the perception of the physical world can be influenced by other people's perceptions of it. A safe conclusion along this line might be the following: the more abstract is the belief, and the more is the area of knowledge not directly related to the individual's immediate surroundings, the more likely is he to gain his beliefs through others.

3. Belief formation (or belief modification), like all human learning, normally does not stop at a certain age, but continues throughout life. The rate of such learning, however, may decelerate as the person grows older. But the reason for such deceleration is likely to be the interference of older Hardened Beliefs (see below) rather than an organic aging process.<sup>11</sup>

4. While it is easier to instill new beliefs in younger people, it is also easier in their case to eradicate old beliefs and replace them with new ones that may be just the opposite. Tenacity of belief increases with age. This is due to the hardening process which requires time.

5. Like all learning, belief formation requires, and can be greatly enhanced by rewards and vice versa. We shall have more to say about this in the pages that follow.

#### The "Hardened Belief" Concept

An average belief is flexible, modifiable and changeable. Rigidity increases with what was referred to as the hardening process. Completely Hardened Beliefs are those that the individual clings to no matter how much clear and concrete evidence to the contrary becomes available to him. Such beliefs are fixed and inextractable, an integral part of the personality, and will die only with the death of the whole person. All new learning will have to be modified in case it bears any relationship with these beliefs. All perception of reality will have to fit the Hardened



Beliefs even at the cost of distortion. All rationality or logic that the person is capable of in other areas of thought will cease to function once this Hardened Core is touched.

The more hardened the beliefs the more they tend to form clusters (which we shall refer to as the belief systems), the units of which cling together even when there may be no logical relationship (see below). A Hardened Belief System develops a built-in defense mechanism that becomes an important functioning part of the system itself. Any opposing expressions to the Hardened Belief System pose a threat to the person as a whole. Such Anti-Beliefs are either shut-off completely, or distorted through selective perception so as to fit in with the Hardened Belief System. If this is not successful, the person expressing such Anti-Beliefs is automatically branded a 'liar' a 'fool,' a 'traitor,' etc. Because of this, there is little or no differentiation about the Anti-Belief System. Every belief bearing the least resemblance to the Anti-Belief System or the least association with it, is automatically labelled false or evil, and thus dispensed with or without any further questioning. Communities sharing a Hardened Belief System (often referred to as ideology, values, or convictions) will use censorship, persecution, ostracism, punishment, or even complete elimination of those expressing Anti-Beliefs.<sup>12</sup>

The hardening of beliefs must be conceptualized as a process, and that is one main reason the term has been selected. A belief can be hardened to a lesser or greater degree depending on how early in a person's life the belief is implemented, how frequently it is reinforced, and how infrequently it is challenged or contradicted in relation to a person's life experience. What we are saying is that the Hardened Belief is produced environmentally, and is not a quirk of a special personality types. The process of hardening is quantifiable and can be measured with a certain

degree of accuracy if we study an individual's total biography. Hardened Beliefs are to be differentiated from phobias or certain psychopathological manifestations that are usually scars of a childhood traumatic experience. They can occur in any person regardless of his mental capacities (though such a person may become handicapped within the area of the Hardened Belief System, and may sometimes give the wrong impression of a mental deficiency), or psychological health.

We must also be careful not to label as Hardened Beliefs any ideas expressed strongly by certain individuals because of enough evidence available to them, or simply because they like to drive in a point.

But above all we must refrain from using the term as a self-defense weapon against any beliefs that pose a threat to our own Hardened Beliefs. Hardened Beliefs can be identified only in the light of a person's total history.

In a society, the Hardened Beliefs that are most likely to become predominant are easily identifiable. They can usually be traced far back into the history or folklore of a society, and thus are likely to be transmitted at an early age to the new generations.<sup>13</sup> They are held and expressed with emotion which may be awe, sacredness, love, hate, disgust, or hostility. They are most often expressed in the various media, from fairy tales to philosophy, from the mass media to the scholarly works, from myth to science, and they are rarely, if ever, challenged or contradicted. This applies to any society, from the most primitive to the most complex, from the most "closed" to the most "open."

Hardened Beliefs may or may not correspond to external reality. That is of secondary importance. Their most important trait is the tenacity, the religiosity, and the rigidity with which they are held even when clinging to them becomes self-destructive.

Sidney Verba observes that "value systems" that are highly articulated are more likely to become rigid while those that are implicit are likely to be flexible.<sup>14</sup> Within our analytical framework such an observation is quite valid (though unfortunately the author turns it into a one-sided outworn argument which dichotomizes between the "open" and "closed" society, the "instrumental" versus the "ideological" political culture) in that an articulated belief is likely to be more repeated and thus more reinforced, while an "implicit" one is likely to become modified, distorted, or inaccurately transmitted, and thus losing its power of reinforcement. Articulation, however, is not the only means of transmission, and the more elemental beliefs do not have to be contained in a "holy bible" in order to be repeatedly reinforced. Sometimes figure symbols and symbolic rituals may be more potent than word symbols. Such symbolic rituals as the pledge of allegiance to the flag in the U.S., or the chanting of prayers five times a day from the top of mosques in Muslim lands are enough to produce Hardened Beliefs with or without a sacred book, with or without the understanding of the verbal content that may accompany such rituals.<sup>15</sup> The conditioning with non-verbal symbols has been widely used throughout history in religion and politics.<sup>16</sup>

Authority:

Quite often all that is needed to produce a complex Hardened Belief System is to inculcate a single belief in one authority, and once such an authority is established, it becomes like the trunk of a tree whose branches may be cut off at will, and new branches with different forms growing in their stead. The hardening lies mainly in the trunk. The branches may harden only when the authority (or those speaking for it) keep reinforcing the same beliefs over time. It then becomes hard even

for the authority to change the beliefs, but in spite of the difficulty, the branches will eventually follow the trunk, and when the trunk falls as an authority, it is likely that the branches will fall also.<sup>17</sup>

Authorities may be mythical or historical figures; they may be popes, kings, presidents, ancestors, prophets, political parties, priests, scientists, gods, magicians, businessmen, governmental institutions, holy books, and so on. The establishment of a belief in an authority is most useful for purposes of control on the part of a ruling elite for through the hardening of this one belief the hardening of a whole belief system becomes not only more easily attainable, but also more manipulative and modifiable when there is reason for such modifications. With the concept of authority we can explain how similar sets of beliefs can be hardened in many individuals at the same time though there may not be any logical connectivity among the various units within these sets.

#### The "Image" Concept and the Hardened Belief:

Kenneth E. Boulding comes close to describing the Hardened Belief when he writes: "Curiously enough, it is often the most successful images that become the most dangerous. The image becomes institutionalized in the ceremonial and coercive institutions of society. It acquires thereby a spurious stability. As the world moves on, the image does not."<sup>18</sup> Further on Boulding calls such an image which seems to have a life of its own long after the justification for its existence had ceased to exist, a "fossil image."<sup>19</sup>

Talcott Parsons et al have formulated theories on the "institution of action" which incorporates values, beliefs, mental patterns, etc.: "By institutionalization we mean the integration of the expectations of the actors in a relevant interactive system of roles with a shared normative pattern of values. The integration is such that each is predisposed to

reward the conformity of the others with the value pattern and conversely to disapprove and punish deviance. Institutionalization is a matter of degree, not of absolute presence or absence."<sup>20</sup>

It is worth noting that Boulding speaks of institutionalization as an obsolete system of belief, the same as the "fossil image." Parsons and His colleagues, on the other hand, speak of institutionalization as a prerequisite for stability of the social order. The difference of view here is probably due to the fact that Boulding had Islam and Marxism (anti-belief systems) on his mind when he wrote about the phenomenon, while Parsons and his colleagues had a more generalized orientation in this regard.\*

Whatever approach one takes towards the process of institutionalization, the hardening of belief differs from it in that it is the result of a personal process, namely the individualization process. The institutionalized beliefs may correspond to some of those described above as the Common Hardened Beliefs, But while some Hardened Beliefs may get institutionalized, many others never do. Hardened Belief identification cannot depend solely on its institutionalization even though institutionalized beliefs are likely to harden. Though Hardened Beliefs have a tendency to fossilize, many of them may be most functional at certain times, and in such cases they

---

\*Looking at it as a Hardened Belief manifestation, it is interestingly significant that Boulding does not mention Christianity or capitalism as "fossil images."

A peculiarity of the Hardened Belief is that the believer can easily point a finger at the irregularities of Anti-Belief Systems while his own Hardened Beliefs are referred to as "human nature," "the truth," "the fabric of society," its "heritage," its "cherished values," and so on.

may serve as a strong driving force for constructive revolutionary action. (In this regard we must add, however, that in order for such action to be truly fruitful, it is preferable that such beliefs be not completely hardened as to be rendered completely inflexible.)

Boulding also proposes that "behavior depends on the image."<sup>21</sup> This is true. But since the "image" is in a continuous state of modification, it cannot be very helpful in predicting behavior. Perhaps one main weakness in Boulding's concept is that he does not make any differentiation between a specific image, i.e., a belief unit, and a person's general perception of all reality. He uses the term both as the composite as well as a component of that composite. Which images are likely to become institutionalized? How does an image become "successful" and why? He acknowledges that some images are more likely to resist new messages than others, but his explanation as to how this comes about is rather vague: "minimization of internal strain...for purely internal reasons."<sup>22</sup>

We call those beliefs that resist new messages Hardened Beliefs. There is no mystery as to how these are produced even though this does not mean that we can understand everything about them. They are a result of indoctrination. But since we receive all kinds of contradictory indoctrinations (which neutralize each other out) throughout our life, Hardened Beliefs must be the result of a homogeneity of messages in the individualization process. And when the hardening is complete, new contradictory messages will simply bounce off without causing any modification to the particular Hardened Belief.

Since a homogeneity of influences is required, beliefs are less likely to harden in the larger heterogeneous communities. Like bodies of water, more stagnation is to be expected in the small pond than at the cross-current, more in the small isolated town than the great dynamic

metropolis.<sup>23</sup>

Those most common beliefs in the society are the most likely to be hardened, the hardening being both an effect and a cause of their preservation and commonality. Other beliefs, however, may harden in the lower sections of our pyramid model, i.e., peculiar to certain groups or subgroups within a society. Hardened Beliefs peculiar to one individual are unlikely though not impossible.<sup>24</sup> But such an individual must be exposed repeatedly to very unique and indirect influences that are different from those of his peers. We can visualize an individual in the United States, for example, who, at an early age (before the society's beliefs had hardened in him) was exposed to Marxist ideas, and that led him to reading Marxist literature for many years until Marxist beliefs hardened in him in spite of all the opposing beliefs surrounding him. This is an extreme case where individualization sets itself apart from socialization.<sup>25</sup>

When a belief is hardened, it can be mistaken for an instinct or as part of "human nature. It becomes like a basic need without which the individual cannot imagine his existence possible. For this reason it becomes a necessity that the "internal strain" be "minimized" through resistance when threatened by the Anti-Belief.

#### The Collision of Beliefs:

Sometimes it is possible for a not-completely Hardened Belief to collapse after an intensive exposure to an Anti-Belief. Under these circumstances, no actual change in belief can take place without a period of confusion, mental crisis, and anguish until finally a compromise between the two beliefs or a replacement of the old by the new occurs.<sup>26</sup> The old belief system will inevitably leave its mark on the new one in the form of mental patterns, intellectual style, etc. Perhaps in this regard the case of the previously religious person who becomes atheist

is familiar. He continues to express the same zeal, patterns of expression, religiosity, dichotomous morality, bent for theological arguments, and so on. He may also proseletyze atheism the same way he used to proseletyze his previous religious faith. In politics we find the same phenomenon among the young American students who adopt Marxist ideology. They tend to be more concerned with political participation, true democracy, true freedom, etc. than with the distribution of wealth and the building of a communist society.

Note of Caution:

We have so far implied that two contradictory beliefs are anathema to each other, that they will neutralize each other, and thus prevent each other from hardening. Such a proposition is valid only in so far as the subject becomes aware of the relationships between the two beliefs. Otherwise a compartmentalization could take place and two contradictory belief systems could harden side by side in the same mind with a built-in wall between them. Such an anomaly is more likely to occur between more complex belief systems rather than between simple belief units. If the subject is reminded of the contradiction, he may feel greatly agitated, exhibit the same symptoms as those of cognitive dissonance referred to above (n. 26), and try to rationalize the coexistence of the two beliefs through the use of all kinds of intellectual gymnastics, or through the blunt denial of any existing relationship. Such a phenomenon may not be of much concern for this analysis, but we must be made aware of its existence.

Belief Content and the Hardening Process:

It is worth noting that the content of certain beliefs may give them



Filmed as received

without page(s) <sup>17</sup>\_\_\_\_\_.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

certain waves of belief to flow in certain directions. In the concept of the national character, the picture is reversed: the nation becomes the major unit of analysis. We start from there to determine the behavior of individuals within the nation. It is the network of interaction that determines the spread of every Hardened Belief and not the political boundaries. The Hardened Belief concept studies the content of beliefs, and not the idiosyncrasies of human action, while, at the same time, considering the latter as manifestations of the former as well as reinforcers of them.

Many other concepts, most of them of a dichotomous nature, have been suggested as tools for the study of socio-political systems. Suffice it to mention a few examples: the traditional versus the bureaucratic or rational (Weber),<sup>28</sup> Gemeinschaft versus Gesellschaft or the traditional versus the differentiated or rational (Toennies),<sup>29</sup> the mechanical versus the organic (Durkheim).<sup>30</sup> Of this type of typology, and sometimes derived from it, we have Talcott Parson's pattern variables which include such traits as the achieving versus the ascriptive, the universal versus the particularistic, the instrumental versus the consummatory, etc.<sup>31</sup> It is also worth mentioning the inner-directed versus the outer-directed society (Riesman).<sup>32</sup>

The above concepts, at best, can be used as graduated continuums between two polar ideal types; at worst, they can be used as rigid stereotypes with an obvious ethnocentricity that makes one's own type of society the desirable one towards which all societies will or should evolve. These variables are mostly descriptive rather than explanatory even though occasionally they have been used fruitfully and imaginatively; in such cases, they served the authors heuristically rather than theoretically.<sup>33</sup>

Finally we must consider such concepts as Weber's "ideas,"<sup>34</sup> and Parson's "values,"<sup>35</sup> and Deutsch's "national will."<sup>36</sup> In the following chapters I shall have more to say about all of these. At this point suffice it to mention that all of these can and will be treated as beliefs.

What the Hardened Belief concept does more is to determine which ideas or values are likely to become stronger determinants of individual and social behavior. We do this by relating them to the socialization process, and the role played by the ruling class and those hired by them in this process.

Karl Deutsch comes closest to the hardening of belief in relating preferred national values to communication theory and the learning process. He even speaks of the "hardening of the 'national will'" and the "closing of the 'national mind'"<sup>37</sup> when describing extreme nationalism. However, Deutsch's study was restricted to nationalism (one Hardened Belief) without attempting to develop any theory of the hardening process, and its relation to stability or revolutionary change.

The above are only few of the concepts that bear some relationship to that of the Hardened Belief. I have presented them in order to fit the concept in a more familiar frame of reference.

#### The Usefulness of the Hardened Belief Concept:

Because Hardened Beliefs are a product of a monotony of messages, they can be identifiable by identifying these messages. Of course this is a much easier task when dealing with a small primitive community than with a developed, complex, and pluralistic society such as the U.S. Here messages are expressed in the millions of words; published material alone may run in the tons every single day, let alone school messages, radio broadcasts, speeches, lectures, and so on. Here is a society of millions with numerous ethnic backgrounds, groups and subgroups of all shades and colors, each

expressing its own beliefs, fighting for its own cause and interests. On one page of the daily newspaper we may find views expressed that are on opposite poles: Michael Harrington and David Lawrence, Walter Lippman and William Buckley. It would appear at first that in this hodge-podge of expression there is a lot of conflict and no harmony. Nevertheless a closer look will reveal a common denominator in all the socio-political public messages. For example neither Harrington nor Lawrence is advocating the destruction of the present structure. One may suggest the replacing of a few bricks here and there, the whitewash of an old wall, the change of the hinges of a rusty door, and so on. The other may prefer the stench of old age, refuses to miss the sound of the rusty old door, etc. The main structure itself is sacred, and nobody is suggesting its total destruction and the building of a new one.

In order to identify the similar messages, we have to search into the various national agencies of socialization. These would include the educational system (primary, secondary, and college), the mass media, the church, the military, the governmental agencies, the corporations, etc. By studying samples of the contents of messages transmitted by these agencies and identifying those identical belief units that are most frequently articulated, and rarely if every negated or challenged, we can lay our hands on those beliefs that are most likely to harden. But such is a huge project, and may become unwieldy.

A more feasible strategy is to arbitrarily designate beforehand a list of beliefs that are considered relevant to one's research interests, and then determine the chances of their becoming hardened:

1. By determining the number of socializing agencies that propagate them

2. The frequency with which they are articulated
3. The number of people they reach

These same steps should be followed on the negative side, i.e.,

1. The number of agencies that contradict those beliefs, and their status of authority
2. The frequency with which these belief challenges are articulated
3. The number of people these messages reach

Needless to say, this is a quantifiable procedure, and one could conceivably devise a calculus of belief formation, and come up with something like "A Hardening of Belief Quotient," but in my view, this will not add much to a systematic analysis. I am also afraid mathematical expression, in this case, may give a false feeling of certainty, and convey an impression of precision that is not needed, and that may not be there in the first place. This is not to say, however, that mathematical expression in this area, especially when used with caution, is to be tabooed.

A simpler and more feasible approach would be to select those beliefs that can be identified in any society or subgroup without much rigor, and then search directly into the frequency with which such beliefs are challenged - if at all - and thus determine the degree of their hardness which is indirectly proportional to such frequency.

This study will roughly follow the last approach even though the aim is not to devise a methodology for measurement, but to provide a systematic analysis of stability and revolution in the American system, using the Hardened Belief concept as the major tool of analysis.

Some of the most commonly Hardened Beliefs of the American society will be studied as a measure of structural stability, and as determinants of political behavior. The premise of this analysis is that the Common Hardened Beliefs within any socio-political system are the pillars upon

which it stands. The undermining and the ultimate breaking of these Beliefs may mean the beginning of the collapse of the power structure, the opening of the way for a revolutionary change, or at least, the gradual acceptance of such a change by the populace. On the other hand, we can assume that any revolutionary movement before the breakup of these Beliefs would be tragically crushed. As we shall show, the breakup of such Beliefs is a lengthy and complex process, an uphill fight, but not an impossible one to win.

Hardened Beliefs can be thought of as compulsive forces that either compel the individual to commit certain acts, or prevent him from selecting alternatives, sometimes at a very high cost that could even be his own life. When a belief is completely hardened, the person automatically responds towards symbols associated with it, and his response is a chain reaction of a programmed series of reflex acts. Such a behavior may be compared to that of post-hypnotic suggestion. In both situations only unsurmountable physical obstacles can prevent the programmed actions from taking place, and when this happens, the person is likely to go through painful frustrations.

In other words, Hardened Beliefs are useful as determinants of human behavior. Diagnosing the Hardened Beliefs of a society (or an individual), however, is by no means a sure predictor of all its behavior. They can help predicting only that behavior related to them. Numerous soft (i.e., superficial and flexible) beliefs play their part in guiding much of man's daily behavior. He is thus allowed a margin of freedom of choice in much of his action. This Hardened Beliefs are the walls beyond which he cannot go, for beyond them lies the forbidden area of the unthinkable. More often the Hardened Beliefs may be more useful as guideposts as to what men will not do rather than what they will do. But when a particular Hardened

Belief is directly at stake, we can predict the response with a high probability.

The Hardened Belief concept makes the metaphysical argument between the behaviorists and the humanists rather irrelevant.

B.F. Skinner, for example, insisted repeatedly that man is not free, and that his behavior is determined, or, at least, we must assume that it is determined "(if) we are to use the methods of science in the field of human affairs..."<sup>38</sup> Skinner also stated that "(we) all control, and we are all controlled."<sup>39</sup> By that he meant that we are all socializing agents as well as socialized subjects. In his famous utopian novel, Walden II, he states this more dramatically in the form of a dialogue between his hero, the psychologist, and his intellectual opponent, the philosopher.

"How could you give them freedom?" (asks the psychologist)

"By refusing to control them!" (responds the philosopher)

"But you would only be leaving the control in other hands."

"Whose?"

"The charlatan, the demagogue, the salesman, the ward healer, the bully, the cheat, the educator, the priest - all who are now in possession of the techniques of behavioral engineering."<sup>40</sup>

As I commented earlier (no. 3), to my point of view, Skinner's basic propositions are sound. However, what he seems to overlook is that since everybody is in a position to control, whose control is going to determine the subject's behavior? How could it be possible for one person, or a group of persons, to control a whole population while rendering all the other controlling agents ineffective? What I am proposing is that this becomes possible only in the case of the common Hardened Beliefs where an agreement is developed among all the socializing agents as to the content of those particular beliefs. But in order for such an agreement to develop, by

the nature of the complexity of life, these beliefs cannot but be limited. They cannot envelop all man's behavior no matter how monolithic such socializing agencies may become, and how primitive the society may be. (This is not to mention the physical environment as a socializing agent, or the influences coming from outside the society itself which we have dealt with earlier.) And if such a complete control by one agency were possible, after all the controllers have become well controlled, we cannot but be faced with a static society where change becomes ipso facto impossible.

On the other hand those who are never tired of singing the glory of man's "dignity," "will," and "freedom" are simply reciting the pre-Copernican platitudes of man being the center of the universe. In the first place, if man is such a responsible creature whose freedom to choose is so complete, then why worry about him being manipulated? Why be so concerned about what values, religion, traditions, political ideology, etc. the younger generation ought to be raised in? Obviously these people cannot deny that "human nature" is not that solid, and that it can be molded in countless shapes and forms. What they are really saying is not that man is free, but that he should be shackled by the same chains with which they are shackled, that he should be imprisoned by the same jailers that jailed them.

Ironically, authors of this school of thought tend to exaggerate the power of manipulation possible in the hands of those "scientists" or "intellectuals" that they fear. Joseph Wood Krutch, for example, writes: "Even those of us whose convictions permit us to doubt that men's thoughts will ever be completely controlled with absolute 'precision' must realize, nevertheless, that the 'scientific ability' to control them to some considerable degree has been growing and that in all probability it will grow still further."<sup>41</sup> All faith in human will and freedom is thus replaced by an unrealistic faith in the power of the manipulators.



Neither Skinner's confidence nor Krutch's fears are justified. The question is not whether Man's behavior is determined or free. It would be closer to the truth if we ask how large a margin of freedom does each individual possess? Simply stated, within our frame of reference, the answer to this would be: the lesser the Hardened Beliefs (in quantity and degree) an individual has, the larger would be his margin of freedom (and so may be his confusion).

The repeated verbal expression of the most common Hardened Beliefs is the outcome of their intrinsic nature as well as a defense mechanism for automatic reinforcement, a self-reassurance, and a weapon against the threat of an Anti-Belief system. Such repeated expression serves also as a self-perpetuating mechanism for the transmission of these beliefs to the new generations, and their hardening in them. The system of perpetuation becomes an automated flow; i.e., it does not need deliberate planning on anybody's part for its propagation.<sup>42</sup>

However, such an automated flow functions only so long as the Hardened Beliefs are not threatened by the Anti-Belief. Here the smooth automated flow is jeopardized, and the ruling class, and any other social stratum whose vested interests become threatened with the possible destruction of these beliefs do not sit idly by while the rug is being pulled from under their feet. It is here that a multiplicity of established institutions as well as newly erected ones engage in a life-or-death struggle against the threatening forces. Automation can no longer be solely depended upon, and manipulation on a massive scale is resorted to. A breaking of the Hardened Beliefs means the break of the established order, and the counter-attack becomes more and more desperate and hysterical.

Actually automation must be understood only as a tendency. It can work smoothly in a small, primitive, and isolated community. In a developed

and complex society, ideological flow always requires some kind of intentional "push" directed from the top, and carried over faithfully by the millions of recruits whose previously acquired Hardened Beliefs become now handy for the struggle of survival of the established order. An extra reward for the effort reinforces the Beliefs further, and the recruits may even fight a more fanatic battle than their masters.

The "push," in other words, has to be always there in a developed society, even during a stable period. Otherwise, just by the sheer plurality of beliefs clashing daily within a well-developed communication system, threaten to soften the Hardened Core.

Footnotes

Chapter I: Socialization and the Hardened Belief Concept

1. e.g., Jacob and Teune give ten factors "that appear to exert an integrative influence upon people": 1. geographical proximity, 2. homogeneity, 3. transactions, 4. knowledge of each other, 5. shared functional interests, 6. the "character" or "motive pattern" of a group, 7. the structural frame or system of power and decision-making, 8. the sovereignty-dependency status of the community, 9. governmental effectiveness, 10. previous integrative experience.

See Philip E. Jacob and Henry Teune: "The Integrative Process: Guidelines for Analysis of the Bases of Political Community" in Jacob and Toscano, ed.: The Integration of Political Communities, (New York, J.P. Lippincott Co., 1964), p. 11, 12.

2. Speaking about new developments in political science, Karl Deutsch puts it this way: "Causality was thus replaced by probability, and the search for single causes and for master keys to prediction or control gave way to multi-variate analysis."

See Karl W. Deutsch: "Recent Trends in Research Methods in Political Science" in James C. Charlesworth, ed.: A Design for Political Science: Scope, Objectives, and Methods, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1966, p. 150.

3. For a critical analysis of some of these models see Floyd W. Matson: The Broken Image, (Garden City, N.Y., Anchor Books, Doubleday and Co., 1964), especially Chapter I, "The Mechanization of Man" pp. 3-29. The most outstanding work which uses the cybernetic model most imaginatively is Karl W. Deutsch: The Nerves of Government, (New York: The Free Press, 1966).

4. e.g., Ross Stagner: Psychology of Personality, 3rd. ed. (N.Y.: McGraw Hill, 1961), p. 128.

Norman Bradburn: "The Cultural Context of Personality Theory: in Joseph Wepman and Ralph W. Heine, ed.: Concepts of Personality, (Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., Chicago, 1963), pp. 333-335.

5. e.g., Herbert Hyman: Political Socialization, A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior, (N.Y.: A Free Press Paperback, The Macmillan Co., 1959), p. vii.

Also Orville G. Brian, Jr. and Stanton Wheeler: Socialization After Childhood, Two Essays, (N.Y.: John Wiley & Son, Inc., 1966), pp. 3-7.

6. A causal observation of daily world events shows clearly the interactions occurring on a world-wide scale: an old mosque is burned in Jerusalem, a demonstration takes place in an American University, and the placards carried are shown on television screens the world over including North Vietnam and the Soviet Union. The student movement in general is international in scope, very much like that of the workers' movement envisioned by the Marxists since the Communist Manifesto, but which was never fully realized.

7. Nationalism may be a good example of such a belief. Even though one nationalism may be antagonistic to another, it is a shared belief among many nationalities that each one must love and defend his own nation, etc.

8. Ideology in this context will be used loosely to mean a set of institutionalized beliefs. National ideology will mean those commonly shared beliefs at the top of the pyramid.

For a good assortment of definitions of the word, see Robert E. Lane: Political Ideology, (N.Y.: A Free Press Paperback, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1962) pp. 13-16.

9. Kenneth Boulding, in his imaginative work: The Image, (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1956) talks about the same phenomenon I called individualization. By image he means the sum total of one's perception of reality: "The image is built up as a result of all past experience of the possessor of the image." p. 6.

Walter Lippman has referred repeatedly to approximately the same concept. Sometimes he calls it the "picture in our head," or the "pseudo-environment," and sometimes the "image" as well. See Clinton Rossiter and James Lare, ed.: The Essential Lippman, (New York: A Vintage Book, Random House, 1963), particularly p. 140, 141.

10. Perhaps one major weakness in the theories of such a behaviorist as B.F. Skinner is that he seems to imply that man, the scientist, can be the sole agent of "social engineering," and his "engineering" can be practiced without competition from non-human sources. See B.B. Skinner: Walden II, (New York, MacMillan, 1948), passim.

Also see B.F. Skinner: "Freedom and the Control of Men," The American Scholar, Winter, 1955-56, pp. 47-65.

11. That is unless the hardening of belief is organic and this is doubtful. Needless to say we are not concerned here with such ailments as senility and others which are associated with brain cell damage.

12. I owe some of the above observations to Milton Rokeach: The Open and Closed Mind, Basic Books Inc., 1960, pp. 36-62.

Rokeach offers some of these as symptoms of what he calls a "closed mind." The main reason Rokeach's concept was not adopted is because he implies that such a person is a stereotype. While it is true that the more hardened the beliefs the more likely is the mind shut off from beliefs threatening it, this does not constitute a special personality type, for the same person may be quite rational and "open-minded" in most other areas of thought. Hardened Beliefs are environmentally produced, and are not the monopoly of any special type of personality. Boulding, op.cit., describes the clash of conflicting beliefs this way: "The resistance may take the form of simply ignoring the message, or it may take the form of emotive response: anger, hostility, indignation." p. 12.

13. In this respect the Hardened Belief concept becomes closest to that of culture as propounded by the anthropologists. The concept of culture, however, has some kind of permanency, continuity, and peculiarity about it that makes it inconvenient to study the more complex societies whose cultures are composites of many simpler ones, and which are constantly

in a state of flux. The concept of culture is all-encompassing while that of the Hardened Belief is differentiating, and can be put to better use in specific areas of culture, while, at the same time, studying the process of change.

Perhaps the best use of the culture concept has been achieved by Ruth Benedict: Patterns of Culture, (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1934), Introduction and passim.

Also see Franz Boas: The Mind of the Primitive Man, (New York: The Mac-Millan Co., 1938).

14. Sidney Verba: "Conclusion" in Lucian Pye and Sidney Verba: Political Culture and Political Development, (Princeton: The Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965), p. 546.

15. The result of such repetitious reinforcement is clear when we observe the deep emotional attachment Americans have towards "Old Glory" and the way they respond whenever such a symbol is invoked. As to the Muslim his tenacity to Islam, and his resistance to be converted to other religions is well known particularly to many frustrated Christian missionaries. Of course the mosque prayers in this case are only one of several other reinforcements. Also the fact of the Muslim's possession of a Book where the beliefs have been articulated must not be overlooked even though to the millions of illiterate masses the Book has probably played more of a symbolic role which could have had more influence than its verbal content.

16. The best known work on the use of political symbolism (which does not differ from religious symbolism) is Murray Edelman: The Symbolic Uses of Politics, (Urbana, Ill.: The University of Illinois Press, 1964).

17. Perhaps the most outstanding example of such an authority was that of the Japanese Emperor after World War II who had the awesome task trying to convince his people that he was no longer the Authority. In spite of the difficulty no one else could have had the power to achieve what he did within such a short time.

18. Kenneth E. Boulding: The Image, op. cit., p. 79.

19. Ibid., p. 80.

20. Talcott Parsons et al.: "A General Statement" in Toward a General Theory of Action, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harper Torchbooks, Harvard University Press, 1951), p. 20.

21. Kenneth E. Boulding, op.cit., p. 6.

22. Ibid., p. 13.

23. Considering anti-communism and belief in God as Hardened Beliefs in America, some empirical studies have established that these beliefs are more predominant in smaller communities. For example a survey conducted by N.O.R.C. showed that 40% of those in metropolitan areas, 32% of those in other cities, 23% of those in small towns, and 19% of those on farms were "more tolerant" towards communists and atheists. See Samuel

Filmed as received

without page(s) 30.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS.

U.S.A./U.S.S.R., The Viking Press, New York, 1963, 1964.

Lipset used three of Parson's variables to describe the American society and compare it with other societies. See Seymour Martin Lipset: The First New Nation, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1967, p. 240.

32. David Riesman et al.: The Lonely Crowd, Abridged ed., Yale University Press, 1950, 53, 61.

33. For example see William H. Whyte: The Organization Man, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1956, who uses Riesman's concepts in a brilliantly sarcastic way to describe the conformity of the new man shaped by the coporation.

34. Weber discussed the relationship between ideas and interests in his famed work: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Chalres Scribner's sons, 1958.

35. Talcott Parsons: Structure and Process in Modern Societies, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960, passim.

36. Karl W. Deutsch: Nationalism and Social Communication, second ed., The M.I.T.Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1953, 1966, pp. 165-186.

37. Ibid., p. 181.

38. B.F. Skinner: Science and Human Behavior, Macmillan, New York, 1953, p. 5.

39. Ibid., p. 438.

40. Walden II, op. cit., p. 256.

41. Joseph Wood Krutch: The Measure of Man, Grosset & Dulap, 1953, 54, p. 75.

42. Lasswell hit this point when he wrote: "A well-established ideology perpetuates itself with little planned propaganda from those it benefits most." See Harold Lasswell: Politics, Meridian Books, The World Publishing Company, New York, 1936, 1958, p. 31.

## Chapter II

### THE RULING CLASSES AND THE COMMON HARDENED BELIEFS

There is considerable evidence to show that the ruling classes (or the ruling elites) throughout history have generally been aware that for the maintenance of their power they had to preserve or instill certain beliefs in their subjects. And when those in power are too preoccupied with other matters, or too slow-witted to become aware of this, chances are that some hangers-on: magicians, quacks, priests, jesters, poets, philosophers, scientists, writers, etc. will open their eyes, or even take it upon themselves to reinforce the necessary beliefs, or when needed, create new myths that would help the cause of the established order.

It is easier for us to detect such an awareness on the part of the social thinkers who left a record of their thoughts rather than on the part of the ruling members themselves. The following examples are offered as selected samples from ancient and modern social thinkers. They are by no means a historical coverage of this line of thought (which would probably cover volumes):

Not only was Plato concerned in his Republic about the education and breeding of his Guardian class, the philosopher kings, for whom he drew a detailed program of study, but he also showed concern for the education of others in order to assure the stability of the whole structure:

"If a sound system of nurture and education is maintained, it produces men of a good disposition; and these in turn, taking advantage of such education, develop into better men..."



But the main purpose of such breeding is revealed in the next paragraph:

"In short, then, those who keep watch over our commonwealth must take the greatest care not to overlook the least infraction of the rule against any innovation upon the established system of education either of the body or the mind...The introduction of novel fashions in music (or poetry) is a thing to beware of as endangering the whole fabric of society, whose most important conventions are unsettled by any revolution in that quarter."<sup>1</sup>

Plato's successor, Aristotle, believed that whether the regime was an oligarchy or a democracy, there could be no stability without the existence of both the "wealthy" and the "people." If the distinction between these two is abolished, the "constitution" would be destroyed.

Then he adds:

"But of all the safeguards that we hear spoken of as helping to maintain constitutional continuity the most important, but most neglected today, is education, that is educating citizens for the way of living that belongs to the constitution...It is useless to have the most beneficial rules of society fully agreed upon by all who are members of the politea, if individuals are not going to be trained and their habits formed for that politea..."<sup>2</sup>

Machiavelli who tried to master all the tricks of a ruling elite for the handling of their subjects as well as other elites, and who wrote his treatises from the point of view of the rulers, and for the service of their own interests, did not neglect the manipulation of people's minds for the protection of those interests:

"It is therefore the duty of princes and heads of republics to uphold the foundations of the religions of their countries, for then it is easy to keep their people religious, and consequently well conducted and united. And therefore everything that tends to favor religion (even though it were believed to be false) should be received and availed of to strengthen it; and this should be done the more the wiser the rulers are, and the better they understand the natural course of things."<sup>3</sup> (parenthesis in original)

Then he goes on to show how the Romans used all kinds of religious beliefs (including terrorizing people's minds) in order to keep them in line.<sup>4</sup>

A more modern social thinker (later followed by other "positivist" thinkers), Saint-Simon, formulated a program for an industrial society, a Systeme Industriel, where "the check on egoism...is to be Christian brotherly love...The fate of the proletariat is to be improved as much as possible, not so much for their sake as for that of the elite. There are two ways of keeping this class in check: either use force to impose the social order, or make them love it."<sup>5</sup> Saint-Simon's vision was that of an international European Scientific Society. But in spite of its being scientific, he thought "a spiritual bond will be necessary - a common body of doctrines and beliefs affording a moral unity to all European societies... a common religion, for it is conflicting beliefs which lead inevitably to war."<sup>6</sup>

A more recent successor to Saint-Simon is Emile Durkheim. In his book, The Division of Labor in Society, Durkheim describes a complex industrial society as the differentiation of functions which creates a heterogeneity that may cause social division:

"What is needed if social order is to reign is that the mass of men be content with their lot. But what is needed for them to be content, is not that they have more or less but that they be convinced they have no right to more. And for this, it is absolutely essential that there be an authority whose superiority they acknowledge and which tells them what is right."<sup>7</sup>

To achieve this, Durkheim stresses the role of education, and to him "education is a matter of getting the child to accept social authority and to learn his duty."<sup>8</sup>

Gaetano Mosca attributed man's behavior to the "social forces" that play upon him. Rejecting racial theories of any kind, he acknowledged "cultural superiority." His "ruling class," it turns out, is culturally superior, and the leadership of such a superior "organized minority" over a "disorganized majority" is a prerequisite for every human society.

The "ruling class" cements its rule through the "political formula," which is a "universal moral principle." "The majority of a people," he writes, "consents to a given governmental system because the system is based upon religious or philosophical beliefs that are universally accepted by them." According to him, if the ruling class fails to cultivate those general beliefs among the masses, they will fail to unify the different social groups behind them.<sup>9</sup>

Among contemporary American political scientists, Lasswell is probably the best representative of those who dealt with elite manipulation of the masses:

"Any elite defends and asserts itself in the name of symbols of the common destiny...By the use of sanctioned words and gestures the elite elicits blood, work, taxes, applause, from the masses."<sup>10</sup>

Furthermore Lasswell goes on to suggest:

"Constituted authority perpetuates itself by shaping the consciences of those who are born within its sphere of control...Revolutions are ruptures of conscience."<sup>11</sup>

"Any well-knit way of life," writes Lasswell, "molds human behavior into its own design. The individualism of bourgeois society like the communism of a socialized state must be inculcated from the nursery to the grave. In the United States, as one among the bourgeois nations, the life of personal achievement and personal responsibility is extolled in song and story from the very beginning of consciousness."<sup>12</sup>

Lasswell, in other words, is suggesting in the above the voluntary inducement of Hardened beliefs.

#### The Marxists and the "Superstructure":

Marx, Engels, and the other Marxist writers treated this subject repeatedly, but from a different perspective. Their concern was not law and order under the powers that be as was the concern of the other authors. Theirs was a revolutionary approach, written from the point of view of the manipulated rather than that of the manipulators. Their aim was the betterment of the concrete economic conditions of the masses rather than

the manipulation of their minds to make them accept their condition and the authority of their ruling class.

According to the Marxists, the "superstructure" (which includes religion, law, art, political ideology, etc.) has been the tool of domination in the hands of the ruling class: "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class."<sup>13</sup>

This theme is touched upon repeatedly in the writings of Marx, Engels, and Lenin, among others. As elaboration on this theme, Marx and Engels write the following:

"The ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas; i.e., the class, which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force. The class which has the means of material production at its disposal, has control at the same time over the means of mental production, so that thereby, generally speaking, the ideas of those who lack the means of mental production are subjects to it."<sup>14</sup>

Further on they go on to say:

"For each new class which puts itself in the place of one ruling before it, is compelled merely in order to carry through its aim, to represent its interest as the common interest of all the members of society, put in an ideal form; it will give its ideas the form of universality, and represent them as the only rational, universally valid ones."<sup>15</sup>

Religion was particularly singled out by the Marxists as a powerful tool in the hands of the ruling classes. In his essay "On Historical Materialism" Engels writes:

"...he (the English bourgeois) was not long in discovering the opportunities this same religion offered him for working upon the minds of his natural inferiors, and making them submissive to the behests of the masters it had pleased God to place over them."<sup>16</sup>

In the "Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels write the following on education:

"And your education (the bourgeoisie's)! Is not that also social, and determined by the social conditions under which you educate, by the intervention, direct or indirect, of society, by means of schools, etc.? The Communists have not invented the intervention of society in

education: they do but seek to alter the character of that intervention, and to rescue education from the influence of the ruling class..."<sup>17</sup>

Lenin later followed the same line of thought in applying education for the drastic change of beliefs after the takeover of the state by the vanguard of the proletariat. He deemed it necessary to re-educate not only the bourgeoisie but the proletarians themselves "who do not abandon their petty-bourgeois prejudices at one stroke, by a miracle, at the bidding of the Virgin Mary...but only in the course of a long and difficult mass struggle against petty-bourgeois influences."<sup>18</sup>

One major difference between the Marxists and the conservative social thinkers was that while acknowledging the power of indoctrination of the ruling class over the masses, the Marxists assumed that eventually, due to class antagonism in their relationship to the means of production, the proletarians will develop their own superstructure; i.e., ideology which is in opposition to that of the bourgeoisie, a "consciousness" which will eventually bring about revolution. The Marxists' materialist interpretation of history assumed that economic conflict under capitalism, something that exists objectively outside and separate from the human mind, will eventually reflect itself in the human mind, particularly the one suffering most under it, the working class.

The Marxist interpretation of history is of special interest to us in this study because it is an outstanding model of revolutionary and structural social change, and because it is directly concerned with the interplay between objective reality and people's beliefs about it. Such interpretation is intriguing because it is so persistent in spite of the Marxists' extraordinary sophistication about the power of indoctrination on the part of the ruling class, in spite of their full understanding of the possible fabrication of illusory beliefs on a mass scale, beliefs

that may not at all correlate with objective reality.

In one of his early writings in 1844, Marx wrote:

"The abolition of religion as the illusory happiness of the people is required for their real happiness. The demand to give up illusions about its condition is the demand to give up a condition which needs illusions."<sup>19</sup> (underlining in edited excerpt).

Neither do Marxists deny that objective reality can ever become a stimulus for man's action without circuiting through his brains first.

For example Engels writes:

"...we simply cannot get away from the fact that everything that sets men acting must find its way through their brains...The influences of the external world upon man express themselves in his brain are reflected therein as feelings, thoughts, impulses, volitions..."<sup>20</sup>

But then we are justified in questioning that if man's brain is influenced by the physical world as well as by the manipulation of other men such as the ruling class (as indeed Marx and Engels have repeatedly stated), and if man's brain is capable of modifying, reshaping, distorting, or completely avoiding certain objective realities - dependent upon its previously constructed beliefs; or, in other words, if man's brain can be the victim of illusion, as, according to the Marxists, it had been so for centuries, and since those who own the means of production, also own the means of dissemination (or in the words of Marx and Engels "the means of mental production"), what is then that can prevent the ruling class from dominating the proletarian mind even through the creation of illusions, i.e., in spite of the antagonism created through the relationship of capitalist production?

Indeed if the feudal lords were able to use religion for centuries to dominate the cerfs, why can't capitalists use religion as well as other more wordly and "scientific" beliefs in order to preserve the capitalist system?

If we admit that both economic reality as well as human messages influence the human mind as indeed the Marxists, contrary to vulgar criticisms (see below), never denied, how can we assume that economic reality must eventually prevail? While we must admit the possibility of its winning over in certain individual cases, we cannot accept that its universal winning is a predetermined fact, or that the proletariat, because of their particular relationship to the means of production, are ipso facto revolutionary. While Marx and Engels were fully aware of the necessity of "class consciousness" as a prerequisite for the rise of the proletariat, they seem to have underestimated the potential power of the bourgeoisie to kill "class consciousness" before it is born, and to inject the proletariat with higher doses of the very bourgeois ideology the proletariat is supposed to destroy and replace.

In another context Engels writes:

"We maintain...that all former moral theories are the product, in the last analysis, of the economic stage which society reached at that particular epoch. And as society has hitherto moved in class antagonisms, morality has always been a class morality; either it has justified the domination and the interests of the ruling class, or, as soon as the oppressed class has become powerful enough, it has represented the revolt against the domination and the future interests of the oppressed."<sup>21</sup>

But how can this new morality take over and replace the ruling class morality when the ruling class is still in a position to hold the reins, forcing through punishment and reward its own morality? What is the mechanism that can trigger a reverse of the situation after it has long been established? The antagonism of the economic relationship? But the economic antagonism has always been there, and the ruling class (whether slave master, feudal lord, or bourgeois) has almost always been able to neutralize any "class consciousness," "class ideology," or "class morality" with larger doses of the "opiates of the masses." Indeed we are justified

in asking why it was the bourgeoisie, a new competitive class, after mobilizing the masses under its leadership, finally destroyed the feudal order, though the antagonism had existed for hundreds of years between the serfs and the feudal lords. The concentration of wealth and power in the hands of the few was not only accepted as an unavoidable fact of nature, but as the will of God. The poor were to be compensated for their wretchedness in Heaven, and this way (with the exception of occasional spontaneous, isolated, mostly aimless small scale rebellions that were easily crushed) the class structure was left intact for centuries.

Of course the Marxists assumed that the proletarian consciousness would be triggered by the inherent economic contradictions of the capitalist means of production. Due to unavoidable repeated depressions, the pauperization of the working class, its destitution and poverty, it was assumed that the bourgeoisie had already involuntarily created its "gravediggers." In other words, the triggering mechanism for the switch in proletarian thinking would be basically economic in nature. The Marxists apply evolutionary laws of social development in their expectations of the proletarian revolutionary role. For it is only under capitalism, it is theorized, that the oppressed classes reach a state of maturity under which class consciousness becomes possible, and class antagonisms most obvious. The theory is not totally unfounded, nor is it just based on a proletarian mystique. Under the factory "socialist" type of production, it becomes possible for large numbers of workers to be in contact with each other, and thus it becomes more possible for them to organize themselves and speak with one voice against their exploiters.

But how can we conclude from this that they will organize for the overthrow of these exploiters? Even if a certain group (or class) rebels against its miserable conditions, how can we conclude beforehand that such



a group will not simply appeal to the master, and make certain demands (if it can articulate them), all this without such a group doubting for a moment as to who the master is or should be. Even with the occurrence of depressions, how can we presuppose that the working people will revolt against the system itself? How will they be able to relate their poverty to the capitalist system instead of relating it to God's will, their own sins, the bad crops, the corrupt government bureaucrats, an external or internal enemy, the Jews, the Negroes, and indeed (ironically) the Communists? Because of a potential revolutionary tendency, how can we beforehand determine the content of the goals?

Obviously the jump from rebelling against one's masters to the decision of abolishing them as a class, and putting power in one's own hand is a drastic intellectual jump that requires much more than sheer consciousness, but a great deal of sophisticated knowledge and understanding of the great complexity of one's social, political, and economic world. How can we expect such a jump from a class whose picture of society is being drawn for him by the very class he is supposed to dispose of (or its hired agents), a class who is being immunized every day of its life against any alternatives to the capitalist order?

C. Wright Mills comments on this:

"1. It is true, admits the sophisticated marxist, that wageworkers in advanced capitalist societies are not revolutionary...2. But, he argues, that is because of the intensive capitalist propaganda, the misleaders of labor who dominate the trade unions, the 'labor aristocracy' that is bought off by the imperialist powers, the traitors who run the social democratic labor parties."

But then, asks Mills, are the above "contained within the theory, or do they constitute new theories?"<sup>22</sup>

There can be no denial that economic relationship can be a most decisive factor in the formation of the "superstructure," but it is precisely

such a relationship that puts the ruling class that controls the means of production in a most strategic position from which it can dictate the content of mass ideology. The ruling class does not have to "invent" the "correct" ideology," but it has the advantage of selecting some of the most convenient traditional beliefs, and reinforcing them repeatedly until they harden on a massive scale. In an advanced capitalist system those who own the wealth possess in their hands the power of reward and punishment, and with technological development, the high productivity of the society makes available larger quantities of rewards that can be distributed to larger numbers of people without affecting the original lopsided distribution. By controlling the material reward, capital can control the distribution of status, and the value system that determine status hierarchy. Punishment through the use of violence does not have to inflicted, but rarely, for the maintenance of the "correct" beliefs. Reward is much more effective; and when punishment is needed, the sheer denial of material reward or status is usually all that is needed.

The question in the light of the hardening of belief concept is not whether the economic base produces the "superstructure" or vice versa. As we hinted earlier, this is a chicken-or-egg question. Both variables are both dependent and independent in a complex reversible equation. In our analysis we start with the Hardened Belief not because it is an independent variable, but because it is the point that can be put in the clearest focus in the complex chain reaction.

Max Weber hit a similar point when he wrote (speaking of his Protestant Ethic thesis):

"It is of course not my aim to substitute for a one-sided materialistic causal interpretation of culture and history. Each is equally possible..."<sup>2</sup>

It would be unfair, however, to accuse the Marxists of a one-sided interpretation of history. Though one can easily pull out of context several dogmatically-sounding passages from Marx and Engels pointing to that effect, a closer study of their writings reveals their full awareness of the role of ideas and politics in the shaping of history. They were not ignorant either of the fact that ideas could also have a life of their own, and thus shape history for long periods of time, regardless of the economic basis. Otherwise, how else "false consciousness" could ever be possible?

On this point, Engels, in one of his letters in 1890, writes:

"According to the materialist conception of history the determining element in history is ultimately the production and reproduction in real life. More than this neither Marx nor I have ever asserted. If therefore somebody twists this into the statement that the economic element is the only determining one, he transforms it into a meaningless, abstract and absurd phrase."<sup>24</sup> (*italics in original*)

In another letter, the same year, Engels describes those who accuse Marx and himself of offering a one-sided explanation of history as "tilting at windmills." He refers them to Marx's Eighteenth Brumaire "which deals almost exclusively with the particular part played by political struggles and events, of course within their general dependence upon economic conditions." This letter is concluded with a note of anger:

"What these gentlemen all lack is dialectic. They never see anything but here cause and there effect. That this is a hollow abstraction, that such metaphysical polar opposites only exist in the real world during crises, while the whole vast process proceeds in the form of interaction (though of very unequal forces, the economic movement being by far the strongest, most elemental and most decisive) and that here everything is relative and nothing is absolute - this they never begin to see. Hegel has never existed for them."<sup>25</sup>

What the Marxists can be justifiably accused of in this respect is their overemphasis on the materialist side of the equation in their strong revolt against the Hegelian idealist interpretation. Ironically this overemphasis made them underestimate in the history-making process, their own role, which as I shall point out later, in the light of the Hardened

Belief concept, is indispensable in the series of reactions that could finally trigger revolution against an established order.<sup>26</sup>

The question most relevant to the hardening of beliefs is the congruity between the verbal and material messages, for each type of message must reinforce the other. This way no type of message has to have precedence over the other because of its economic or verbal nature. Of course it is natural that certain messages will have greater impact on the individual than others (but these can be verbal over other verbal messages, and so on) depending more on the already formed belief structure of the individual himself rather than on the inherent nature of the messages.

When capitalism promises prosperity to everyone but succeeds delivering it to a few, its propagandistic messages are likely to lose much of their effectiveness, and are thus prevented from inducing hardening of belief. Indeed the Marxists are right in assuming that repeated depressions can undermine the belief in a capitalist system, regardless of the intensity of capitalist propaganda. However such a situation is only hypothetical. In the first place, capitalism promises prosperity only to those who work very hard. This way those who are willing to work hard, but cannot find a job usually end up blaming themselves. They become more and more convinced that there is something definitely wrong with their own person. Perhaps they never worked hard enough in the past. After all "nobody owes anybody else a living."

Besides, in cases of severe depressions, the propaganda can be made to fit the situation. All kinds of complex technical explanations (usually incomprehensible to the layman) are offered to rationalize the malfunctioning of the system. Particular individuals, groups, governments, political parties, bureaucrats, etc. can be blamed, the system itself always remaining beyond reproach. Though under such circumstances some softening of belief may occur

in many individuals (as indeed happened in the thirties), the Hardened Belief in capitalism can still be saved in the population as a whole. And when the depression is over, the hardening process proceeds normally again, and every doubting Thomas is forced to feel guilty - let alone punishments for those who had become involved in "subversive" activities.

In our model no particular class or strata can be ipso facto described as revolutionary or non-revolutionary. Proletarians are like any other humans: their beliefs are likely to harden in favor of the very system that exploits them as long as the messages with which they are bombarded do not contradict each other. Once such beliefs are completely hardened, it will not make any difference even if the messages do contradict each other. This does not mean, however, that, given the right circumstances, such as the clash between the material and the verbal messages, a large portion of the working class (i.e., those whose beliefs had not had the chance to become completely hardened) cannot be eventually revolutionized.

#### Who Is The Ruling Class in America?

It might be appropriate at this point to discuss briefly the concept of class as it has been used in this study, and the way it applies to the advanced capitalist system of the U.S. The concept of class can be a very ambiguous one, and it has been used in different ways by various schools of thought. There is always some arbitrariness on the part of an author in the way he uses a concept. He usually adopts the formulation that is relevant to his type of analysis and its purposes. While I prefer my own use of the concept, it does not necessarily follow that other uses, if relevant to other special purposes, are invalid.

Though many changes have taken place in the structure and functioning of the capitalist system since the days of Marx, the basic Marxist concept-

ualization of class seems to be even more valid and applicable today than it was in his time. In their relations to the means of production, people can still be divided into two major classes: 1. those who own the means of production, the capitalists, 2. and those who have to sell their own services in order to earn a living, the wage-earners. Of course, like any social classification, this one does not have a sharply cut demarcation line. It leaves us with a small minority of individuals who fall on the margin of either class. How much stock or real estate should one own in order to qualify as a capitalist? Is the person who owns his grocery store, but earns less than a blue-collar worker a capitalist? Is the physician (or the lawyer) who makes \$100,000 a year selling his services a capitalist or a wage-earner? But the few individuals on the margins should not persuade us to drop a useful concept. We can answer the above questions more definitely if we simply tighten our definitions. A capitalist, we may say, is the individual who owns enough capital that can earn him enough income allowing him and his family to continue living at least at the average living standard of the society regardless as to whether he works or not. Anyone whose standard of living will have to drop sharply the moment he stops working is thus not a capitalist according to this definition.

While a capitalist may be on one or several boards of trustees of corporations, foundations, hospitals, universities, etc., or may hold a high executive post in a corporation or government he usually holds these positions because they are strategic for the control of corporate capital. A capitalist, however does not actually have to work in order to earn a living. His earnings from capital ownership is usually much more than he needs for a life of luxury. Some of the functions he accomplishes may be socially useful; it is his role as a capitalist that is superfluous. Whatever

useful roles he plays can be played by other persons who do not have to be capitalists.

The class of wage-earners would include anyone who is not a capitalist (according to the above definition): blue-collar workers, white-collar workers, salesmen, salaried physicians, teachers, professors, civil servants, scientists, engineers, etc. While some rare individuals belonging to these groups may, at a certain point, become qualified as capitalists, the vast majority among them continue to be wage-earners all their lives.

Class, according to this definition, must be differentiated from stratum, status, rank, etc. Class is determined by ownership or lack of ownership of capital, and not by the amount of yearly income. Neither is it determined by culturally subjective factors.

Though Marx mostly spoke of two objectively antagonistic classes, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, at the end of Das Kapital he spoke of three classes existing in England at the time: wage laborers, capitalists, and landowners.<sup>27</sup> This was the last chapter of Marx's major work, a chapter that was never finished. He separated capitalists from landowners because of their source of income (rent as opposed to profit) It is hard for us to understand why Marx at this time separated these two classes on the basis of a minor technicality. Whatever his reasons might have been, such a differentiation seems unwarranted, particularly in an advanced capitalist society where capital owned by one individual may be used in a great diversity of enterprises, including real estate buying, selling, renting, and farming.

Technically neither the petty bourgeois who owns and runs his little enterprise (grocery store, gas station, restaurant, etc.) nor the small farmer who owns and runs his family farm can be accurately classified with either class. They are not capitalists in that they cannot live off their capital. Neither are they wage-earners in that they do not work for

somebody else in return for a wage.

But for all practical purposes both the petty bourgeois and the small farmer in America can be classified as wage-earners since both of these have to invest their labor in order to survive much more so than their capital - even though they technically own their means of production, and a few among them may occasionally use outside help.

As for the small businesses, there were less than five million of them in the U.S. in 1967. The average life expectancy of a small business is about six years. Many of these end up in bankruptcy. "Most do not earn for their owners much more than they could get with less effort and risk by working for somebody else."<sup>28</sup> The small enterprise in America has very little future, and we can assume that most of those who start a small business will eventually end up as regular wage-earners.

The small family farm, on the other hand, has been on a rapid decline for many years. The farm population, according to U.S. census was more than 30 million in 1930, 19 million in 1954, 16.6 million in 1959, less than 13 million in 1964 (figures have been rounded). The number of farms has dropped from 6.3 million in 1930 to about 3.7 million in 1959. For all practical purposes, the peasant class that forms the majority of the world population is on its way to extinction in the U.S. Farming has become like any other production process a capitalist enterprise with its two distinct classes of capitalists and wage-earners.

Those who qualify as capitalists in our definition will thus be a very small minority of the population, falling in the upper 5% income group, the great majority of it probably falling within the upper 1%.<sup>29</sup> The importance of identifying class in this manner makes it possible for us to locate ultimate power. The main difference between the two classes is that the class of wage-earners ultimately has to depend on the capitalist class for its very



lifelihood, regardless of the training, qualifications, or education of its members. The objective economic conflict of interests between the two classes is not by any means a zero-sum game, but the conflict between them nevertheless is still greater than it can be between any two strata among the population. It is to the benefit of the upper class that the class of producers be also a class of consumers, a situation that has been economically beneficial to both classes, but this higher distribution of goods and services was due to the technological explosion for which the class of wage-earners is to be credited. Besides, this extra consumption, while improving the living standard of a great number of wage-earners, also multiplied the wealth of the capitalists without much change in the original lop-sided distribution among the population as a whole.<sup>30</sup> We must not also forget what we mentioned earlier that the increase in consumer goods smoothed the socialization of the masses, and helped strengthen their faith in the system. Almost every increase in wages which was mostly due to union struggle and not to capitalist initiative has been accompanied with increase in prices except in those cases when the loss could be made up by higher production efficiency, the profits either increasing or at least remaining constant. Thus what is gained by one group of wage-earners is paid for by another group of wage-earners, and so on. This way the conflict appears to be between wage-earners and other wage-earners while the antagonism between the wage-earners and the capitalist class is hidden. One group of wage-earners is blamed for increase in prices after its union wins a raise. The non-unionized white collar workers, and indeed many unionized blue collar workers have learned to think of themselves as "middle class" and to identify their interests with those of the capitalists, many of them even thinking they are capitalists themselves, undoubtedly an extraordinary achievement of socialization for which the capitalist class ought to be congratulated. (We shall discuss this subject more fully in the

next chapter.) Meanwhile every improvement in the product, any extra expenses for advertisement, any taxes, any forced improvement in production such as prevention of pollution, or added safety in cars, in general any non-profit making improvements are automatically passed on to the consumers, who are mostly none other than the wage-earners.

C. Wright Mills concentrated his analysis on decision-making and came out with a "power elite" instead of a ruling class.<sup>31</sup> The main defect with this type of analysis as well as those written to refute it is that their main concern is how far the decision-making process in the U.S. differs from an ideal preconceived model of democratic decision-making.<sup>32</sup> The main question they ask is this: is decision-making concentrated in the hands of the few at the top (elitist model), or is decision-making well distributed, checked, and balanced (pluralistic model)? Legitimate as this question may be, it does not probe enough into whose interests these decision-makers are serving. The preoccupation with individuals making decisions without taking into consideration the money interests they are hired to serve completely obfuscates the main issue at hand. Mills' opponents (who, as to be expected under the circumstances, are numerous) go into great pains to point out that some new individuals do get recruited into the upper echelons, that politicians (mayors, congressmen, etc.) do also make important decisions, that the decisions made do sometimes favor the public; that members of the upper echelons may disagree among themselves about many issues, and thus cannot function as a unified conspiratorial group (Mills never said they did), and if all this fails to convince the reader, he is usually reminded that his leaders, after all, are "good Americans" who can be trusted to make decisions in his favor.

But such a preoccupation with the identification of actors by both sides of the controversy, without the guidance of a class concept, verges on

the sensational, and misses the relevant and most important issues in the process. Many a maid (or slave for that matter) in many a household may be making the major decisions of the household, but it better be that those decisions be acceptable to the masters, or else that maid may suddenly find herself without a job. Political power is money power regardless of who is making the decisions, particularly in a society where money is the master key to the attainment of all other valuables.

Of course Mills was well aware of this fact, but in his preoccupation with the identification of individuals who make top level decisions, he included in his elite many who in reality are no more than the hirelings of the ruling class in spite of the fact that they are entrusted to make many decisions on their own. The military elite is such an example. This group, in spite of its powerful influence in some areas of decision-making is used by the ruling class for the furthering of the latter's interests (i.e., through the signing of Defense contracts), and the defense of the established order. Except for those individuals who are enriched in the wheeling and dealing process, most of the top military remain part of the salaried class which can be kept under control not only by immediate rewards (or their denials,) but also by promised future rewards when top military personnel are given high posts in the client corporations (mostly to serve as their lobbyists in the contract business): In 1959, for example, the 72 largest arms suppliers alone employed 1,426 retired officers, 251 of them being of flag or general rank.<sup>34</sup>

The capitalist class in the U.S. is not a completely closed system. According to Mills, Lundberg, and other authors, the circle of the rich is becoming a more hereditary and closed circle (In 1900 only 39% of the very rich were children of upper class parents. By 1950, some 93% of the very rich were inheritors<sup>35</sup>) Other authors, such as Lipset and Bendix, challenge

the conclusion that mobility into the upper business class has declined.<sup>36</sup> But all this is of minor importance to the class concept. What is at issue is not capitalists but capitalism. It is inconsequential even if we can obtain a new breed of capitalists with every new generation (which of course cannot be the case). What is of consequence is that the capitalist system, by its very nature, concentrates wealth and power in the hands of a few people whose very training and socialization make their decisions and actions dominated by the motive of profit maximization. Their ownership of the nation's wealth makes the very lives of the other millions dependent upon the interests of this small minority regardless of who the members of this minority are, or how charitable and god-fearing they may be.

The admission of a few new members into this class or the ouster of a few out of it every once in a while does not change the structure itself. The new admissions could not have made it in the first place had they not been dominated by profit maximization in its extreme form. Actually these upstarts become the most fanatic in defending their "natural right" to wealth and power, and the most aggressive in cut-throat tactics in their profit-making ventures. Because of their success, their belief in the myth of equal opportunity is strengthened. The fact that they were singled out to succeed makes them convinced of their superior talents. The system to them is truly just since it did reward those who deserved to be rewarded, and this feeling of superiority in itself is the most rewarding. "The survival of the fittest" become the most cherished words to these individuals' ears. Subjectively the system has rewarded them more than it did anybody else. No wonder they become its most militant defenders. In so far as the millions of wage-earners are concerned, it can be stated that this rare possibility of upward mobility into the capitalist class does not work in their best interest. What is worse, the possibility of such a rare case of upward mobility helps keep

alive the "from rags to riches" illusion, and serves as a reinforcement for the support of the status quo (the same way the publicizing of the one person among millions winning in a lottery induces millions of others to buy lottery tickets).

The Economic versus the Political Distribution:

The most vehement apologetics for the system do not deny the realities of the economic distribution. What they argue about is that the distribution of political power may not correspond with the distribution of economic wealth. From that premise they argue that in spite of the presence of an economic elite, it does not follow that the political decisions made are always favorable to the economic elite without serving the public interest.

That such may occasionally be the case is of course undeniable, for, as we mentioned earlier, the antagonism between the two classes is not always a zero-sum game. There are numerous instances when the interests of the capitalist class correspond with those of the wage-earners. For example, a decision to introduce social security is favorable to the capitalist class since it increases the propensity to consume in a large proportion of the population. But this does not mean, as I shall point out later, that the capitalist class always looks so far ahead even for its own interests. The Social Security Act was passed under severe circumstances when the capitalist system itself was threatened with collapse, and there are some who still oppose it till now.

Besides, the interests of the capitalist class are not always in harmony with each other, and the class by no means speaks with one voice, or agrees on the best means to preserve the present structure. The capitalist system is inherently a competitive one, and the conflicting interests at the top may occasionally serve to destroy certain practices disadvantageous to a

portion of the wage-earners. When one interest fights the irregularities of another competing interest, the public may benefit, but such a public victory is only incidental.

A more important question to ask is: what happens when the interests of the wage-earners are in direct conflict with those of the capitalist class? Will the latter willingly, for example, tax itself in accordance with its share of the wealth? If the majority makes decisions, as is claimed in democratic doctrines, then why should such a majority bear the major burden of the tax, while allowing so many loopholes in the tax law so as to exempt many a millionaire from paying any taxes at all?

In my view, one of Lundberg's comments in this regard is a pertinent one, worth thousands of pages of sophistry, obfuscation, and hair-splitting. If the pluralist theory held, Lundberg asserts, if major decisions in the United States were the product of countervailing and balanced groups, the outcome in terms of money, position, and prestige would be a great deal more equitable than it is.

"If the decision about the distribution of the basic economic means is arrived at pluralistically, why is the payoff so uneven? If one goes along with the pluralist view we must conclude that people have acquiesced in their relatively low reward by the economic system. Yet millions of people protest all the time that they are being underpaid. They sound as though they had not consented to the decision-making about the distribution of money."<sup>37</sup>

To this we might add that the advanced technology of the United States has long become capable of producing in such an abundance that the old Marxian slogan "to each according to his needs" can truly become a reality, and yet millions continue to live in poverty, millions remain unemployed, about 10% of the labor force have to depend on war production (to defend the present distribution), the vast majority of wage earners (usually referred to as the middle class) have a hard time breaking out even, many of them

"moonlighting," and many others with more than one member of the family forced to work.

It is obvious that the masses of wage-earners have very little voice - if any - either over the allocation of their natural resources, or the use and distribution of the products of their own hands and minds.

The government that is supposed to represent the people is not only handpicked by the capitalist class (though later legitimized by the election rituals), but also whatever decisions made at the governmental level concerning the allocation of natural and human resources are of secondary importance as compared with those made at the corporate level. Though government is supposed to control a substantial amount of capital, (about 20%) such an amount remains a small fraction of the amounts controlled by the corporations. Moreover, most of the governmental budget handled by the political system (which essentially represents capital and not people) serves to protect and boost the big money interests.

The old Jacksonian maxim "that people is governed best which is governed least" continues to be a guiding principle in American ideology in spite of some added federal power after the New Deal. It is revealing that this principle has often been propagated by the leaders of big business as a guiding principle for governmental role. If put bluntly this principle simply means: Government should remain the slave of big business and never its master. After all, why should the ruling class rule indirectly through government as long as it can rule directly, and with the least public harassment, through the corporation?<sup>38</sup>

However, government, in spite of its potential threat, remains indispensable. Through government many functions are achieved which "the people" (the ruling class) cannot achieve by themselves. Among these functions are the maintenance of order, the legitimation of the class structure, conflict resolution

between the conflicting interests of factions of the ruling class, conflict resolution between factions of the ruling class and factions of the wage-earners, the socialization of the masses, the protection of the status quo against foreign and domestic enemies, and the protection of the monied interests in other countries, etc. But on top of all the above functions (and others not mentioned) the government serves as a marvelous scapegoat for the failures of capitalist anarchy. The two-party system in particular is probably the most ingenious social invention in this regard. While both parties are the creation and the direct tools of the same privileged class, they alternatively serve as the punch-bags for the blows of frustrated public opinion in times of depressions, inflations, recessions, poverty, unemployment, wars, etc. This way the solution seems simple: if the bad times happen during a Republican administration, the people will elect a Democratic administration instead, and vice versa. This way both classes are satisfied: to the capitalist class it does not make that much difference under which label its interests are served; the class of wage-earners is satisfied because its governmental system is "so democratic, and it offers the people a choice."

The genius of such a system lies mostly in the way it automatically manipulates punishment and reward. When the blows of one party are too severe over large portions of the population, all the alternative party has to do is reduce the severity of the blows, and the system would automatically be credited, though the reward in such a case is nothing more than a reduction of the punishment. One party engages the country in a costly war to protect the world-wide interests of monopoly capital. The war proves hopelessly damaging to the very interests it was supposed to defend. The alternative party finally manages to end the war (which the other party would have been obliged to end by now anyway). The wage-earners



are grateful even though the war as far as their objective interests were concerned, was uncalled for in the first place. The system works, people repeat with awe and admiration. It certainly does, and, miraculously, without any basic changes in the original power structure.

One can easily point to the predominance of millionaires in the Nixon Cabinet (or even the F.D.R. Cabinet, the administration that was supposed to have represented the poor man, and the one for which Roosevelt was accused by other members of the millionaire club, to have betrayed his own class), or one can point to the business and professional (mostly law) background of U.S. senators or congressmen, with the rare occurrence of a labor background among them<sup>40</sup> in order to show how the capitalist class can control government by simply being in it. But the fact is that the background of politicians is of secondary importance in so far as their being representatives of capitalist interests. The popular belief that it is preferable to elect the rich for they are less likely to be corrupted in high office may have some psychological validity (even though under the present circumstances the masses are not likely to win much either way). Those coming from poor backgrounds are more likely to be more easily manipulated by the moneyed interests. What we said about the nouveau riche above applies equally well to the nouveau politicians. To put it in psychological terms, the hungry rat can always make a better subject for conditioning than a full rat when using food as a reward.<sup>41</sup> To those coming from a more humble background, the money rewards, the new status and prestige that are showered upon them in a high political (administrative or managerial) position are far more appreciated than in the case of those to whom these rewards are not new. Because of their indebtedness to those who finance them (reward), and because of their fear of their ever losing their newly found privileges (punishment), they make much better errand

boys than those coming from the capitalist class itself. To top it all, those who do a good job for their constituency (i.e., the money interests that sponsored them) will eventually be made capitalists themselves, at which point their ultimate interests become one and the same as those of their sponsors.<sup>42</sup>

Economic Interests and Human Behavior:

How much do economic interests influence human behavior? The question has been a perennial one among social thinkers, and it bears relevance to our analysis here.

The most famous model based on individual interests has been that of Adam Smith's long-lived "invisible hand" where

"every individual is continually exerting himself to find out the most advantageous employment for whatever capital he can command. It is his own advantage, and not that of the society which he has in view. But the study of his own advantage, naturally, or rather necessarily, leads him to prefer that employment which is most advantageous to the society..."<sup>43</sup>

The above quote can be justifiably considered the heart of the free enterprise gospel. It is a master achievement of rationalization. Pure selfish behavior is not only excused, but also incorporated into a body of moral and religious ethics which demands social responsibility. We shall return to this later.

The Marxists, even though opponents of the Smith model, were much influenced by it. However, the Marxian model probes deeper into man's consciousness. The workers' economic interests may not determine the workers' behavior now, but eventually, with the development of "consciousness" these interests will predominate.

If by economic interests we mean the satisfying of the primary human needs such as the need for food, sex, the avoidance of pain, etc., we

can safely assume that the search for the satisfaction of these needs is a determinant of behavior not only in man, but all the way down to the amoeba. However, when we go beyond these primary drives, human behavior, economic or otherwise, is the outcome of a learning process resulting in a more or less hardened belief formation. The basic needs can and are usually used as punishments and rewards in the learning process. Any pleasure inducing stimuli may be used effectively. Secondary or acquired rewards (or punishments) that may be of a purely symbolic nature may be used with the same effect once the individual has been conditioned to them. That is, what has been learned today may be used as a reward tomorrow.

What kind or quality of food should one eat? How or when should one indulge in sex? What kind of shelter should one have? These are all determined through the socialization process. As was hinted in chapter one, even primary drives can be modified to a certain extent. People can learn to become vegetarians, monks, or nuns, or at least not to have sex until they get married at a certain age; they can learn to fast for days and feel good inside. They can even be indoctrinated to jump into a ravine and die at a certain age. They can be led to climb the highest and most dangerous mountain "because it is there," (while in reality it is because it was put in their head).

What we are saying is that people will follow their Hardened Beliefs even when these are against their most basic human needs. We must keep in mind, however, that producing Hardened Beliefs that work against these basic needs requires a more thorough socialization process, i.e., continuous and without challenge or disruption for a long time. It is more natural and much easier to produce beliefs that harmonize with the basic needs, since these can be more easily used as effective rewards, whatever the case may be, Hardened Beliefs in humans substitute or even supersede what

has been usually referred to as instinctual behavior. The Hardened Beliefs may thus be thought of as induced instincts.

Under ideal conditions (i.e., a primitive isolated small community) the repetitious cycles in humans from one generation to another, can be predicted with the same precision as that of an insect.

Therefore we cannot answer whether human beings seek their self-interests without searching into the way they were socialized, and identifying the Hardened Beliefs that have been produced in them. Which means we have to look into the type of ruling class (or elite) a society has, its value priorities, its type of government, institutions, and socializing agencies. Needless to say, the answer would vary from one society to another, and it would be most inaccurate to transform findings of a specific condition into a general theory of Man. When Adam Smith assumed a rational behavior on the part of the individual to maximize his profits, he was describing the petty bourgeois ideal of business bargaining and transactions, the values that Weber later dubbed the Protestant Ethic.

Even under the conditions of a simple economy, while it is possible to expect everyone trying his best to get enough nourishment and stay alive, it cannot be expected that everyone will succeed in achieving his pursuits. Between the desire and the achievement there may be a wide gap. Such a gap will widen the more complex the economic system becomes. For the achievement of profit maximization requires not only a belief in it, but a very specialized knowledge, and also a strategic position within the competing forces.

In a capitalist society the belief in the desirability of maximizing profits becomes a Common Hardened one. The unlimited accumulation of wealth

becomes not only permissible, but is considered a god-given right. Obviously the amount of wealth accumulated in many cases goes far beyond the primary human need for food and shelter, and even beyond the acquired needs for luxury in a technological age, for, at a certain point, the law of diminishing returns sets in. But money is much more than buying power. It is political power, a symbol of achievement, status, respect, honor, etc.

While the belief in the right of limitless possession is shared by almost everyone, the accumulation of meaningful capital is achieved by the very few. As we mentioned earlier, very rare wage-earners ever become capitalists. If there is to be stability, the situation must be accepted by both classes, and it is.

But when we speak about everyone seeking his own economic interests, we are speaking of two different scales of value, one guides the behavior of the capitalist class, the other guides the behavior of the wage-earner. While the capitalist has been socialized into believing that it is his natural right to own, accumulate, plunder, and manipulate in order to maximize his own profits, the wage-earner is socialized into believing that it is the right of the rich to accumulate and dominate. In his view the rich are rich because they have earned it. They must possess some mysterious superior power or intelligence. To many wage-earners, the correlation is perfect between one's possessions and one's intelligence. The wage-earner is willing to defend their right to be rich, for he thinks that by defending their right to be rich, he is defending his own right to become rich - if he could.<sup>44</sup> The wage-earner measures his economic reward by what he or his father used to earn in the past, by what his co-workers are earning, by whether he can "make ends meet," by what other workers of different races, other professions, or other countries are making.

His economic interests are almost never measured by what the big company executive, or the millionaire who owns half the company stocks are making. Such an intellectual jump is almost unthinkable in a stabilized capitalist society. The wage-earners watch and penalize each other for not putting in enough work for every penny they earn, but they rarely think how the top executives are wining and dining while saving taxes, and making more money in the process. The wage-earner never dreams about controlling the stocks of his company, seeking to buy smaller companies, controlling the state or presidential elections, or becoming the secretary of Defense (he feels he is exerting great power when he casts his vote). The wage-earner will be satisfied in a euphemistic job title, a petty increase in salary, a token possession of stock, even when his own research and inventiveness is earning millions in dividends for the major stock holders of his corporation.

Is everybody pursuing his own interests in this model? The answer is yes - as those interests have been determined in the societal belief system. The businessman,\* by upbringing, training, expectations, and sense of duty, feels obligated to maximize the profits of the business he is running. Or, as Weber states it: "Man (according to the ethic of capitalism) is dominated by the making of money, by acquisition, as the ultimate purpose of his life."<sup>45</sup> What is usually referred to as economic interest is also a Hardened Belief which drives businessmen into compulsive behavior which may go far beyond their self-interest - if we measured self-interest by the attainment of happiness, internal peace, and good health. Even if we measure

---

\* "businessman" is used in this context in order to include with the genuine capitalists those who play a capitalist's role, but who do not qualify as capitalists themselves (in my definition of the term). Some of these may be graduates of a business school or climbing corporation men who function as salaried managers. The term also includes a large number of the petty bourgeoisie.

self-interest by the amount of wealth accumulated, quite often the businessman himself (who by training is much more efficient than the average wage-earner in this regard) may occasionally fail drastically in maximizing his business profits. This is particularly true when he has to view his business in the long run, and in the context of the larger society. This is aptly stated by Bendix and Lipset when they write:

"...businessmen...still pursue their interests, as they interpret them. And although their interpretations sometimes deviate from what their interests as defined by a purely rational calculus would be, it is still true that businessmen seek to maximize the advantages of their position and that they do so deliberately." (their italics)<sup>46</sup>

The Hardened Belief that makes money accumulation the ultimate purpose of life automatically makes those who own the money the ruling class of the society as long as those who do not own it continue to believe in the right to ownership. Such ownership makes money both the carrot and the stick, and thus a most efficient manipulative tool. There cannot be a ruling class without such a class having at its disposal some valuable which is accepted by the whole society as of top priority. Such a valuable does not have to be money. It can be magical secrets, physical power, religious or scientific knowledge, etc. depending upon the value system that has been historically determined through the socialization process. Whatever the valuable may be, the very process of using it as a reward reinforces the belief in its priority, and also in the legitimacy of those who control it. Members of the ruling class are themselves socialized into the belief system that sustains their position of power. They do not have to act in consort as a group of conspirators, and they do not. In a way it is an invisible hand, but, contrary to that of Adam Smith, it does not work for the benefit of the whole society, but for the benefit of a small faction of it (or, more accurately, what this small faction believes to be for its benefit). Acting as separate individuals or as separate groups, members of the ruling

class establish socializing agencies through which they transmit their own Hardened Beliefs to the masses. In this role they do not differ from parents who are anxious to have their children adopting their own beliefs.

It is possible that some of the persons who first thought of such concepts as the divine rights of kings, the special quality of nobility blood, the superiority of a certain race, the honor of dying in battle, the infallibility of the Pope, etc. may have been as cynical as Machiavelli in his meanest mood, but to their children and their grandchildren, these beliefs (with perhaps rare exceptions) can no longer be simple rhetoric. The king himself now believes he is the representative of God on earth. The nobility now truly believes in its superior breed. The Pope in his infallibility. And of course the capitalists in their right to own the wealth of a continent. What may have started as a cynical rhetoric, a rationalization, a fraud, or an illusion, may, after a few generations (sometimes a few years with intensive propaganda which fits in with an older Hardened Belief) become a Hardened Belief in both the rulers and the ruled.

When the academic promoters of the capitalist class (as to be expected under the situation these are numerous) present the Sunday School image of the businessman as no longer motivated by profit maximization, but by noble values and social responsibility, we are justified in asking why there should still be capitalism. Since when has profit maximization been separated from everything that is sacred and noble in the capitalist's mind? For hundreds of years hundreds of minds have worked hard to incorporate the Hardened Belief of wealth accumulation with the Hardened Belief of religion until the two became inseparable. When it is claimed that the businessman has a "conscience," we do not question it, but his conscience would make him feel most guilty when he goes against the pillar of his value system: profit-making.



An economist put it this way:

"But if profit maximization is not the directing agent, how are resources allocated to their most productive uses, what relation have prices to relative scarcities, and how do factors get remunerated in accordance with their contribution to output?..."<sup>47</sup>

One main difference between the new capitalism and the old one is that the calculus of profit maximization has become much more sophisticated. What the apologetics do is confuse between the incidental by-product (social benefit) and the main product aimed at (profits), between the reality and the Madison Avenue distorted image.

One can easily fill pages citing surveys, or quoting big businessmen to reveal their exact motives, but for our purpose here, we shall be satisfied in quoting a perceptive author who has not only dealt first hand with top businessmen, but who also is himself a chairman of the board of a public relations firm. David Finn writes:

"...the mountain of recent speeches, articles and reports describing the new sense of corporate responsibility in top management circles rests on very insecure ground indeed...So long as he believes that his primary duty is to provide a fair return on investment for his stockholders, and that he can best perform that duty by maximizing profits and growth through loyal devotion to the corporation, he will never be able to do more than make a token contribution to the social progress of his era..."<sup>48</sup>

#### The Socializing Agencies:

In several studies that deal with political socialization, there has been much concern with the agencies of socialization, and the importance of the individual role played by each in the socialization of the citizen. In general, there seems to be an overemphasis on family role.<sup>49</sup> One recent study even attempts to weigh the father's versus the mother's influence as determinants of their progeny's political identification and certain political beliefs.<sup>50</sup> If we are to abstract an important conclusion out of such studies, it would be the following: the individual's political beliefs tend to be

more predictable, the more is the degree of congruency of beliefs among the various agents with whom the individual happens to have been in contact.<sup>51</sup> Such a conclusion is supportive of the Hardened Belief concept which takes the content of belief as its basic unit of analysis, and not the agencies of socialization. Which agencies are stronger determinants of belief will certainly vary from society to society, and from one case to another. It should not come as a surprise therefore when researchers come with indefinite and sometimes contradictory results when weighing the impact of various socializing agencies. While the family seems to be a decisive determining factor in so far as political party identity in the U.S. (we might also add religious sect, ethnic identity, etc.), it plays a secondary role in so far as developing the more sophisticated political beliefs of the society. Hess and Torney, in their study of more than 17,000 elementary school children deemphasized (contrary to previous assumptions) the role played by the family, and concluded that, regarding the family as the most important agent of socialization "may be valid within certain areas of behavior, but it is not adequate as a model for the development of attitudes toward political objects or the growth of active political involvement."<sup>52</sup> The reason for this should be obvious: the family transmits to the child its political and religious identity, and this, at least in the U.S. is not challenged by the agency next in line, the school, or any other agency ever after. Teachers are not supposed to interfere with the parents' socialization in this area. Instead of telling the child which political party is superior to the other, the teacher usually tells him about the superiority of the two-party system, and the privilege of possessing such a freedom of choice. In America, you are supposed to "vote for the Party of your choice," and "attend the church of your choice." These are the beliefs that can be placed at the top of our pyramid model (see chapter one). Which Party you vote for, which church

you go to are beliefs that fall at a lower level.

Whatever idiosyncrasies the parents may transmit, in a stabilized society, their attitudes toward the political and socio-economic system is not likely to contradict that of the general consensus of their society.<sup>53</sup> The preoccupation with the agencies of socialization in these studies usually - but not always - leads to the neglect of the role played by the ruling class in the selection of beliefs to be transmitted or reinforced. These agencies do not function in a vacuum, nor are they as independent of the power structure as they are generally portrayed to be.

In any developed society many institutions are thoroughly engaged in the socialization of the masses. Of course all these institutions may have several other functions, and the socialization function in some of them may be considered secondary. Nevertheless their socialization function is essential for their survival and the survival of the system as a whole.

The following may be considered as the major socializing agencies in the American system:

1. The School (elementary, secondary, and college)
2. The Church (of all denominations)
3. The Armed Forces
4. The Corporations (through public relations and the media)
5. The Mass Media (newspapers, radio, television, movies, magazines, books, etc.)
6. The Political System (political speeches, election campaigns, the political parties, government publications, press releases, press conferences, etc.)
7. Private and Secondary Associations (labor unions, boy scouts, veteran organizations, political organizations, professional organizations of all kinds, etc.)

The family and the peer group cannot be considered but individualization agents, i.e., important in their transmission of lower level beliefs on the pyramid model.\* Of course they do transmit also common beliefs, but in such a function, they are only agents of the formal agencies above. This is particularly true in a stabilized system when the common beliefs of the society are no longer negated by peers or those who become parents for they, themselves, have been "processed" by the same system that now socializes the child. The emphasis on family and peer groups in political socialization literature is probably mainly due to its preoccupation with party identification rather than with beliefs on the upper level. For determining the latter, only those agencies that are in a position to influence beliefs on a massive scale, and who have the potential to modify current popular beliefs, and if need be, even change some of them, can be considered primary socializing agencies.

The multiplicity of socializing agencies in the U.S. is usually considered a healthy sign by those authors who compare the American system with the so-called totalitarian systems. For example Brzezinski and Huntington who dedicate a long chapter on comparing socialization in the U.S. with that of the U.S.S.R. focus on this "plurality of agents" in the U.S. where "(no) single organization monopolizes the shaping of attitudes toward any one issue, and very few attempt to shape attitudes on all issues."<sup>54</sup> The family is again supposed to have a dominant role in this process: "No agent, apart from the family, attempts to shape all the individual's political attitudes of the citizen."<sup>55</sup> In spite of admitting that the family's political beliefs are not likely to conflict with those of the other socializing agencies in the U.S., the supposed dominance of the family is still taken as a sign of independence. It is acknowledged that "once the regime becomes stabilized... and after the passage of sufficient time, the original need for politization

begins to decline."<sup>56</sup> But it is not explained that such a stability, or the correlation of family beliefs with those of the formal agencies has come about precisely because of a long politization by these formal agencies. And the fact that there may still be some conflict between the family in the Soviet Union and the formal agencies simply means that the Soviet Union is still passing through a revolutionary period in its history, and it may take a little more time before the new politization process is complete. The resistance of people in Communist countries to Marxist-Leninist ideology is repeatedly taken by Western authors as a sign of human independence, a reassertion of the mystique of human dignity. In a book on Eastern Europe, an author writes: "The dynamism of totalitarian indoctrination has been checked by the tenacity of the human mind in its striving for freedom."<sup>57</sup> The same "tenacity" can still be said about those who insist that the earth is flat, or those who tried Galileo because his scientific theories did not agree with their religious beliefs. What these authors are saying is that the attachment to the more traditional beliefs (i.e., parochialism, nationalism, vestiges of feudal and bourgeois custom and beliefs, religion, etc.) is a refusal of the human mind to become "captivated," as a Polish emigre writer has stated it.<sup>58</sup> Such comments usually reduce themselves to this: will the individual submit now in contradiction to what he has been submitting to in the past? Will the soldier be "brainwashed" now by an enemy in contradiction to all his previous "brainwashings" by his own nation? Will the Poles, the Czechs, the Hungarian submit now to intensive Communist indoctrination in spite of all their previous continuous indoctrination for centuries? In short, can the completely Hardened Beliefs eventually be broken? It is clear that it is not a matter of freedom and captivity, but a matter of whose captive are they going to be: ours or theirs? (that is if we insist on calling the hardening of beliefs a captivity).

It is obvious that what these authors are really concerned with is not the socialization process itself, but the content of beliefs that such a socializaion is disseminating. They have nothing against the socialization that takes place in the Western societies, or in other societies where the Hardened Beliefs of the Western societies are being propagated.<sup>59</sup>

To an American educator, (George Z. Bereday) "the Russian system of experimental schools is admirable, but the Soviet attempt to thrust 'communism and materialism' down the throats of children seemed criminal."<sup>60</sup> Everything done in the Communist countries in the area of socialization is viewed with the same hostility, suspicion, and cynicism. Even the boarding schools in the Soviet Union whose aim, it is acknowledged, is to open the opportunity for a better education to children from poor family environments, are considered "a growth of the quest for total power" by the authorities.<sup>61</sup>

What is most shocking about the Communists is that they are trying to kill some of the most Hardened Beliefs of the Western societies. It is not a matter of which agencies and how many are involved in this process. It is a matter of which Beliefs are being killed. There lies the "criminal" act. For to kill the Hardened Beliefs that have become a part of the human personality is much like killing the person himself.

It is irrelevant to measure ruling class manipulation by counting the number of agencies involved in the process. 'It is also irrelevant whether the various agencies are labelled private or governmental, particularly where the private owners are themselves the ruling class. It is not important as far as measuring the degree of manipulation, which agency is playing a more or less dominant role in the process.

It does not make much difference whether in the Soviet Union there is one agency (which indeed is not true\*) or fifteen. The relevant question is:

---

\* It can be rightly claimed that all agencies in the U.S.S.R. are more or less dominated by members of the Communist Party. But so are the agencies in the U.S. more or less dominated by businessmen.

are there certain identical beliefs that are being propagated by all these agencies? The answer is definitely positive. Do these include all man's beliefs, i.e., total control, as has been claimed? The answer is definitely NO. If this were true, the Soviet Union would have regressed to Medieval times. As was stated in Chapter One, total control of the individual (i.e., the hardening of all, or almost all his beliefs) is neither possible nor desirable in a modern developed and complex society. This would be incongruent with a scientific and rational approach to social and physical problem solving, a prerequisite to any society that wants to develop. How can "the Bosses in the Kremlin" have complete control over the minds of their people when Marxism itself is so broad and an offspring of Western thought, which in turn is a composite of world thought? How can these "Bosses" block all ideas coming from the past (including the Russian heritage itself)? How can they prevent the inflow of ideas coming from the outside (including the Voice of America) in this modern inter-connected world?

However, it is worth noting that a revolutionary regime is faced with an uphill fight in the battle for beliefs. Beliefs that have been hardening for centuries have to be destroyed before the desired change can take place. This is particularly true when the regime cannot avoid being bombarded from within and from without with messages that try to reinforce the old Hardened Beliefs. It is no wonder that at this stage there is a conflict between those generations socialized in the old order, and the new revolutionary elite that tries to destroy the old order. It is only through intensity in the socialization process that the new order can succeed. But here we must emphasize again that such intensive resocialization does not have to cover but a small area of the total societal beliefs.

What has been usually referred to as a "pragmatic" approach to solving deep-seated social and economic problems may not at all be pragmatic. For

this "pragmatic" action will be carried through within the confines of the same Hardened Beliefs that were responsible for the problems in the first place. The result will ultimately be the emergence of the same problems in a slightly different form. This is the trouble with reformist movements and reformers. Only through a counter-attack that can destroy these retarded Hardened Beliefs that any meaningful progressive social change can take place.<sup>62</sup> We shall deal with revolutionary change in Chapter Six.



Footnotes

Chapter II: The Ruling Classes and the Common Hardened Beliefs

1. Frances Macdonald Cornford, trans., ed.: The Republic of Plato, Oxford University Press, New York, 1966, p. 114, 115.
2. Aristotle: The Politics, trans. ed. by T.A. Sinclair, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1962, p. 216.
3. Niccolo Machiavelli: The Prince and the Discourses, Modern Library ed., Random House, New York, 1950, p. 150.
4. Ibid, pp. 149-164, No need to repeat these accounts here, but they do present considerable evidence that the Roman rulers used such psychological weapons successfully (Machiavelli used such Roman authors as Titus Livius as his reference).
5. Irving M. Zeitlin: Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, Prentice-Hall, Englewood, N.J., 1968, p. 65.
6. Ibid., p. 67.
7. Emile Durkheim: The Division of Labor in Society, The Free Press, New York, as quoted in Ibid., p. 241.
8. Ibid., p. 259.
9. Ibid., pp. 195-202.
10. Harold Lasswell: Politics, op.cit., p. 31.
11. Ibid., p. 42.
12. Ibid., p. 32.
13. Karl Marx and Frederich Engels: "The Communist Manifesto" in Lewis S. Feuer: Marx & Engels, Anchor Books, Doubleday & co., New York, 1959, p. 26.
14. Marx and Engels: "The German Ideology" in Howard Selsam and Harry Martel: Reader in Marxist Philosophy, International Publishers, New York, 1963. p. 199.
15. Ibid., p. 200.
16. Frederich Engels: "On Historical Materialism" in Lewis Feuer, op.cit., p. 25.
17. Marx & Engels: "The Communist Manifesto" in Feuer, op.cit., p. 25.

18. As quoted by Stalin: "Foundations of Leninism" in Arthur P. Mendel, ed., Essential Works of Marxism, Bantam Books, New York, 1961, p. 240.

19. Karl Marx: "Excerpt from Toward the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right" in Feuer, op.cit., p. 215.

20. Frederick Engels: "End of German Classical Philosophy" in Feuer, op.cit., p. 215.

21. Friedrich Engels: "Excerpts from Herr Eugen Duhring's Revolution in Science" in Feuer, op.cit., p. 272.

22. C. Wright Mills: The Marxists, a Laurel ed., Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1962, p. 97.

23. Max Weber: The Protestant Ethic, as quoted by Reinhard Bendix: Max Weber, An Intellectual Portrait, A Doubleday Anchor Book, N.Y., 1962, p. 46.

24. Friedrich Engels: "Letter to Joseph Bloch (1890)" in Howard Selsam and Harry Martel, ed., op.cit., p. 204.

25. Friedrich Engels: "Letter to Conrad Schmidt (1890)", Ibid, p. 210.

26. In this regard an official Soviet text on Marxist-Leninist ideology states: "A socialist revolution is not invention of Communist theoreticians, as reactionary propaganda tries to make out. The very development of modern capitalism impels the working people towards a revolutionary transformation of society."

See O.V. Kuusinen et al: Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963, p. 476.

27. Karl Marx: Capital, Vol. III, International Publishers, New York, 1967, p. 885.

28. Paul A. Samuelson: Economics, Seventh ed., McGraw Hill, New York 1967, p. 76, 77.

29. For example, the upper 2% of all shareholders own 58% of all stocks in America. The lower two thirds (67% owns only 10%. in early 1959 only 14% of the nation's spending units owned stocks at all. Those with \$25,000 and up holdings accounted for 90% of the stocks.

See Gabriel Kolko: Wealth and Power in America, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962, p. 52.

30. The income share of the richest tenth of the population has remained more or less constant over the past half century while that of the lowest income tenth has dropped from 2-3% between 1910-30 to 1.1% (to that of the whole national income) in 1959. The lower income 50% of the population accounted for 27% of the national personal income in 1910, and only 23% in 1959. Ibid., p. 15.

According to a study prepared for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System on the basis of Census Bureau Data: Survey of Financial

Characteristics of Consumers, 1962 (as cit. by Lundberg, p. 15), the number of households in the country worth between \$100,000 and \$200,000 was 1.25% of all households, those between \$200,000 and \$500,000 less than 1%, those with \$500,000 and up less than 0.4%. If we assume that in order to qualify as capitalists, one's net assets must be around \$500,000 or more the number of capitalists would be in the vicinity of 0.2% of American households (200,000 out of 57.9 million households).

Other important studies on the distribution of wealth in America (and which arrive at about the same conclusions) may include the following:

1. Robert J. Lampman: "The Distribution of Wealth According to Estate Tax Returns," 39th Annual Report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1959. Lampman further develops his data in "Changes in the Share of Wealth held by Top Wealth Holders, 1922-1956" in Review of Economics and Statistics, Nov., 1959, pp. 279-92.
2. A continuing project on the distribution of wealth in America has been carried out by the Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan: 1960 Survey of Consumer Finances, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961.
3. Ferdinand Lundberg: The Rich and the Super-Rich, A Bantam Book, Lyle Stuart Inc., 1968. On this topic see particularly Chapter One, pp. 1-34.  
Lundberg abstracts the following important fact from the Lampman findings:  
"More than 30% of the assets and equities of the personal sector of the economy (about 20% of all wealth in the country being government-owned) in 1953 was held by 1.6% of the adult population of 103 million.
31. C. Wright Mills: The Power Elite, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956. It must be pointed out that earlier in his career Mills did use the Marxist class structure in his analysis. For example see "A Marx for the Managers" (with Hans H. Gerth), and "The Political Gargoyles: Business as Power" in Power, Politics, and People, The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, ed. by Irving Louis Horowitz, Oxford University Press, London, Oxford, New York, 1963.
32. The literature on this is voluminous. Suffice it for our purpose here is to mention two well-known works:  
Robert A. Dahl: Who Governs?, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1961.  
Arnold Rose: The Power Structure, Oxford University Press, New York, 1967.
33. E.G., Arnold M. Rose writes: "The 'American Creed' of liberty, equality, fair play, justice, etc. and the more universal religious and humanistic ideals are not mere words which can be completely twisted and distorted to serve the interests of any group." op.cit., 18, 19.
34. Gabriel Kolko: The Roots of American Foreign Policy, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969, p. 33.
35. C. Wright Mills: The Power Elite, op.cit., p. 107.

36. Seymour Martin Lipset and Reinhard Bendix: Social Mobility in Industrial Society, The University of California Press, Berkley, 1959. Particularly see Chapter IV, "Social Mobility and the American Business Elite," pp. 114-143.

37. Ferdinand Lundberg: The Rich and the Super-Rich, op.cit., p. 277.

38. See the quote in 1883, for example, of the President of Western Union Telegraph Co. arguing in favor of the laws of "supply and demand" and against "legislative interference" where he declares he is a believer in the Jacksonian Maxim.

John William Ward: "Andrew Jackson" in Daniel J. Boorstin, ed., An American Primer, A Mentor Book, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1966, p. 294. The same maxim is probably invoked every day by one business spokesman or another. It may be considered a fundamental of the American business creed.

39. On the U.S. Parties, Ferdinand Lundberg, who cannot be considered a Marxist by any stretch of the imagination, writes:

"The United States can be looked upon as having in effect a single party: The Property Party. This party can be looked upon as having two divisions: The Republican Party...and the Democratic Party... The big reason third parties have come to naught - a puzzle to some political scientists - is simply that no substantial group of property owners has seen fit to underwrite one. There is no anti-property party," The Rich and the Super-Rich, op.cit., p. 41.

Of course we should not ignore the fact that Unionized labor is also active in sponsoring one or the other of the political parties, but unionized labor is only about 20% of the work force in the U.S. Through collection of dues, the Union Leaders, usually isolated from the rank and file, are not only in control of large capital, but become capitalists themselves. In that role they cannot be expected to differ from capitalists in their political behavior any more than capitalists would differ from each other.

40. For a detailed report on the background of U.S. Senators, see Donald E. Mathews: U.S. Senators and their World, Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, New York, 1960, particularly Chapter Two, pp. 11-46. For the background of the "political elite" as a whole, see C. Wright Mills: "The American Political Elite: A Collective Portrait" in Power, Politics, and People, op.cit., pp. 196-207.

41. In experimental psychology it was once thought that old rats are more stupid than young rats since they learned more slowly in the laboratory experiments. Finally it occurred to one experimenter (Stone, 1929) that mature animals kept underweight may not be as starved as young growing animals. When both the young and old animals were motivated by maximal hunger drives, the apparent stupidity of the old rats disappeared. See Neal E. Miller and John Dollard: Social Learning and Imitation, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1941, p. 21.

42. Aside from Marxist works on this topic, the following American works are recommended:

Robert S. Lynd and Helen Merrell Lynd: Middletown in Transition, Harcourt Grace, New York, 1937.

- Ferdinand Lundberg: America's Sixty Families, Vanguard, New York, 1937.
- Mathew Josephson: The Politicos, Harcourt Brace & World, New York, 1938.
- Mathew Josephson: The Robber Barons, Harcourt & World, New York, 1934, 1962.
- Floyd Hunter: Community Power Structure, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1953.
- Floyd Hunter: Top Leadership, U.S.A., Chapel Hill, University of Carolina Press, 1959.
- Gabriel Kolko: Wealth and Power in America, op.cit.
- Gabriel Kolko: The Roots of American Foreign Policy, op.cit.  
 (Though this work deals with foreign policy, the author's analysis is a class analysis. What is worth noting here is that the author disagrees with C. Wright Mills' inclusion of the military elite as a power elite. According to Kolko, the generals are nothing more than the tools of the capitalist class.)
- Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson: The Case Against Congress, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1968.  
 (Though this work is of the expose journalistic type, it is most revealing and informative in so far as the relationship between the monied interests and the politicians.)
43. Adam Smith: The Wealth of Nations, Book IV, ch. ii, as quoted by Thorstein Veblen in Max Lerner, ed., The Portable Veblen, the Viking Press, New York, 1948, p. 241.
44. What I am saying here is not sheer speculation. It is based on informal interviews with several white-collar workers who all agree with the views expressed in the text. For more on this, see chapter three, p. 115.
45. Max Weber: The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1958, p. 53.
46. Reinhard Bendix & Seymour Martin Lipset: "The Field of Political Sociology" in Lewis A. Coser: Political Sociology, Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, New York, 1967, p. 17.
47. Edward S. Mason: "The Apologetics of Managerialism" in the Journal of Business, Jan., 1958, p. 7, as quoted by Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy: Monopoly Capital, Modern Reader Paperbacks, New York & London, 1966, p. 22.
48. David Finn: The Corporate Oligarchy, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1969, p. 246.
49. For example see Herbert H. Hyman: Political Socialization, op.cit., Richard E. Dawson and Kenneth Prewitt: Political Socialization, Little Brown and Co., Boston, 1969.  
 Fred Greenstein: Children and Politics, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1965.  
 For a review of the literature of the family role in socialization, see Stephen W. Wasley: "The Impact of the Family on Politics" in The Family Coordinator, Jan., 1966, pp. 3-23.
50. M. Kent Jannings and Kenneth P. Langton: "Mothers versus Fathers: The Formation of Political Orientations Among Young Americans" in The Journal of Politics, May, 1969, pp. 329-357.

51. In this regard the above study by Jennings and Langton states it this way: "In the same analysis (comparing father's and mother's beliefs with that of majority opinions on such issues as U.S. participation in the U.N., allowing Communists to take office, etc.) we found graphic evidence that on the above issues homogeneous triples are most often preserved when the opinion of both parents is consonant with the national adult majority position. Students (seniors from secondary schools) are most likely to deviate from the expressed issue position of their homogeneous parents when the parents are expressing a minority viewpoint." Ibid., p. 353.

52. Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Torney: The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Anchor Books, ed., Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1967, p. 109.

53. Hess & Torney state it htis way: "From the Perspective of Political Socialization, the family's primary effect is to support consensually held attitudes rather than to inculcate idiosyncratic attitudes," Ibid., p. 113.

54. Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington: Political Power, U.S.A./U.S.S.R., The Viking Press, Compass Book Ed., 1963, 1964, pp. 71-127, quote from p. 86.

55. Ibid., p. 78, 79.

56. Ibid., p. 78.

57. H. Gordon Skilling: The Governments of Communist East Europe, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1966, p. 211.

58. Czelaw Milosz: The Captive Mind, New York, 1955.

59. As an example of this double standard, Carl H. Lande quotes approvingly a former Philippine Vice Governor who said that the aim of the education in the Philippines was different from that in the U.S. In the latter education was to impart the "established national culture to the coming generation." But in the Philippines, its aim, under American guidance, was to "set out to modify profoundly its political, social, and economic institutions...to hasten such changes in the national character as might seem necessary for the accomplishment of these purposes." See Carl H. Lande: "The Philippines" in James S. Coleman, ed.: Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965, p. 325.

60. As quoted by Frederick C. Barghoorn: Politics in the U.S.S.R., Little Brown, New York, 1966, p. 87-88.

61. See Jeremy R. Azrael: "Soviet Union" in James S. Coleman, ed.: Education and Political Development, op.cit., p. 271.

62. This is not to say that no social change can take place without the destruction of the Hardened Beliefs. Change can take place as long as it does not touch the Hardened Beliefs. For example, in the Southern United States, it is possible to build the best school facilities for the black people (reform) as long as black people remain separate. But as long as the

Hardened Belief towards the negro remains, only a form of token integration can take place under duress. Such a Hardened Belief cannot disappear as long as the same political and educational institutions remain. It could possibly disappear slowly and very gradually if the South continues to be bombarded by outside messages, but that is unlikely.

For a worthwhile and informative discussion of the obstructionist role of certain beliefs in South Asia in preventing economic and social development of the region, see Gunnar Myrdal: Asian Drama, An Inquiry Into the Poverty of Nations, vol. I, Pantheon, A Division of Random House, New York, 1968, pp. 71-125.

### Chapter III

#### THE BELIEF "MOLECULE" OF STABILITY

In asserting pluralism and democracy in an American city (and in America as a whole), Robert A. Dahl writes:

"The fact is that the Economic Notables operate within that vague consensus, the prevailing system of beliefs to which all the major groups in the community subscribe...Within limits they can influence the content of that belief system, but they cannot determine it wholly."<sup>1</sup>

We cannot but agree with Professor Dahl that the "Economic Notables" cannot determine wholly "the prevailing system of beliefs, but we must add quickly that they do not have to. In an advanced and complex capitalist society such as the U.S., in order to maintain the stability of the power structure, only one Basic Belief has to be maintained: the belief in the right to unlimited ownership (and all the powers and privileges that ensue thereof).

The ruling class can be quite confident about maintaining its powers and privileges as long as this one belief continues to be upheld. The ruling class can afford to be flexible about almost all other beliefs. It will not affect the power structure, for example, if people want to be Catholics, Jews, Unitarians, Democrats, Republican, Liberals, conservatives; it will not make the least bit of difference if they identify themselves as Italians, Irish, Poles, blacks, whites, Middle class, working class, white collar, etc. As we shall show later, the more pluralistic is the society the more ideal it would be for the stability of a capitalist system. We might also add that as monopoly capital grows into a global system, the fragmentation of the world into small nation-states, or small ethnic groups,



works best for world capitalism.

Of course the above Basic Belief does not stand in a mental vacuum, Neither does its reinforcement have to be carried out directly. In a complex and advanced society the hardening of the Basic Belief upon which the survival of the system depends must be carried out with more subtlety. The Basic Belief may also be strengthened through the hardening of what we may refer to as Supportive Beliefs. Both types of belief are integrated into what we may call a belief system. A belief unit of either type (Basic or Supportive) may be thought of as an "atom," while a belief system may be thought of as a "molecule." In the United States, among the most essential Supportive Beliefs, we may mention: 1. nationalism, 2. religious beliefs, 3. anti-communism. The first two can be described as traditional in that they can be traced far back in history, and have been hardening for centuries. To put the Hardened Beliefs in the service of the Basic Belief, all the propagandist usually has to do is to link the two together. Anti-communism is a more recent belief, but it has been inculcated with such intensity that it has become more hardened than the others.

The Supportive Belief units are not as essential as the Basic one. While collectively indispensable, individually they are not only interchangeable, but also replaceable. For example, if the belief in God disappears, the system may lose some of its strength, but the resulting condition may not be too critical, for a more worldly belief, such as the democratic creed, may effectively take its place. The weakening of the nationalistic belief may present a more serious problem, but it does not have to be fatal to the ruling class as long as the other Supporting Beliefs persist, or a new one develops. A loyalty to the corporation may safely replace the loyalty to the nation-state. What we are saying is that this "molecule" of belief is a flexible one, and there lies the secret of its survival. It is only when

all the Supporting Beliefs collapse at about the same time, a most unlikely if not impossible event, that the power structure may become threatened.

Authors on the left, when describing mass manipulation in the United States tend to describe it as totalitarian the same way those on the right describe the Soviet Union. Herbert Marcuse, for one, refers to American society as a totalitarian one with a "totalitarian logic which produces "one-dimensional thought and behavior" as well as "one-dimensional man."<sup>2</sup> Marcuse, however, speaks of "industrial society" as totalitarian, not excluding the Soviet Union. The closest Marcuse comes to a definition is when he refers to totalitarianism as "economic-technical coordination of society... through the manipulation of needs."<sup>3</sup> Of course Marcuse includes thought control as part of the domination even though he is more subtle than to pronounce such a control as total. He rather talks about the absence of "negativity" to oppose this one-directional flow of domination.

What I am suggesting here is that thought domination by a single group in an industrial complex society cannot be total regardless of its type of economic or political system. But the domination may be extremely powerful in those areas of belief such as the ones I mentioned above. These can be hardened to such a degree that freedom of thought in so far as finding or even searching for alternatives to the established order can become completely paralyzed. In so far as other beliefs irrelevant to the continuity of the power structure, the system has generally been tolerant. In this sense we cannot call the American system totalitarian.

THE BASIC BELIEF:

This belief has been so hardened in Western societies that to many people it may sound odd even to cite it as a belief. The right to property has always been - at least in the Western tradition - one of man's most

inalienable rights, as sacred and indisputable as any religious creed or Newtonian law of nature.

Wealth and property rights have a long historical tradition in all the sources that have contributed to Western thought, Judeo-Christian, Greek, Roman, Germanic, etc. With the exception of what the Marxists referred to as primitive communism among some American Indian or African tribes, the right to unlimited wealth and property in recorded history has generally been the rule. Christian teachings as well as the other great religions took wealth and poverty for granted. They urged charity, the giving of alms on the part of the rich, but the sheer suggestion would have been unnecessary had it not been taken as an axiom that there will always be the wealthy and the wretched, the masters and the slaves. One may be able to point to some incidents in the teachings of Jesus where he was disdainful of the rich, and he expressed very little hope for them to inherit the Kingdom of Heaven (the parable of Lazarus and the rich man is one example), but such hopeful prospects for the poor to end up in Abraham's bosom were twisted around by the future ruling classes, and served as tranquilizers for the suffering millions.

The fact was that Jesus, as we know Him from whatever little record we have of Him, was not much concerned with changing the socio-economic or political structure of His time. He was more concerned with the saving of men's souls rather than their bodies. Perhaps "Give unto Caesar what is Caesar's" portrays Him best in this respect. What is more important than the original record of Jesus for this discussion is the established Church that was built in His name, and which dominated the minds of Western man for centuries. Without having to go very deep into the Church's history, it can be seen clearly that the Church's Establishment not only served the

powers that be, but for centuries, was itself the major power. Not only did it serve the propertied interests of the feudal lords, but became one of the greatest feudal institutions in its own right. While the feudal system reigned supreme, the Catholic Church helped harden the belief in the established order.

The Reformation did not try to change the status quo either. While Martin Luther occasionally decried the abuses of moneylenders and the oppression and deprivation of peasants by landlords, he could see no evil in the extreme inequality of ownership or privilege. And when the peasants of Southern Germany finally rose in rebellion, Martin Luther, who himself was the son of peasants, reacted with righteous indignation - against the peasants. Now he identified with the ruling class. Not only did he call the peasants "thieving rabble," but urged the nobility to crush the rebellion, an operation which resulted in the murdering of thousands of peasants.

The famous Weberian thesis which finds the roots of the "Spirit of Capitalism" in the theological foundation of Protestantism is not very relevant to us here. What we must keep in mind, however, is that the Reformation did not interfere with the socio-political structure any more than did the Catholic Church. On the contrary, we can say that generally it was a boost to the established order in spite of its revolutionary change in so far as the Church orthodoxy was concerned. When Protestantism was adopted by the German princes, the cooperation between them and the Protestant leaders was satisfactory to both. For the protection of the latter, the former's right to rule became a divine right, and any kind of anti-authoritarian activity was condemned.

The rise of capitalism and the gradual destruction of the feudal system did not drastically change man's relationship to property, though the nature of property gradually changed from land to finance and industry.

The extreme inequality in ownership remained in both systems. In my view the Marxists exaggerated the differences between capitalism, feudalism, and slavery, partly in order to serve their evolutionary analytical model. Though differing in many technical aspects, all these systems have inherent within them an extreme inequality of property, together with an exploitation of the poor by the rich. In many respects, capitalism can be thought of as industrial feudalism.

As to the political and social philosophers, inequality was not only accepted, but also rationalized and idealized.

John Locke who was one of the major inspirers of the American Constitutionalists incorporated his theory of property into a religious framework. He, like the other natural rightists, listed property as an essential human right. But that is not all. In Locke we find the seeds of the later very influential social Darwinism. Although God gave the benefits of the earth to all men, personal property, according to him, is justified through man's labor which removes his property from "the common state of nature" it was found in. This way the inequality of ownership is easily justified through the natural inequality of men. Those who work and toil deserve a better reward while the idle must suffer deprivation.<sup>4</sup>

We can give a long long list of social thinkers from the times of Plato all the way down to the times of Talcott Parsons, and include such big names as Cicero, Thomas Aquinas, Martin Luther, Machiavelli, Grotius, Montesquieu, Hobbes, Adam Smith, John Stewart Mill, de Tocqueville, Mosca, Weber, etc. to show how repeatedly those rights of property were justified and sanctified. Some of those thinkers may have occasionally spoken out for equality which may have meant many things, but never an equality of property. The fact that in spite of their depth of perception, sense of justice, breadth of inquiry, their eyes were closed as far as the gross injustices and tyrannies

committed in the name of property rights shows how hardened such a belief was in them. Of course many of those thinkers, the same as the latter-day muckrakers in America, did point to some of the evils and injustices committed by some members of the ruling class. But we find the questioning of the basic institutions founded on property rights rare indeed. A richless and poorless society was almost inconceivable.

This is not to say that the notion of communistic living was completely lacking in Western thought. Actually one can cite several examples of either actual such communities or imagined ones suggested by utopians. The early Christians practiced under certain peculiar and difficult circumstances a collective type of living that has been described as communistic. Plato in his Republic, prescribes communistic living for his Guardian class by completely abolishing the family, and living on common property. But this is privileged communism for a small elite resembling clannish living rather than communism for the masses. In the Laws Plato hesitantly plays with the idea of limitation of property, but he soon retreats from this intellectual adventure on the grounds that communism is too difficult to maintain and that inequality is likely to arise again sooner or later, and Plato does not hesitate to propose that "power and authority be awarded on the basis of wealth rather than intellect."<sup>5</sup> Generally speaking, Plato probably ventured into questioning the right of unrestricted acquisition more than many other thinkers that followed for hundreds of years after him.

Thomas Campanella, an Italian friar who lived between the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, wrote a utopia, The City of the Sun, where a theocratic type of communistic society was painted as the ideal society. This inspired the Jesuits later, particularly when they attempted to found such a society in Paraguay. All such small communities that adopted this type of living including many religious orders, the utopias of the nineteenth

century such as those of Robert Owen and others, the Kibbutzes in Israel in our time, have been very limited in their scope, and did not attempt to challenge the feudal or capitalist system within which they existed. What these types of collectives usually abolish is more of a personal type of property rather than the property of the ruling class. Such utopian or Christian socialism can be traced to primitive communism, and must be differentiated from Marxian or modern communism.

In the eighteenth century there were serious questions posed about property by the Enlightenment intellectuals before, during, and after the French Revolution: Diderot, Mably, Rousseau, Babeuf, F. Fourier, Proudhon, and others. But here again we might say they occasionally touched the boundary of the forbidden, but rarely went beyond it.

Rousseau, despite his realization that inequality of property was at the source of much of what was wrong in society, he was unable to go any further than recommend slow and gradual change through representative government. He could not conceive how abolition of property could be possible.

Babeuf was one of the first true revolutionaries in this respect, but he was done away with by the Directory of the bourgeois revolution.<sup>6</sup> His famous defense at his trial, which was threatening to the belief in bourgeois property was not published till almost a hundred years later, and thus did not reach many people.

Proudhon who became famous for his axiom: "Property is theft" must, in the final analysis, be listed among the utopian socialists, though he contributed directly to Marxian thought.

It was only with Marx that the first serious and effective challenge to property rights began. It can be stated that all social thought since then has been more or less a Marxian dialectic. All the outstanding social

theorists of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century: Weber, Pareto, Mosca, Michels, Durkheim, and others, can be viewed as a reaction to the Marxian challenge to an old Hardened Belief.<sup>7</sup> (One can stretch the list to include contemporary American theorists such as Parsons, Lipset, Easton, and many others.)

To sum up the above: inequality of ownership can be looked upon as a very old and very Hardened Belief in Western thought. Such a belief is an available and effective weapon in its own right in the hands of the ruling class. Challenges to this belief have been scarce, the only serious one starting only in the nineteenth century, and this line of thought has been fought bitterly, and more or less isolated as a positive force from the main stream of thought in the capitalist countries, particularly in the United States.

#### THE BASIC BELIEF IN THE AMERICAN MILIEU:

The American stream of belief was the least touched with egalitarian principles in so far as property was concerned. The American open continent, rich in land and resources, reinforced Locke's theory that man's amount of property correlated with his energy, talents, and toil (the important factors of inherited wealth, of inherited opportunities for learning, as well as sheer luck are usually ignored in this theory).

The wealthy framers of the American Constitution did not hesitate to call themselves "gentlemen of principle and property" as if the two went together as a matter of course. Besides, they did not make any effort to hide the fact that the Constitution they had gathered to write for posterity must not only guarantee the privileges of property, but must also guarantee the maintenance of political power in the hands of gentlemen of property. They designed a non-monarchical form of government called republican.



Many among them expressed deep distrust and fear of those without property and with out principle. The delegate from Massachusetts at the Philadelphia Convention declared that the evils they experienced at the time flowed from the excesses of democracy. The delegate from Pennsylvania stated: "If property then is the main object of government, certainly it ought to be one measure of the influence due to those who are to be affected by the government." The delegate from South Carolina also stressed that these were his sentiments too: "Property is certainly the principal object of society."<sup>8</sup> And when it came to the question as to who was to vote in the "representative government" proposed, the apprehension of mass participation in government prevented any agreement on this issue, and the problem was returned to the states where local control of "gentlemen" was secure, and where only those who owned property and paid taxes had suffrage rights. To add extra safety for the future, the Constitution allowed popular vote only for the lower House, and left the selection of the Senate in the hands of state representatives and that of the President to the state Electoral Colleges. The abolishing of titles was a most fortunate gesture - for those who would have gotten the titles. Though it may not have been intentionally designed for this purpose, it served nevertheless to obscure the awareness on the part of the masses about the identity or existence of a privileged ruling class.

The classic study by Charles A. Beard<sup>9</sup> about the economic foundations of the American Constitution has been bitterly attacked by many latter-day ideologues even though the content of the Constitution as well as the whole record of the Philadelphia Convention do not make any attempt to hide this fact. The reason for such candidness was simple: the Founding Fathers did not have the slightest doubt in their mind as to the correctness and justice of privilege. Their consciences were clear. Karl Marx had not been born then.

What is of great interest to this discussion is that James Madison, himself one of the leading framers of the Constitution, and one of its greatest publicists, in his famous Federalist Paper # 10 clearly expresses his fear of "factionalism" in a most revealing manner. The most threatening factionalism, according to Madison, is that of a "majority." Here Madison offers a class analysis that could almost be labeled Marxian in its approach if not in its purpose:

"But the most common and durable source of factions, has been the various and unequal distribution of property. Those who hold, and those who are without property, have every formed distinct interests in society."<sup>10</sup>

A minority faction is not much of a problem for "relief is supplied by the republican principle which enables the majority to defeat its sinister views by regular vote."<sup>11</sup> In such a case a majority is useful because it is not acting as one faction that can threaten private property:

"The diversity in the faculties of men, from which the rights of property originate, is not less an insuperable obstacle to an uniformity of interests. The protection of these faculties is the first object of government." (emphasis added)<sup>12</sup>

Again the correlation between property and "faculty" is made clear. The government's first function is to protect these faculties, or to protect unequal property.

How can the majority be prevented from forming a faction (or in Marxian terms, developing a class consciousness)?

"Either the existence of the same passion or interest in a majority, at the same time must be prevented; or the majority, having such coexistent passion or interest, must be rendered, by their number and local situation, unable to concert and carry into effect schemes of oppression."<sup>1</sup> (schemes of oppression here is another way of saying a revolution of the majority against the propertied minority).

Madison suggests that the best form of government to prevent such type of threatening "factionalism" is that of a large republic because "you make it less probable that a majority of the whole will have a common motive to

invade the rights of other citizens; or if such a common motive exists, it will be more difficult for all who feel it to discover their own strength, and to act in unison with each other."<sup>14</sup> All this can be put bluntly in the old simple cliché: divide and rule.

Madison dismisses "pure democracy" because of the "mischiefs of faction:"

"A common passion or interest will, in almost every case, be felt by a majority of the whole; a communication and concert results from the form of government itself...Hence it is, that such democracies have ever been spectacles of turbulence and contention...incompatible with personal security, or the rights of property...Theoretic politicians who have patronized this species of government, have erroneously supposed, that by reducing mankind to a perfect equality, they would, at the same time, be perfectly equalized and assimilated in their possessions, their opinions, and their passions."<sup>15</sup>

The above document is not only important because it is a masterpiece of shrewd political craftsmanship, but also - and this is more important here - because it has been an essential source of American ideology: the wealthy are wealthy because they have better faculties; therefore for the sake of stability, and for the benefit of all, it is desirable that the wealthy should rule. Stability becomes the most essential function of government, for stability means the protection of those with property and higher faculties, and who could do a better job for such a protection than these "faculties" themselves?

After almost two hundred years of hard work by all the socializing agencies, the overwhelming majority in America - including those with not too much "faculty," or no "faculty" at all - believe so strongly in the righteousness of this value of inequality they are willing to die for it.

Madison, as well as Hamilton and Jay, feared no other tyranny more than that of the "mob" or the "multitudes." If government was feared, it was only because it could become dominated by the majority against the minority (the ruling class). They feared the abuses of liberty more than the abuses of power - though of course that depended on who was using the liberty and who

was using the power. Jay, the third author of the Federalist Papers, distrusted the masses even more than the other two. He preferred a very limited franchise, and very stringent requirements for office in order to safeguard the government from "the whims of the masses." The device of the Framers of the Constitution for preventing the grab of governmental powers by the masses or by a small faction from within the ruling minority itself was the same basically as that for preventing the majority from forming a united faction: division. In government they called it "balance of power" or "checks and balances." Thus, aside from the three branches of the Federal government, there were also the checks of the numerous state governments. Madison discusses this necessary fragmentation of power in Federalist Paper # 51: "The more interests and sects, the less the danger of the tyranny of numbers."<sup>16</sup> This is the pluralism that has been so idealized that it has become equivalent to democracy itself. Actually, from the beginning until the present, government, while essential as a tool in the hands of the ruling class, is also a potential enemy. The Framers had nothing against a strong government as long as they could be sure it was controllable - by them. At the Philadelphia Convention one delegate accused Hamilton of wanting a President having all the powers a king had except the title, but the other delegates did not heed the critic. The President could be carefully selected through the Electoral College. He could be checked and balanced, it was assumed, through the other branches of government. In external affairs, he was given the potential power of a dictator (being the Commander in Chief among other things), for in this case, power in the hands of one man cannot become the tool of the "majority" to the detriment of the "minority" since the external threat forces and demands the unity of the whole for the defense of the system.<sup>17</sup>

It is true that the Founding Fathers had strong fears of each other dominating the government. For example, the merchants feared the landlords,

and vice versa. Numerous conflicts among the various interests continue to the present, but such conflicts have been minor when compared with the fear of the working or unpropertied masses. Thus the Federalist writers had to pacify the critical rich that the Constitution formula had guaranteed that neither their monied competitors nor the wretched masses could ever dominate all positions of power at the same time.

Whatever democratic features the Constitution had, they were coldly calculated not to threaten the dominance of wealth and property. Madison and Hamilton, for example, in Federalist # 54 try to allay the fears of those "gentlemen" who did not feel comfortable about the fact that representation was based on the number of persons and not property. The authors agree that government is created to protect property as well as persons. The American Constitution, it is true, does not designate the protection of property rights to one house and personal rights to another. It is true, the authors state, that the law gives the rich citizen the same vote as the poor, but they remind their apprehensive critics that "the rich citizen is usually able to influence others to vote his way and so has added power."<sup>18</sup>

Gradually it was realized that Madison and Hamilton were right. The extension of suffrage and the voting process did not at all threaten the wealthy class. On the contrary, through elections, the legitimacy of wealth power was strengthened. Now to speak in the name of this abstract called "the people" began to sound as if it had validity. Hobbe's myth of the contract between the people and their sovereign looked as if it was being enacted in reality.

American history took many turns. There was Jeffersonian democracy, Jacksonian democracy, the Civil War, the Progressivism and Reformism of Theodore Roosevelt and Woodrow Wilson, the New Deal of F.D.R., and the other "Deals" and "Frontiers" that followed, but none of these ever reduced

the power of wealth in American society. Technically the nature of wealth has been repeatedly changing (i.e., the Civil War crushed the power of the plantation owners and brought victory to the financiers and industrialists), but not its power.

Jeffersonian democracy was a relief in so far as personal freedom of expression was concerned. It was less oppressive, less blatantly aristocratic, and less elitist in its spirit, more egalitarian in as far as due process of law, more tolerant, more decentralized, etc., but Jeffersonian democracy never intended to be mass democracy in the sense that the masses would control the allocation of their country's resources; it never meant that the wealthy class lost any of its wealth or power. Perhaps Jefferson's historical words in his first Inaugural Address: "We are all Republicans - we are all Federalists" were more than symbolic. They were a new dedication to the Republican form of government and an avowal of loyalty to its Constitution. Jefferson's attitude towards the opponent Party set the compromising tone for the future two-party system. The experience showed clearly that two different parties could disagree on many issues without threatening the basic power structure. Moreover, it proved that a two-party competitiveness could give the system more resiliency, and thus more durability.

The further flowering of the democratic form and the romanticizing of the common man in the age of Jackson ensued after it became clear that the political enfranchisement did not pose any economic or political threat to the "minority." The common man remained common; only now he became more satisfied with his commonness. The threats to the privileged members of the "minority" came from factions within itself, and not from any unified action of the "majority." The new democracy opened the door for public office to anyone, with or without property, provided he belonged to the "victors" who were none other than the winning faction of the ruling class. The losers,

however, were only losers in the political game which hardly touched their economic power which always remained a potential political power.

Suffrage was granted to everyone except women, slaves, and young men. The political game certainly became much more exciting, entertaining, and dramatic to both the participants and the runners for office. It made the winner a popular hero; the loser remained a potential force for the future; and the people felt important, for by voting they thought they were truly determining the destiny of their nation.

But again the new egalitarianism never assumed that men possessed equal (or nearly equal) talents as these related to the possession of property. Jackson's advocacy of a weak government went very well with Adam Smith's principles of the divine "invisible hand," and was precisely what the ruling class desired. Only now such a "weak government" got the signed approval of the masses through the electoral process.

As to the protection of "superior talents" the President himself was clear:

It is to be regretted that the rich and powerful too often bend the acts of government to their selfish purposes. Distinctions in society will always exist under every just government. Equality of talents, of education, or of wealth cannot be produced by human institutions. In the full enjoyment of the gifts of Heaven and the fruits of superior industry, economy, and virtue, every man is equally entitled to protection by law..."<sup>19</sup>

The President, who himself was a wealthy planter, while attacking a group of wealthy financiers (many of whom were foreigners) for seeking to get richer by act of Congress, at the same time expressed his willingness to protect their wealth for they had right to it. The attack on one faction of the propertied class never meant a challenge to the Basic Belief in unequal talents corresponding to unequal wealth.\*

---

\* A more cynical interpretation to Jackson's motives in attacking the financiers and vetoing the Bank Renewal Bill has been that the Bank's President had used the Bank resources to support anti-Jackson Congressmen.

The Civil War: This war brought about the abolition of one "property:" human beings. In this respect it may be considered revolutionary. But, according to the best interpretations, the abolition of slavery was only incidental. Though Abraham Lincoln and many others in the North had become morally opposed to slavery, they were willing to demote this moral principle to a secondary order in their hierarchy of priorities.

In his Inaugural Address, Lincoln promised to abide by the Law of the Land, the Constitution of the United States, and promised not to interfere with the institution of slavery in the States where it existed. After all, the Constitution counted property, together with life and liberty, as one of man's natural rights, and made it clear that slaves were not men but property. To insure the protection of the masters (who were men) against the escape of their "property," the Founding Fathers had inserted a special clause (Article IV, Section 2) to insure the return of such escapee to his lawful owner. It was this clause that Lincoln swore to abide by in his First Inaugural Address. Four years previous to that, in the famous Dred Scott case, the Supreme Court had reemphasized these points in the clearest language:

"The unhappy black race were separated from the white by indelible marks, and laws long before established, and were never thought of or spoken of except as property, and when the claims of the owner or the profit of the trader were supposed to need protection." <sup>20</sup>

After Lincoln's election, and with his full approval, his Republican Party proposed an amendment to the Constitution that would guarantee slavery forever in the South. <sup>21</sup> Indeed Lincoln's belief in the rights of property was so hardened that during the war, in his Second Message to Congress, he offered a long term plan of a gradual emancipation of the slaves that would have stretched till the end of the century, and with full compensation to the slave-holders. He defended his proposals with deep conviction:



"Yet the measure is both just and economical. In a certain sense the liberation of slaves is the destruction of property - property acquired by descent or by purchase, the same as any other property."<sup>22</sup>

The Fittest of the Race: The Robber Barons

The latter half of the nineteenth century saw the development of American industry, the increased dominance of capitalist interests, and the decline of farming interests as a potent political force. The Acquisition of wealth in the hands of a few individuals reached unprecedented, undreamed of, astronomical proportions. To the delight of the new aristocracy which later came to be known as the Robber Barons, a new ideological weapon came to the scene, that of the theory of Evolution and Social Darwinism. In the age of science and technology, it was no longer sufficient to point to the natural rights of property, but to add that the rights of inequality were not only ordained by God, but that they were an inevitable scientific law of nature. This way God and scientific laws merged and became an absolute force sanctioning the heroic succession of the new giants among men.

It can be postulated that Darwin's Origin of Species was influenced by the economic and intellectual mood of his time as much as it influenced later on what came to be known as Social Darwinism. Laissez-faire, competition, imperialism, etc. could not but leave their mark on the way Darwin's biological thesis was formulated and expressed. Though Darwin was not describing the economic or social life of man, he visualized the survival of species or individuals of species as a survival of favored individuals and races, a struggle for existence, a survival of the fittest, a struggle between males for females, a struggle for food, nature "favoring the good and rejecting the bad," the beautiful over the ugly, and so on.<sup>23</sup> Natural selection is thus a brute continuous fight, and the winner is ipso facto the one who deserves to survive, every victory leading to improved and superior qualities of living species.

This view of the biological world clearly reflects the world view of Adam Smith, Malthus, Ricardo, Herbert Spencer, and many other apostles of capitalism and imperialism. Actually Herbert Spencer was the one who first coined the phrase, "the survival of the fittest" in 1852, seven years before Darwin published his masterpiece.<sup>24</sup>

Now everything fitted beautifully in place. When men were engaged in a cutthroat competition for material gain, those who were the winners were clearly the fittest, the best, the most intelligent, the most beautiful, the same way it was with all of God's creatures in nature's jungle.

It was inevitable that such a school of thought would inevitably lead (or justify further) to the belief in white supremacy, the white man's burden, manifest destiny, and later on to vulgar racism as practiced by the German Nazis. We must be reminded here that racism as practiced by the Nazis did not originate in Germany even though the Germans had been conditioned enough by rabid nationalism to accept the idea of their superiority with great enthusiasm. Gobineau, a French Alsatian, published his treatise on Inequality of Human Races in 1854 in which he declared the supremacy of the Teutonic races. In 1899, a work by an Englishman, H.S. Chamberlain, Foundations of the Nineteenth Century, encouraged by the conclusions of Social Darwinism, went ever further than the previous work in promoting the case for inequality among the races.

After the flood of anti-Nazi propaganda during the War and after, many Western authors now self-righteously wonder how the civilized German people were able to swallow such ludicrous theories. The fact is that all imperialist powers have believed, and still do, in their racial supremacy in relation to the peoples they conquer or dominate. German racism was condemned by them simply because it declared its supremacy to other white races who thought of themselves just as fit and just as powerful.

Hitler and his cohorts used Darwinian metaphors (i.e., big fish eat little fish) to justify conquest, subjugation, genocide, and war.

Thanks to natural selection, according to Darwin, the jungle was getting more beautiful all the time. And so was society in the free-enterprise system, echoed Spencer. The law of the jungle became the law of civilized society. Darwin praised Spencer, and Spencer praised Darwin. The new capitalist giants praised them both.

While capitalism was natural selection among individuals, imperialism was natural selection among nation-states and races. Nazism was further natural selection so that the fittest of the fit might reign supreme over all the others, and thus lead to a more beautiful human jungle.

Solution a la Carnegie:

Among the victors of natural selection in the U.S., perhaps none was as articulate as Andrew Carnegie who wrote his famous piece on "Wealth" (which later became publicized as "The Gospel of Wealth") in 1889.<sup>25</sup> With a fortune by that time of about \$30 million, Mr. Carnegie could truly be considered a winner.

Carnegie searches for a harmonious relationship between the rich and poor. The fact that there exists so much inequality between the living conditions of the two classes is considered a sign of progress and civilization. In contrast, he describes the dwelling wigwam of a Sioux Indian chief which did not differ from those of the poorest of the chief's subjects. This is backwardness.

Carnegie admits that under the law of competition, friction results "between employer and employed, between capital and labor, between rich and poor." But he contends that the price that society pays for the law of competition is worth it for all the material benefits it gets from it, "and

while the law may be hard for the individual, it is best for the race, because it insures the survival of the fittest in every department."<sup>26</sup> That Carnegie considers himself one of the fittest of the human race, there can be no doubt. Those selected few in whose hands the wealth of the race usually ends due to the law of competition, possess "special talents," "ability," "individualism," "the best minds," "superior wisdom," and so on. The rest of humanity who failed in the race for plunder are looked down upon as "drones," "lazy," "incompetent." Those who make the millions are the select trustees and agents who would do (through their superior wisdom, experience, and ability to administer) for those "poorer brethren" "better than they could or would do for themselves."<sup>27</sup> Just as Calvin was selected through the grace of God so was Carnegie selected through this nature's law of competition.

The socialists or anarchists who want to destroy the present conditions, according to Carnegie, "are attacking the foundation upon which civilization itself rests," for it is upon the sacredness of property (that) civilization itself depends."<sup>28</sup> So strongly does Carnegie believe in this Law that he proclaims that to try to destroy it "would necessitate the changing of human nature itself."<sup>29</sup> The race has already tried a life of brotherhood through communism, and did not produce the wealth and civilization we now have.

What Carnegie overlooks is that for millions of years, men have lived far less a life of brotherhood than of competition, and yet did not produce much until quite recently, and that in a very small area of the world, and under very special historical conditions. Most societies that we know of have had a privileged class, and have been closer to capitalism than to communism. Yet Carnegie insists that the order that produced him (Individualism, Private Property, The Law of Accumulation of Wealth, the Law of Competition) "is the highest result of human experience."<sup>30</sup>

The Law of Property, according to this "Gospel," must be applied equally to both the millionaire to his millions, and the worker to his hundred dollars bank savings. Only at this point "equality" becomes desirable, and the capitalist game of grabmanship must stop. This is indeed a shrewd way to obscure the class division, a topic we shall treat later on in this discussion.

Carnegie's suggestions as to what a millionaire should do with his millions are important in that they later served as a means to white-wash the image of the most hateful Robber Barons. Being the trustee of the rest of the poor and the less competent humanity around him, the millionaire should be careful to "help only those who will help themselves." Otherwise the Law of Competition would be meddled with, and that would be bad for the race. So Carnegie recommends that the wealth of the Millionaire (after having left moderate sources of income for wife and children - which apparently, for some reason, will not meddle with the Law of their Individualism) be administered through trust funds which are spent - in the superior judgement of the millionaire - to produce the most beneficial results for the community. Indiscriminate charity is to be avoided by the rich. Not a penny should be spent on the "slothful, the drunken, the unworthy." Here Benjamin Franklin's ethics which Max Weber considered to contain the essence of the Spirit of Capitalism are revealingly expressed again. What is most valued in the Carnegian Gospel is the Law of Accumulation which must be left free so that individualism will continue, and nature automatically separating the superior minds, and setting them apart as guardians and trustees of the poor, all for the improvement of the whole race. In this paternalistic way, a solution is found for "the problem of the Rich and the Poor..." apparently two different breeds of humans which will have to continue to exist side by side in spite of their basic differences, and who will have to accommodate each other in the best interests of Evolution.

Though there were critics at the time who denied that the accumulation of wealth was necessarily the result of creative and industrial enterprise, those voices were heard by a small and limited audience, while the "Gospel" spread like wild fire in both America and England. With the power, prestige, and money of a Carnegie, who would hear the small voices of the dissenters? After it was published in the Pall Mall Gazette, the "Gospel" was published in England as a penny pamphlet, "often reprinted and widely commented on in newspapers and periodicals on both sides of the Atlantic. The "Gospel" won Carnegie greater fame than he had ever before enjoyed."<sup>31</sup> It was a most welcome piece received with open arms by the members of the ruling class, and fed by them with extreme care to the millions through the media which they owned and controlled. The "Gospel of Wealth" which was written by and for the millionaire soon became the "Gospel" of all America.

The Populist Movement: This movement of the late nineties, which was the voice of an older dying rural America being crushed under the dominance of industrial capitalism, was accused of being a threat to true Americanism. The populist movement, it must be noted, was not a revolutionary movement in so far as property rights were concerned. It attacked certain forces of capital in the same way its inspirational figure, Andrew Jackson, did some seventy years before. At this time, however, the new forces of concentrated capital were able to crush this movement not only at the polls, but to outcast it from people's minds, eventually including those of the rural areas. Concentrated capital has great advantages over scattered capital (as was the case in most of the farming interests of the time). With a small number of individuals owning the capital, it is much easier to organize and mobilize for self-preservation.

One of the most noted apostles of the new "Gospel" whose attack at the Populists was most publicized was William Allen White. He was an editor of

local newspaper in a small Kansas town. By adopting the "right" ideology at the right time, he was quickly adopted by the powers of wealth to later become an adviser to Presidents and a national celebrity.

In "What's the Matter with Kansas," the editorial that made him famous, White lashed out bitterly at the "lazy, greasy fizzle who can't pay his debts," at those "who hate prosperity, and who think that because a man believes in national honor, that he is a tool of Wall Street," and at those who want to "get something for nothing."<sup>32</sup> So well received was this article that it was immediately reprinted in two Chicago papers, and then in the New York Sun. The Chairman of the Republican Party distributed the editorial across the nation as a campaign document. The author received thousands of requests for copies yearly until his death in 1944.<sup>33</sup> Even though this disciple of wealth modified some of his ideas as he grew older and wiser, his millions of admirers did not. Until this day the ideas he expressed in this little editorial (which were really nothing new even then) are still parroted daily by some of the greatest papers and magazines as well as by the greatest politicians and Presidents across the land, and faithfully recited by the millions of believers who do not belong to the select few by any stretch of the imagination.

The Progressive Era: This era (1901-1914) was a period of readjustment after several economic depressions. There was a slight retreat from the attitude of absolute unbridled behavior of capital. Hesitantly it was decided that government had to play some role in the economic life of the country. But if any sins were committed against the teachings of the "Gospel," they were certainly minor ones, demanded by expediency for Wealth's own sake. Theodore Roosevelt who declared he was fighting for the preservation of democracy and the protection of the poor man also assured the wealthy that while "labor is the superior of capital," it was only so because "capital

(was) the fruit of labor." Fearing that he might be denounced as a "Communist agitator" for saying that, Roosevelt assured his listeners that he was only quoting Abraham Lincoln (which he was). This was the side that the capitalist should hear. However, there was also the other side of Lincoln's quotation that T. Roosevelt wanted the workingmen to hear:

"Capital has its rights, which are as worthy of protection as any other rights...Nor should this lead to a war upon the owners of property;... property is desirable; is a positive good in the world."

When Theodore Roosevelt attacked the business interests which "too often control and corrupt the men and methods of government for their own profit," he wanted to be sure his words would not be misunderstood:

"Every special interest is entitled to justice - full, fair and complete - ...the wealthy man whomsoever he may be, for whom I have the greatest contempt, I would fight for him, and you would if you were worth your salt...The Constitution guarantees protection to property, and we must make that promise good."

To the poor man who may get any false notions, Roosevelt makes sure that the spirit of the "Gospel" is not meant to be breached:

"When I say I want a square deal for the poor man, I do not mean that I want a square deal for the man who remains poor because he has not got the energy to work for himself."<sup>34</sup>

#### Climax and Anti-Climax:

Among American Presidents, perhaps Calvin Coolidge and Herbert Hoover represent the quintessence of the spirit of the "Gospel." Coolidge became especially famous for two statements: 1. "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, any time." (After the police strike in Boston in 1919), and 2. "The Business of America is business."

In a famous brief speech entitled: "Have Faith in Massachusetts" addressed to the Massachusetts State Senate in 1914, Coolidge established himself as a new prophet. The speech brought him to the attention of a few



gods of wealth who immediately saw in him signs of great wisdom, and who immediately sponsored honorary dinners for him at which they distributed copies of the new two-page masterpiece. Soon the speech was published with other Coolidge addresses by Houghton Mifflin Co. at the instigation of his wealthy admirer, a wealthy merchant by the name of Stearns. With the latter's assistance, Coolidge was elected lieutenant governor of Massachusetts, later governor, and finally reached the White House. With Stearn's wealth, the speech was distributed to libraries, printed and reprinted in newspapers. According to some opinions, had it not been for this speech, Coolidge would have never reached the White House.

Stearns reported that the president of the American Telegraph and Telephone Co. read the speech four or five times, and stated: "That is the greatest speech ever made by an American."<sup>35</sup>

The Coolidge speech reemphasized the old theme that was much needed at the time. It gave its blessings to the "marriage" between capital and labor. Coolidge declared that "(the) welfare of the weakest and the welfare of the most powerful are inseparably bound together. Industry cannot flourish if labor languish...The suspensions of one man's dividends is the suspension of another man's pay envelope."

Accepting the class structure as an undisputable reality, there can be no question about the validity of these statements. How can there be exploiters without the exploited? The mighty is only mighty in relation to the weak. What is a king without a kingdom? On the other hand, as long as the "superior" few owning the wealth of the earth, how else can the lower breeds survive unless they work for the few?

Further in the speech the would-be President gives comfort and reassurance to his sponsors by reinforcing again the teachings of the "Gospel:"

"He (Man) has a right that is founded upon the constitution of the universe to have property that is his own. Ultimately property rights and personal rights are the same thing. The one cannot be preserved if the other be violated...History reveals no civilized people among whom there were not a high educated class, and large aggregations of wealth, represented usually be the clergy and the nobility..."<sup>37</sup>

Here again the line between personal property and the ownership of the means of production is obliterated, and the weak are called upon to defend the rights of the mighty to property which is supposedly the same as their own. This principle assumes that property right cannot be but absolute: if the millionaire loses his right to his millions, then the poor loses his right to the roof over his head, and this way civilization is lost. What could be a better defense of capitalism than the declaration that everybody is a capitalist including the bum whose property consists of an old overcoat that covers him when he sleeps in the park? Is it any wonder that Coolidge became the President of the United States?

Herbert Hoover was another in a series of prophets to find his way to the White House. His belief in the "Gospel" was so strong that he deeply felt that the Democratic Party was "dangerously socialistic" and "collectivistic" and that the United States was "being infected from the revolutionary caldrons of Europe."<sup>38</sup> (which of course enraged the Democrats who were just as loyal to the system as Hoover was.)

Hoover popularized the phrase: "Rugged Individualism." This to him was a unique feature of America; any distraction from the principle was not only incorrect, but disloyal.

Being a wealthy businessman himself, nothing seemed more threatening to him than the competition of government. It would mean "the undermining the individual and enterprise through which our people have grown to unparalleled

greatness."<sup>39</sup> Freedom of business was again linked with individual freedom. Freedom of the capitalist meant one and the same as the freedom of Man. As a faithful student of Social Darwinism, Hoover expressed the view that "commercial business requires a concentration of responsibility," while government "requires decentralization and many checks and balances." Otherwise government can become despotic, while apparently business cannot become despotic. Again it is stated that "leadership in business must come through the rise in ability and character. That rise can only take place in the free atmosphere of competition."<sup>40</sup>

Competition in business, according to Hoover, is sure to lead to able and good leaders that can be entrusted with great power, while competition in government is not free and cannot lead to a leadership that can be trusted. If Hoover's thought reveals anything extraordinary, it is the deep mistrust and suspicion with which it views the very constitutional government of the United States. This lack of faith in the supposedly built-in checks and balances is matched with a blind faith in business competition automatically leading to the selection of the fittest. The supremacy of capital over government is made very clear, and ironically by a capitalist running for the Presidency of that very government. The government's money is the tax-payer's money, and government cannot be trusted with it. The capitalist's money is his own, and nobody has any right to watch over him how he wants to invest it, spend it, or bury it. The Law of Natural Selection takes care of all that. The extension of governmental power over capital would make the government "the master of the people's souls and thoughts...Free speech does not live many hours after free industry and free commerce die."<sup>41</sup> Apparently the capitalists who are the selected ones can also be trusted in the area of freedom of thought while government which is supposedly checked and balanced cannot be.

What is noteworthy is that Hoover - as well as all the other believers - never had any qualms about government stifling freedom, competition, or rugged individualism when it came to helping business. Not only did Hoover approve negative measures (i.e., huge tax reductions, practical suspension of anti-trust laws, etc.), but also positive ones (i.e., subsidies to business, very high tariffs on competing imports, etc.). It is handouts to the poor that Hoover opposed. To help these was "giving something for nothing," and interfering with nature's Law of Selection. Helping the rich did not interfere with the Law since they had already proved their superiority.

There can be no doubt about the sincerity of Hoover's conviction. The Great Depression struck the land. The total economy of "rugged individualism" collapsed. Millions of workers were left jobless; millions starved. Many of the "fittest" lost their symbol of fitness: their wealth. Yet Hoover insisted on playing it cool as President, refusing to summon the power of government to provide relief to the needy, the homeless, and the jobless. Finally, under severe criticism and public pressure, he grudgingly agreed to establish a Reconstruction Finance Corporation which would bolster failing industries, but until the end, he refused to offer assistance to individuals through government. Hoover lost the next election to Franklin D. Roosevelt. The Depression gradually began to improve. World War II with its mobilization of industries, and arms production and selling finally healed the Depression. The War ended. Hoover stuck to his guns, and continued to insist that "the New Deal was more dangerous to free men than the Depression itself."<sup>43</sup> In his Memoirs published in 1951-52, he continued to quote extensively from his famous address of 1928 on "Rugged Individualism" in order to assure posterity a secure and free future. Such is the completely Hardened Belief in action. And if there is a heaven in the Carnegie "Gospel," there can be no doubt that Herbert Hoover must be sitting closest to Carnegie's bosom.

### The New Deal:

This era has been referred to as another American revolution. After the Coolidge and Hoover era, anything would appear revolutionary. However, after an economic depression of such proportions, what is worth contemplating about is the limitation of the change that occurred. The sheer survival of the system after such an overwhelming trauma is kind of miraculous. Even though a few intellectuals moved a little to the left during that period, there was hardly any movement that posed a serious threat to the power of wealth.

Even though F.D. Roosevelt used a lot of soothing reassuring rhetoric about "reappraisal of values," the values to be reappraised never touched the rights of unlimited wealth. Even though governmental measures were introduced to boost the economy and create employment, and Roosevelt spoke about "the redistribution of goods," and spoke out against privileged, monopolistic economic power that was endangering American liberties, he was careful to add that the welfare state was not meant to hamper "individualism," but to protect it.

The quarrel between the liberals and the conservatives revolved around the role government can play for the maintenance of the class structure, while the class structure itself was no issue.

The New Dealers were more sophisticated to understand better the system within which they operated, and were more confident that no matter how powerful government could become, it would continue to be in the grasp of the ruling class. As was mentioned in Chapter Two, not only was Roosevelt himself a millionaire, but he also stacked his Administration with millionaires (with a sprinkle of scholarly liberals brought in, as Lundberg puts it, for window-dressing). In a way the New Deal approach can be looked at as an extension of the Carnegie teachings, or of the Coolidge thesis that the welfare of the powerful and that of the weak were inseparably bound together. The

main difference in the approach is that the New Dealers were confident that the powerful could administer the affairs of their "poorer brethren" through government more effectively than through private foundations - while the latter of course remained alive and well.

John Maynard Keynes was able to face the problem squarely when he wrote:

"It is certain that the world will not much tolerate the unemployment which, apart from brief intervals of excitement, as associated - and, in my opinion, inevitably associated - with present day capitalistic individualism."<sup>44</sup>

The Keynesians in the U.S. were capable of seeing that the system was in deep trouble. They were even willing to admit that it could not be that all those millions roaming the streets aimlessly without work were nothing more than lazy bums.\* The Keynesians were more visionary in the sense that they could see that channeling a portion of the economy through government could bring many happy returns to the moneyed interests, while, at the same time stabilizing the system through more distribution of minor rewards (or at least those who could not see that far were willing to try).

In his famous First Inaugural Address (typical style of liberal democracy: flowery platitudes, vague promises, inspirational generalities), Roosevelt hinted about his philosophy of government:

"...we now realize as we have never realized before our interdependence on each other; that we cannot merely take but we must give as well; that if we are to go forward, we must move as a trained and loyal army willing to sacrifice for a common discipline, because without such discipline no progress is made, no leadership becomes effective."<sup>46</sup>

Roosevelt's faith in the Constitution of the United States was strongly affirmed, the same as was his faith in God, the nation, and democracy. It is apparent that Roosevelt's study of the Constitution, and his perception of the historical experience made it clear to him that action through government did not pose any threat to the ruling class. On the contrary it was the lack of action that could lead to the rise of the masses.

---

\* The mass media at the time continued to insist at the height of the Depression that whosoever was really looking for a job could find it!

But in spite of all assurances, the fear and suspicion of government had been hardening for so long that some of the wealthiest magnates bitterly opposed the New Deal, and so did some 85% of the newspapers. The Democrats now represented smaller wealth, and their mass base was the urban areas and their political machines, while the Republican Party remained the tool of the wealthier families such as the Rockefellers, the Du Ponts, the Mellons, etc. Of course such a well defined separation was only temporary. While the wealthier families still have more trust in the Republican Party, they have gradually learned that partisanship is not to be taken very seriously. Millionaires of either Party have repeatedly served in either Administration. It is only the small man who continues to take the Parties seriously. Members of the ruling class know better. They are always willing to sponsor the politician who is willing to do their bidding, the Party label being used to attract the voters of the particular constituency. Those who were opposed to the Democratic Party at first gradually began to support it, particularly when it became clear that it was not communistic by any stretch of the imagination. And when the profits began pouring into private pockets from the projects of the New Deal, the Democratic Party became unbeatable. The more government proved "good to business" the more the suspicion of government softened. Five different Presidents have been in power since the death of Franklin D. Roosevelt (including two Republicans), and the government has never grown any smaller. During his time, it has been gradually realized that "big government" can be as well controlled by the wealth oligarchy as little government.

Madison and Hamilton's assurances about the safety-valves within the Constitution proved correct (even though it is not the Constitution alone that should be credited for this). Indeed every step toward government bigness opened more doors through which the power of wealth could penetrate.

The greater grew the government budget the greater grew the profits. It gradually became clear that road building, dam building, urban renewals, social security, poverty programs, missile building, "defense" spending, space programs, education programs, training programs, medical care, etc. have all proven their worth in the calculus of profit-making.

This is not to say, however, that the fear of government's potential threat has died out. While under the system, all government projects end up as private projects (except those that do not have private-making potential), there lies in government (real or imaginary), among other things, the frightening danger of business regulation. Besides, though many interests gain from government, there are still many who do not, enough of them to continue to fight against "the bureaucracy in Washington."

The Nourishing of the Basic Belief:

We can ascertain that the Basic Belief of the stabilizing nucleus continues to be one of the most Hardened Beliefs in American society in spite of the apparent twists and turns that American ideology as a whole has taken. The attitude toward government may have changed since the days of Coolidge and Hoover, but this did not even touch the belief in the unlimited right to wealth and power. The "Gospel of Wealth" still reigns supreme even among the most unwealthy. Liberals deny believing in the Invisible Hand or Social Darwinism, and yet, hear them discuss such topics as the market, competition, the free-enterprise system, or how the Soviets have been forced to adopt capitalistic methods, and you know they are talking about the same things, though not using the same words. We shall have more to say on this later in this discussion.

What may lie behind the strength of this Belief is the fact that the verbal messages are articulated in such a way that they do not seem to contradict with the obvious reality. The socializing messages never claim



property equality nor the desirability of striving toward that goal in American society. Actually most Americans cringe at the thought of such equality. What the verbal messages stress is equality of opportunity. This is something hard to disprove by the average person. Moreover, it is admitted (at least in the more sophisticated literature) that even such an equality is only an ideal that democracy is supposed to strive for. Nevertheless, though it is occasionally admitted that a person starting from the ghetto has much less opportunity than someone starting with a few million dollars, it is still insisted that opportunity still exists for everyone. One person may have to work harder for it than another, it is true, but opportunity is supposedly still there waiting for everybody.

It is seen to it that the Horatio Alger story is kept alive. Such great institutions as Time Magazine, Fortune, the Wall Street Journal, The New York Times, The Readers' Digest, among many others, are always ready to provide their millions of readers, every now and then, with new stories of "self-made men" who, starting from a starved home, with nothing but their brains and guts, were able to make millions.

An outstanding sampler may be the following report from Time Magazine, December 3, 1965:

"As a land passionately devoted to free enterprise, the U.S. has always been the best place for a man to make his million. The fabled 19th century millionaires...all began poor. Despite their often controversial actions, they, like most American millionaires, basically enriched themselves by enriching a growing nation.

"The U.S. offers countless opportunities for the man who wants to accumulate a personal net worth of \$1,000,000 or more - and thousands seize them every year...How do they do it? In a variety of individual ways, but their common denominator is that they find an economic need and fill it."

A sophisticated expert on wealth in America such as Ferdinand Lundberg strongly disputes the claim that these are self-made men, and insists that nearly all of the 90,000 plus millionaires do it by inheriting.<sup>47</sup>

But how can we expect the average reader of Time Magazine to discover for himself such a hidden and complex reality?

What is interesting about the above passage is that it reflects clearly the spirit of the "Gospel," Adam Smith, Herbert Spencer, and Andrew Carnegie in one: "land passionately devoted to free-enterprise..." (Adam Smith is still alive. Devotion to his teachings is passionate), "...the best place to make a million...19th century millionaires all began poor...the U.S. offers countless opportunities..." (equal opportunities for everyone... the best win the race), "enriched themselves by enriching the nation." (Smith meets Carnegie. What is good for the millionaire is good for everyone. In the Carnegie language: this is good for "the improvement of the race"), "each in his individual way" (rugged individualism).

We can postulate that the verbal messages (propaganda) can be more easily hardened in the following cases:

1. Where concrete reality is too complex to be comprehended directly by the average individual.
2. Concrete reality is unreachable or untestable (such as published reports on the Soviet Union or China where both #1 & #2 apply).
3. When the ideas expressed are purely abstract - or when reality is not supposed to be concrete, at least not in the here and now (this may apply to religious and some philosophical or metaphysical beliefs).

In these particular cases, only counter-propaganda which may have to include more sophisticated information can prevent such beliefs from hardening. Needless to say, such a situation puts the ruling class and its socializing agencies at a tremendous advantage since very few people have had the training in depth to understand and digest the more sophisticated information, even when it is available. What is worse about such a situation is that in a class society where salesmanship reigns supreme, superficiality

of social analysis is more generously rewarded as long as it "sells" the system (more on this in Chapter Six). Eulogies, platitudes, and even outright deceptions substitute a multi-dimensional portrayal of reality. This is because the voices that are made to speak the loudest are those speaking for particular interests, and not for the society as a whole. Their usual aim is to sell and not to inform and educate. It is unfortunate that this way the most Hardened Beliefs usually turn out to be the most simplistic and inaccurate ones; for these are the most reinforced, and their lack of complexity is in the way they are formulated and not necessarily in what they are trying to portray). For example, how many people in the U.S. "devoted passionately to free-enterprise" would know that free-enterprise based on competition and as envisaged by Adam Smith has been on its death-bed in the U.S. since the beginning of this century (really dead for all intents and purposes)? How many people would know that "people's capitalism" is nothing but a deceptive myth?<sup>48</sup>

Through such simplistic portrayals of reality, the average citizen is made to defend the status quo as a package deal, for whatever the package may contain. Democracy is the two-party system and "election of government by the people." Free-enterprise is General Motors and I.B.M. The main point is that what is good is what is, without having to probe deep into these concepts, or how the real world corresponds to them. Above all the citizen must know he must be loyal to them the way he must be loyal to his God and country.

The same way men and women with college degrees, artists with genius and integrity, actors with great talent, writers and musicians with originality can all be hired to produce commercials or sing silly ditties to sell all kinds of trash, so they can be hired to preach the "right" ideology. Only in the latter case it can be done more cheaply, for here many of those

whose beliefs have already hardened will volunteer to propagate the desired beliefs on their own. Usually all they want is a job or some status, and they will be willing to dedicate their lives to their mission.

Economists and historians, among others, have created a voluminous body of literature in praise of the "entrepreneur." The technological advancement of the last two centuries has been credited to this fabulous personality with the mysterious "entrepreneurial" talents. Those who in their own time were hated for their ruthless methods of exploitation, and the devious means with which they ruined their competitors, all these have had a face-lifting operation for their images. Now, in the age of the "mixed economy," the villains of the past have been transformed, in the best spirit of the "Gospel" into heroic figures to whom the country - and;the whole human race - owes its fruits of progress. Early in the century, a professor of English at the University of Chicago compared Shakespeare and Rockefeller in their value to humanity, and found the latter superior.<sup>49</sup>

The same way Medieval Europe immortalized its saints, so did America with its own brand of sainthood. Buildings, colleges, hospitals, libraries, museums, research foundations, other foundations, charity organizations, scholarships, parks, airports, expressways, department stores, theaters, plazas, zoos, etc. carry the names of one or another member of the new sainthood. Their serene portraits stare benevolently in libraries, hospitals, and museums. Writers are hired to write the biographies of the dead as well as the biographies and the memoirs of the living - without the blemishes. Newspapers and magazines of all kinds frequently publish articles about how these men of wealth help others, and try to correct society's ills at great sacrifices to themselves.<sup>50</sup> Everything good, beautiful, constructive, and enjoyable is thus associated with the names of these men. Since property is so sacred (regardless of the way it is acquired),

when a small fraction of it is returned to the public (regardless of the motives of the giver), the public is expected to be grateful, and it is.

In a preface to a new edition to his book of the thirties, The Robber Barons, Mathew Josephson mournfully writes the following:

"Of late years, a group of academic historians have constituted themselves what may be called a revisionist school, which reacts against the critical spirit of the 1930's...To the revisionists of our history our old moneylords 'were not robber barons but architects of material progress,' and in some wise, 'saviours' of our country. They have proposed rewriting parts of America's history so that the image of the old school capitalists should be retouched and restored, like rare pieces of antique furniture."<sup>51</sup>

Why, we may ask, should the entrepreneur and the capitalist system be credited with the creation of all the technological marvels so highly valued by modern man? These are the final products of hundreds of years of scientific development which had nothing to do with capitalism or any other economic system. Very few individuals were both inventors and entrepreneurs in the much romanticized Ford and Edison tradition. With few exceptions, scientists, engineers, and inventors have been wage-earners, part of the brain power exploited by the capitalist for his profit. The material progress could have been achieved once the scientific knowledge was ripe for it. True, management and accumulated capital was needed, but in this respect it would not have made much difference as to who owned the capital, individuals, government, collectives, or the people as a whole.

In the American situation, a virgin rich continent was opened. The accumulation of centuries of human knowledge and skill was brought in. Several cultures, many of which technologically advanced, converged, each contributing its share to the continent's development. The educational system (which by the way is a socialist and not a capitalist system) probably contributed the most since it made much talent available, talent which would have otherwise been lost. All these and other factors produced

the technological achievement in the U.S. The fast development of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries has shown how superfluous - if not a handicap - capitalism is in as far as development is concerned.

The wage-earners have built America, and yet they have been led to believe they owe it all to their ruling class, and, if any credit is given to them, they have to think about it in the context of the system within which they operated. This way all the glittering gadgetry which they enjoy, from the electric bulb to the car and the television set, are all used as powerful rewards to reinforce their belief in the capitalist system.<sup>52</sup>

#### The Basic Belief and the Mass Mind:

The impact of such long and intensive socialization on the masses can be ascertained simply by observing their unquestioned support of the status quo, their lack of questioning the right of the multi-millionaire to his wealth, their repeated voting in office of men of great wealth (though usually the people do not have any other choice), their expression of gratitude towards any tokenistic gesture on the part of the rich, their acceptance as a matter of course the leadership of businessmen at the local level, etc.

Robert E. Lane, in his formal in-depth interviews of a New England town workers reaches the following conclusions:

"These sentiments are expressed with feeling; they are universally shared; the principle that there is very little gain without effort is endorsed as both true and moral. Surely, then, looking out upon an economy where some men seem to have acquired great wealth without commensurate effort would encourage a dissatisfaction with the going order; might, indeed, plant the seeds of a new urban Populism. It is not so, because the phrase 'wealth must be earned' is given both meanings: only through earning can one acquire wealth, and whoever has wealth could only have acquired it by earning it. Not discontent, but justification for the going order emerges from this interpretation." (emphasis added)

Lane quotes one of his interviews who is supposed to be the most cynical in the sample:

"I believe the man (the rich man) is smart enough to make money, he should have something to say. I'm not jealous of anybody that's got a million dollars. He's much smarter than I am - more intelligent. He knew the way to get it." (emphasis added).

Lane adds that "Eastport men hold that a rough justice is done in the rewards and punishments of life...that merit is rewarded and that there is a kind of distributive justice in the world, rather than capriciousness, favoritism, nepotism, and the like."<sup>53</sup>

A survey conducted by the Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan in 1956 shows to what degree Americans are loyal to "free-enterprise" and how distrustful to government even when it comes to public utilities.<sup>54</sup> To the statement: "The government should leave things like electric power and housing for private businessmen to handle," the answers were as follows:

	<u>Grade School</u>			<u>High School</u>			<u>College</u>	
	1	2	3	1	2	3	1	2
Agree	28%	38%	44%	31%	46%	46%	49%	54%
Pro-con	3	10	7	5	8	5	8	10
Disagree	12	19	23	27	25	26	25	24
No opinion	57	33	26	37	21	23	18	12

It must be noted that public utilities (particularly electricity) in most capitalist countries are nationalized. In this country, in the late thirties, after scandals in the management of utilities were still fresh in people's minds, over half the persons polled favored government ownership of electric companies.<sup>55</sup> What is striking in the above results is that the number of those who disagree hardly goes above a quarter of those who were polled. We can imagine what the response would have been

if more than electricity and housing were involved.

On another item by the same Center,<sup>56</sup> it was found that only 14% of those with college approved of a national medical care program; 26% of those with high school did, and so did 34% of those with grade school. Those who were against were 65% with college, 46% with high school, and 30% with grade school.\*

On another item dealing with something as beneficial to the interests of the individual as government guaranteeing jobs for all citizens, the results were as follows: of those with college, 39% were for, 47% were against; of those with high school, 54% were for, 28% against; of those with grade school, 71% were for, 14% against (the rest had no opinion.

The above results again show the depth of suspicion of government even when it comes to the most essential needs of the individual: his health, and his very source of livelihood. We can postulate that such a suspicion of government is an indirect symptom of the belief in private enterprise, and a direct outcome of verbal messages. The significant association with the amount of education shows not only the effect of the educational agencies, but of all the other agencies, that education makes accessible to the individual. Of course it must also be remembered that other variables associated with education, such as the socio-economic background,

---

\* Medical care is a very interesting case in point. For many years the American Medical Association, in cooperation with several insurance companies, spent millions of dollars using all kinds of Madison Avenue tactics to convince Americans that buying their own medical insurance, and paying their doctors any high fees they asked for were acts of freedom, and any type of insurance through government, or any act of regulation by government in people's behalf was un-American, and against individualism. So successful was the AMA's campaign (in spite of its absurdity) that it took more than twenty years to finally pass the Medicare Bill in 1965, a meagre insurance plan restricted to the aged. Now that it has proven its profitability to the "doctor business," it should come as no surprise if the Medicare Plan is eventually extended to cover all citizens.



are also at play here.

As was mentioned earlier, the verbal messages in the above are in contradiction with the basic needs of the individual. Since such a contradiction is simple and obvious enough to the average person, the complete hardening of such beliefs is unlikely. The fact that the effect of the verbal messages is as high as the responses show reveals the intensity of the socialization process in this area of belief. (This area of belief lies on the sideline, and should not be confused with the Basic Belief itself.)

Footnotes

Chapter III: The Belief "Molecule" of Stability

1. Robert A. Dahl: Who Governs?, A Yale Paperbound ed., Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961, p. 84.
2. Herbert Marcuse: One-Dimensional Man, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964; see particularly Introduction, Chapter one, two, and Conclusion.
3. Ibid., p. 3.
4. John Locke: "Of Property" in Ernest Barker, ed.: Social Contract, A Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press, 1962, pp. 16-30.
5. Benoit-Smullyan: History of Political Theory, Part I, Student Outline Co., Boston, 1938, p.11.
6. Edmund Wilson writes the following on the execution of Babeuf: "...the bourgeois instinct for property was already becoming the overmastering motive, taking the place of other instincts and ideals: all those who had succeeded in getting anything clung to it with desperate tenacity; the idea of redistribution frightened them out of their wits. And the poor were no longer prepared to fight." See Edmund Wilson: The Finland Station, Doubleday Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., Garden City, New York, 1940, p. 73.
7. This is the thesis of Irving M. Zeitlin: Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, op.cit., especially see Epilogue, p. 321. 322.
8. As quoted by Marian D. Irish & James W. Prothro: The Politics of American Democracy, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1962, p. 98 and 92.
9. Charles A. Beard: An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, The MacMillan Co., 1913.
10. James Madison: "Federalist #10" in Randall H. Nelson and John J. Wuest: Primary Sources of American Government, G.P. Putman's Sons, New York, 1962, p. 167.
11. Ibid., p. 168.
12. Ibid., p. 166, 167.
13. Ibid., p. 168.
14. Ibid., p. 170.
15. Ibid., p. 169.
16. Robert Sobel: The Federalist Papers, Monarch Press, New York, 1965, p. 72.

17. This is not to imply that the Framers necessarily thought about it exactly in these terms. What is important is that such an extreme power under these circumstances in the hands of one man did not seem to pose a threat to them. Perhaps the best documentation on their way of thinking of this issue is found in Jay's Federalist Papers #2-5 (Hamilton also wrote several papers on this issue) in which he discusses the demand for total unity against the external enemy. Jay, even more so than the other two, believed that the nation is best run by an oligarchy of talents. See Sobel, *op.cit.*, pp. 12-14.

18. *Ibid.*, p. 76.

19. Andrew Jackson: "Veto of the Bank Renewal Bill" in Richard D. Heffner, ed.: Documentary History of the United States, A Mentor Book, The New American Library, New York, 1952, p. 99.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 137.

21. *Ibid.*, p. 142.

22. Abraham Lincoln: "Second Inaugural Address" in Boorstin, ed., *op.cit.*, p. 419,420.

23. Charles Darwin: "Recapitulation and Conclusion: (of The Origin of Species)" in Saxe Cummins and Robert N. Linscott, ed.: The Philosophers of Science, Pocket Books Inc., New York, 1954, pp. 245-275.

24. See Richard M. Brace: The Making of the Modern World, second edition, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York, 1961, p. 613.

25. This article of Andrew Carnegie may be found in almost any volume of American documentary selections. My references will be from Daniel J. Boorstin, ed.: An American Primer, *op.cit.*, pp. 518-532.

26. *Ibid.*, p. 521.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 527.

28. *Ibid.*, p. 522.

29. *Ibid.*, p. 523.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 523.

31. Robert H. Bremner's "Comment" on the Carnegie Article in *Ibid.*, p. 530.

32. William Allen White: "What's the Matter with Kansas?" in Boorstin, *op.cit.*, p. 608-9.

33. See the comments made on this editorial by Walter Johnson, *Ibid.*, p. 605, 606, 610, 612.

34. Theodore Roosevelt: "The New Nationalism" (1910) in Boorstin, *op.cit.*, pp. 735-749.

In all fairness to Roosevelt, he must be credited for declaring that he believed in "government protecting property as well as human welfare." And though normally in the long run, the ends are the same, . . . whenever the alternative must be faced, he was for men and not for property.

See *Ibid.*, p. 747.

35. This information is based on Walter Muir Whitehill's comments on the speech in Boorstin, *op.cit.*, pp. 775-781.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 777.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 777, 778.

38. Irvin G. Wylie, "Herbert Hoover: On American Individualism" in Boorstin, *op.cit.*, pp. 827-846.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 832.

40. *Ibid.*, p. 833.

41. *Ibid.*, p. 836.

42. It must be noted that this is by no means the unique attitude of Mr. Hoover. This line of thought runs deep in American ideology all the way from Hamilton, Madison, and Franklin to Richard Nixon. Actually Hoover quotes "that great leader of labor, Samuel Gompers" as saying pretty much the same thing: "I believe there is no man to whom I would take second position in my loyalty to the Republic of the United States, and yet I would not give it more power over the individual citizenship of our country...If I were in the minority of one..., I would want to cast my vote so that the men of labor shall not willingly enslave themselves to government authority in their industrial effort for freedom..." *Ibid.*, p. 835.

43. As quoted by Irving Wylie, *op.cit.*, p. 846.

44. John Maynard Keynes: The General Theory of Unemployment, Interest, and Money, London, 1936, p. 381.

45. In a lecture at the McKinsey Foundation at the Graduate School of Business at Columbia, Thomas J. Watson, the President of IBM expressed the value of government this way: "Much as we may dislike it, I think we've got to realize that in our kind of society there are times when government has to step in and help people with some of their more difficult problems. Programs which assist Americans by reducing the hazards of free market system without damaging the system itself are necessary, I believe, to its survival...."

As quoted by Robert L. Heilbroner: The Limits of American Capitalism, Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, 1965, 1966, p. 34.

46. Franklin D. Roosevelt: "First Inaugural Address" in Boorstin, *op.cit.*, p. 867.

47. See Ferdinand Lundberg's most informative and fascinating discussion in his book, The Rich and the Super-Rich, *op.cit.*, Chapter two, "Room at the Top: The New Rich".

48. For a recent publicizing of this myth, see Henry C. Wallich: "On People's Capitalism" in Newsweek, July 20, 1970, p. 70. According to this column, there are 30.9 million stock-holders in the U.S., but it is not stated what kind of distribution exists, and how little the vast majority of these stock-holders hold.

The fact is that "people's capitalism" is one of the greatest hoaxes that the capitalist oligarchy has ever come up with. It is nothing more than a means to gain control over the little savings of the wage-earners, which allows the true capitalists more power than their huge shares already allow them to have. Besides, it serves as a marvelous propaganda for the confusion of class distinctions.

For a recent inside book on this topic by a Wall Street adviser, see Richard Neye: The Wall Street Jungle, Grove Press, 1970.

49. As reported by David Finn: The Corporate Oligarch, op.cit., p. 70.

50. See for example the article on Henry Ford the Second which describes him as social activist and working for a "peaceful revolution" in Time, July 20, 1970.

See also the article on Ross Perot: Billionaire Patriot, Can One Texan with money, computers, and a lot of faith revive the U.S.A.?" in Look, March 24, 1970.

These are only two of the hundreds of articles published yearly in the popular press on those super-men and how good they have been to America and the world. Most of these articles are usually part of the public relations departments for these men and their companies. It is very easy for billionaires to draw a rosy picture of themselves and the society they have created in their image. Compare this with what the rebels have had to go through in South America. For example, in Brazil, to get one message across to the people over the radio, (and save some prisoners) the leftist radicals had to kidnap the American ambassador, an act which has been repeated in other Latin American countries.

51. Mathew Josephson: The Robber Barons, A Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1962, p. vi.

52. Perhaps Marx and Engels themselves are as much to blame for the propagation of this myth when they called the capitalist an agent of progress, and for several pages at length in none other than the Communist Manifesto they were carried away citing the outstanding achievements of capitalism and the "epoch of the bourgeoisie." However Marx and Engel's views were based on the history of the first part of the industrial revolution when it was much more common that the entrepreneur and the inventor were one.

53. Robert E. Lane: Political Ideology. A Free Press Paperback, The Free Press, New York, 1962, p. 259.

54. As reported by V.O. Key, Jr.: Public Opinion and American Democracy, Alfred A. Knopf, 1961, p. 399.

55. Ibid., p. 399.

56. Ibid., p. 340.

## Chapter IV

### THE INTELLECTUALS AS STABILIZERS:

#### THE TRIUMPH OF MATTER OVER MIND

There are many definitions as to what an intellectual is.<sup>1</sup> For example, to Christopher Lasch, the intellectual is "a person for whom thinking fulfills at once the function of work and play."<sup>2</sup> Lasch contends that intellectualism involves a critical analysis of one's society and its values. When Lasch takes a general look at those who are supposedly intellectual in America, he concludes that their behavior has generally been anti-intellectual.<sup>3</sup> For the purpose of this discussion I shall use the term less restrictively. By "intellectual" I shall mean any person who studies, compares, analyzes, or propagates ideas. The "playfulness" of intellectual activity is, in my view, a sound, appealing, and desirable feature. So is the critical attitude towards the values of one's society. But I shall not designate such qualities as basic criteria for intellectualism. Under my definition, while some politicians, publicists, teachers, ministers, professors, etc. may qualify as intellectuals, many among them may not, depending upon their involvement with ideas, and regardless of their support or lack of support of the status quo.

The intellectual's role in the societal belief formation is of topmost importance because he is the one most likely to obtain what I referred to as individualization rather than socialization. He is the one whose beliefs are more likely than others to escape the hardening process (though such escape may be the exception rather than the rule). Such a possible

non-conformity is not necessarily due to an inherent intellectual superiority, but may be the result of the intellectual's possible exposure to more contradictory messages and outside influences than the average person. Thus the fear of intellectuals by any established order is justified, for they are the ones most likely to start the subversion of the stabilizing beliefs. The intellectual usually has the training and the potential to see contradiction between official ideology and social reality. He can abstract complexities and relate complex situations to beliefs. He can detect relationships between two compartmentalized Hardened Beliefs and eventually subverting them both.

Karl Mannheim who studied at length what he called the sociology of knowledge described the intellectuals as unattached, wavering, lacking conviction, homeless, etc. They, according to him, do not have to belong to any class for "they alone (are) in a position to choose their affiliation." Mannheim considers this to be true because "the intellectuals, besides undoubtedly bearing the imprint of their specific class affinity, are also determined in their outlook by this intellectual medium which contains all those contradictory points of view. This social situation always provided the potential energy which enabled the more outstanding intellectuals to develop the social sensibility that was essential for becoming attuned to the dynamically conflicting forces."<sup>4</sup>

The intellectual's role is further bolstered by his being part of all the socializing agencies, even though in these institutions, as we shall show later, he is usually in the grasp of the ruling class. The intellectual's role should not be confused with real political power. If he is in a position to influence certain areas of decision-making, as was mentioned earlier, in such capacity, he does not necessarily hold ultimate power.

Many intellectuals who have been hired to devise methods to save capitalism fell under the illusion that they were now in power. Such power is no more than that of the architect who is hired to draw a blue-print which may be accepted or rejected, depending on the whims of the owner. Anyone, regardless of his position in a hierarchy, who can be fired (demoted or transferred) any time does not hold any real power. In a capitalist society the only person who cannot be fired is the capitalist himself, for that would mean stripping him of his property, a contradiction of term with capitalism.

As an activist, the intellectual's impact is no more than that of an average citizen. If he happens to have access to real power he may be listened to if what he is suggesting does not conflict with the higher interests.

The intellectual's real influence must thus be understood as long term influence which acts through the modification or change of people's beliefs. His impact may thus be realized (if at all) many years later, quite often long after his death.

While the intellectual has the potential to be a subversive force, throughout history he has been most frequently a stabilizing force dedicating his talents to the service of the ruling class of his time, inventing and manipulating the necessary symbols for the conditioning of the masses. This is not only because the intellectual is the product of the socialization process like everybody else, but also because of the system of punishment and reward in the hands of the rulers. The education of the intellectual, at least to a certain age, may not differ much from that of other people in his culture. When it begins to extend further, it may be too late to rebel for the stabilizing common beliefs may have already hardened in him.



Eventually, many of the extra ideas he learns are used to enrich his rationalizing capacity to justify his already Hardened Beliefs. We can thus postulate that the intellectual's potential as a stabilizing force as well as a subversive force are both greater than those of the average individual.

In the U.S. the intellectuals have rarely questioned the legitimacy of bourgeois power. The founders of the Republic were themselves members of the Bourgeoisie (or the landowning class), and many among them were intellectuals as well. Perhaps their example set a precedence for future intellectuals to identify with the ruling class. However, we must add that the examples of numerous intellectuals throughout history from Aristotle to Max Weber could have set precedence as well.

It is more likely that intellectuals would come from the privileged class itself in societies where the masses are left poor, powerless, and without educational opportunities. In the exceptional cases when intellectuals do come from the lower classes, their aspirations to rise in the social hierarchy make them want to gain the support and acceptance of the upper classes. Like the nouveau-riche, the upstart intellectual becomes the most fanatic defender of the established order. Those who follow this road find it most rewarding. The hard-headed rebels will have to accept deprivation, punishment, and sometimes death. The wretchedness of Karl Marx's life in London is a standing example of the price paid by a revolutionary intellectual who refused the legitimacy of bourgeois power. But even he had to depend on the help of Engels who just happened to be an anti-capitalist capitalist.

#### Freedom of Speech Versus Censorship:

Property rights and the two-class structure are very traditional ones.

Their acceptance comes "natural" to both the intellectuals and the masses. In the U.S. case, the socializing agencies have such a long tradition on their side, and, as was mentioned in Chapter one, the transmission of the stabilizing beliefs has long become automated. Under such circumstances, what can a few discordant voices do? They are like small whispers in the backseats during the crescendo in an orchestra performance. When the stabilizing nucleus has been so hardened, the masses themselves become the vigilantes against dissent. Any formal censorship through government at this point is both unwise and superfluous. Besides, in a complex advanced society, official censorship is impractical and unwieldy. Freedom of speech can be afforded for it becomes an asset rather than a liability.

What is sadly ironical is that the newspaper writer, the television or radio commentator often express gratitude for the freedom of speech they possess. Well, after all the socializing agencies have left their mark on them, why shouldn't they be given "freedom?" If someone is born in a Christian home, sent to a Christian school, and later to a fundamentalist seminary, by the time he is ordained minister, will there be any danger for him speaking against Jesus Christ?

But in case, for one reason or another, something had gone defectively in someone's socialization, and he begins to "bite the hand that feeds him," the public can rest assured that he will not be "fed" much longer, and the public's sensitive beliefs will not be tickled any further.<sup>5</sup> Thus, after having "manufactured" the people's sensitive beliefs, the ruling class can claim to rule in the name of the people. The publisher who fires his nonconforming editor can also do it in the name of the public, a fact that cannot be disputed.

De Tocqueville described this curious phenomenon perceptively some 140 years ago. He called it the "tyranny of the majority." "The authority of

the king," he wrote, "is physical, and controls the action of men without subduing their will. But the majority possesses a power which is physical and moral at the same time..., and represses not only contest, but all controversy." De Tocqueville goes even further expressing this strongly by adding: "The Inquisition has never been able to prevent a vast number of anti-religious books from circulating in Spain. The empire of the majority succeeds much better in the United States, since it actually removes any wish to publish them."<sup>6</sup>

In our own time a reflection of de Tocqueville's words may be found in a report by a Teachers of English Committee on Censorship in 1953, which stated: "When a person wishes to espouse communism, fascism, or any other 'ism' he should be free to do so, to exercise too his right to be a martyr, and perhaps death for his ideas." When all these "rights" were generously granted by the Committee, the document added that such a "freedom" does not "include...any right to teach in our schools and colleges whose purpose is to inculcate faith in our institutions and to promote a society of free people..."<sup>7</sup>

To quote de Tocqueville again:

"You will retain your civil rights, but they will be useless to you, for you will never be chosen by your fellow citizens, if you solicit their votes...You will remain among men, but you will be deprived of the rights of mankind..."<sup>8</sup>

Freedom of speech is an asset in a capitalist system because it means the free expression of conflicting beliefs (of the secondary or tertiary level), a preliminary requirement for the desired fractionation of the society. As was mentioned in Chapter Three, at least some of the Founding Fathers were well aware that nothing could be as threatening to the privileged minority than a unified majority. Freedom of speech often means the free expression of hostility of one group towards another, a perpetuation of

conflict, the exact antidote for class identification or unity.\*

And yet Americans generally act as if such a freedom has been granted to them by generous benefactors from above. How often do we hear in discussions, debates, or speeches, whenever there is controversy, whenever an opinion is heard that is less than 100% orthodox, at least one person must express gratitude and admiration for "this great free country that allows us to sit here and freely discuss such controversial issues." The feeling is clearly conveyed that freedom of speech is not really a natural right, but a precious gift that can be withdrawn any time. Many Americans even seem to think that such a privilege exists only in America, which is another fantastic achievement for the ruling class and its socializing agencies.

Freedom of speech, it has also been discovered, serves as a good catharsis for pent-up emotions. Perhaps a statement by President Nixon in a press conference on May 8, 1970 was most revealing. He said something to the effect that revolution cannot happen in the United States because freedom of speech and petition in this country serve as a "safety valve" against revolution. The ruling class sees (and for good reasons) in self-expression on the part of the masses a defense mechanism for the system, a channeling of hostility into words instead of molotov cocktails.

Redressing of grievances, picketing, two-channel communication, vigorous handshaking, big smiles, negotiations, tokenism, Congressional hearings, sympathetic listening, fact-finding commissions, speeches, parades, flag-waving, political rallies, image-making, prayers for peace, and so on...are all sophisticated bourgeois psycho-therapeutic techniques for the

---

\* This is not to infer that the Founding Fathers or their descendants did not believe in freedom of speech as an ideal, or that they were cynically calculating to allow freedom of speech as a means of fragmenting the masses.

release of tension, resolution of conflict, and the "solving" of social problems. The voting rituals serve the same purpose. "Ballots and not bullets" is a favorite and useful slogan.

If you are one of those individuals - or groups - who are poor, exploited, discriminated against, disgusted with endless wars that may take your very life in the defense of capitalist property all over the world, why, all you have to do is "write your Congressman." (You may even demonstrate peacefully; only you must be very careful since demonstrating for peace may not be very peaceful; in many quarters this is equivalent to treason.) Now if your Congressman (who represents roughly 1/535th of a branch of government which altogether may be completely helpless in as far as your cause is concerned) does not do anything, or is incapable of doing anything, then all you have to do is wait for the next election, and offer your free services to the campaign of the alternative offered by the opposite Party (who may differ from the first only in some of the interests he represents). If, after all this, you fail in spite of the justice and sanity of your cause, you must accept your failure with grace since now democracy has spoken. Besides, you must feel satisfied and relieved since you were given the opportunity to speak out and participate in the making of government.

It so happens that in the hodge-podge of conflicting personalities, interests, and issues, some of the just causes may occasionally win - thanks to the law of probability above anything else. It is such occasional rewards (resembling those of the Las Vegas slot-machines) are sufficient to keep reinforcing the faith in the system.

Few people would ever ask why it is that black people have been redressing their grievances for some two hundred years, and yet twenty-two million

of them remain less effective within the system than the National Rifle Association. The natural rights of the latter to practice marksmanship and hunt deer (and of course to make millions selling guns) have obviously taken priority to the most basic human rights of the black man (the Mexican, the Red Indian, or any of the millions of the powerless poor of all colors).

The Co-optation of Social Science:

In our time, psychologists, as well as all other social scientists have been repeatedly reaffirming in the name of science the value of freedom of speech, participation in the democratic process as useful means for the release of tension and hostility, and indirectly serving the maintenance of stability (which means the class structure).

Beginning in the early twenties, capitalists began to realize that "labor psychology" could be "good for business," and they started hiring psychologists to help them make workers "adjust" to the factory situation, and perhaps to the low pay they were receiving. Many psychologists saw a great promise in this new frontier where they were finally accepted as scientists by the very masters of society. At Western Electric Co. (which was a pioneer in applying the new science), psychologists "discovered" that non-directive interviews with workers served to "blow off steam." The interviewer was supposed to listen sympathetically, and redirect grievances into "constructive" channels. These psychologists decided that all was so great with industry that any worker that showed dissatisfaction must have had some "individual" problems, and needed some kind of psychotherapy. Those workers who joined unions, for example, were of this category. One researcher considered unions as mere associations which gave the worker an opportunity for self-expression which he could not find at his place of work. The pollsters probing into the workers' attitudes,

decided they would be able to strengthen the workers' commitment to capitalism and its symbols through interviews and other associational activities within the factory. This way social scientists tried to help not only their direct employers by inducing workers to work harder for less money, but also laid the foundation for highly sophisticated socialization programs within the corporations for the bolstering of commitment to capitalism. It was also hoped that such chronic problems as tensions, grievances, absenteeism, unionism, and leftism could be solved this way by the new priesthood of science.

It was inevitable after World War II that the social scientists were to bring the notion of freedom and democracy into the factory. Their problem was how to bring "democratic leadership" into this authoritarian setup. The answer was, yes, "group participation," a device under which the factory became a microcosm of the political world outside, i.e., making the workers believe they themselves were making the decisions that management wanted to make for them. This device (which divided the workers into small groups, each group voting separately without knowing how the other groups voted) killed another bird with the same stone: the same as in the outside political world, it fragmentized the labor force within the factory, and thus made its control and manipulation easier.<sup>9</sup>

To come to the world at large, a noted political scientists, writing on Southeast Asia, expresses the attitude of the above psychologists most revealingly. Commenting on the numerous villagers who have flooded the cities in search of work and livelihood, Lucian Pye decides that these people are restless because they have broken ties with their "traditional village-bound life." What is most troublesome is that these people are being recruited to those "deviant movements," and particularly the Communist

parties. The author's diagnosis is that these people "are seeking to resolve intensely personal problems." The solution to all this is participation in politics:

"...one of the basic functions of politics is to provide an outlet through which people can resolve personal crises. The therapeutic powers of political action are enormous, for through it people can find a sense of identity and break the bonds of loneliness;...learn socially respectable ways of expressing aggressiveness and hostility; actively seek respect and deference, power and adoration...as well as a host of other forms of gratifications." (emphasis added)10

The author makes it clear that politics is an entertaining game, much like Nero's circus, can take people's minds off their worries and prevent them from causing trouble to the class structure. The author does not mention whether this sort of game will satisfy the hunger instinct, or give nutrition to a sickly body, but of course when stability becomes the main goal, hunger is of secondary importance.\*

I must point out that Pye's approach to politics is not an isolated one. All the literature in political science and sociology concerned with "system maintenance" or "system equilibrium" has expressed an attitude toward politics which is more or less the same. Christian Bay puts it succinctly when he writes:

---

\*The value of political participation as tranquilizer is well understood by the ruling class and their politicians. Nothing could demonstrate this better than the fact that the Nixon Administration - which is a direct descendant of the McKinley-Coolidge-Hoover line - has supported reducing the voting age to eighteen. Several spokesmen have clearly expressed their thoughts on the matter that the way to bring back the younger generation to the fold is by allowing them to feel they have become part of it through voting. When they vote, it is assumed, they will feel responsible for the outcome just the way their fathers and mothers do. Of course we can presume that the social science experts had assured the Administration that younger people vote like their parents, and that the system will gain more support without any loss to the Grand Old Party.

Urging young dissenters to work for "peace candidates" in elections is another way of putting them under the illusion that they are participating in determining the destiny of their country regarding war and peace, while at the same time gaining their free services.



"...Almond and his collaborators and students have tended to content themselves with studying the development and maintenance of the political systems as the general dependent variable. Pressures and bargaining processes are seen as the important things for elites to be concerned with, not human waste or fulfillment; and 'political development' takes the place of a concern with justice and individual freedom for the least privileged."<sup>11</sup>

So committed are those social scientists to the stability of the established order, and so unthinkable to them is an alternative structure that they have treated the present political system as a finality. Like Newtonian laws of the solar system so are the "laws" of the present structure, and the study dealing with these "laws" is "value-free science."

They have truly come to believe that the political center in the United States (which is nothing more than the mode of a normal probability curve, the natural outcome of the socialization process, the content of which at the present happens to be the New Deal ideology) represents balance and unquestionable logic. To them those who fall at the sides of the curve, "right" or "left" are extremists, i.e., biased, illogical, and fanatics. To attack both right and left to them means balance, neutrality, and objectivity.<sup>12</sup> The world must stand still now that it has found the ultimate formula: "the mixed economy." Any movement backward or forward is "deviant," if not plain evil. The few intellectuals who question the established order are psychologically diagnosed as "alienated" - as if once given a pathological label, their opinions are automatically disqualified.

Politics inspired by private interests have been referred to by political scientists as "instrumental" and "pragmatic" as contrasted with the "ideological" and "consummatory," the latter two looked upon as unrealistic, utopian, romantic, or poetic.<sup>13</sup>

So soaked is social science with the business ethos that the wheelings and dealings in the political process among the various competing interests (usually at a high cost to the public) have been referred to as "democracy

in action." The politician playing the role of the compromiser among the various interests has been admiringly referred to as "the political broker." Even the most corrupt city bosses have been idealized and romanticized because they represented the best spirit of the broker.<sup>14</sup>

Is it logical, we may ask, that political pragmatism be practiced for its own sake? Pragmatic for who? And for what purpose? Is politics simply a means without an end? If the political process is to be enjoyed by the masses for its own sake, or as a substitute for personal frustrations, is it more pragmatic than when it establishes a co-ordinated program to satisfy the human needs of the society? In so far as the ruling class is concerned, it is implicit, though not stated clearly, that politics is the instrument for maximizing profits for those businesses that engage in the political game. Should the means to reach such an end be considered more pragmatic than a wide-ranging rational plan for improving the quality of life of the whole society? We can deduce that according to American political science the answer is yes since central planning would mean the seizing of power from the capitalists by the people, the greatest threat to the Hardened Basic Belief.

In spite of their ambiguity about the class structure in any society, American social scientists do not hide their sympathies toward the bourgeoisie (or any type of more primitive privileged class). Their attitudes toward "business" as opposed to those toward the rest of humanity should be most heartening to the former. Take the main stream of American social science about the underdeveloped countries. The spirit of this main stream can be stated in a few words: what is good for American business must be good for the whole world. Once we scratch the thin facade, such as the concern with "democracy," "political development," and "nation-

building," we discover that these are really of secondary importance. Authoritarianism, totalitarianism, etc. are enough to shed tears only when the system is not friendly to American business. Otherwise, military dictatorship, fascism, oppressive one-party system, government gangsterism, corrupt bureaucracy, Medieval tyranny, etc. are not only acceptable but also encouraged as long as the regime is favorable to American business. In these cases, all kinds of rationalizations are given as to why the situation calls for "strong leadership" which is more qualified to stabilize" the nation or "modernize" it. On the other hand, stability and modernization lose their importance if the regime becomes hostile to American capital. Here the concern switches to worries about "democracy." What makes these evaluations confusing to the uninitiated is that the world struggle is not described as the struggle between capitalism and socialism, but between "democracy" and totalitarianism."<sup>15</sup>

Some social scientists have gone as far as stating bluntly that the emerging nations should set "political development" (whatever that may mean) as their goal instead of economic development. What is wrong with the latter, it is stated, is that "collectivistic" planning becomes tempting, and eventually discouraging "individualistic" enterprise.<sup>16</sup> Quite often there is no hiding of the demand that the underdeveloped societies should remain underdeveloped so that they can continue to supply raw materials, and remain good markets for finished products. The giants of the world must continue to reign supreme in the best spirit of the Carnegie "Gospel," for that would be "best for the whole human race."

The intellectuals of American social science generally disapprove of the intellectuals of the emerging nations because of the leftist tendencies of the latter, and their harassment of the business class when they are

in power. Even when intellectuals are unemployed, as in the case of India, they do not gain any sympathy from the American social scientists. On the contrary, they are frowned upon because of their tendencies to join those "deviant" parties, the same as do many of the starved masses. A shiver is felt because in the Communist countries it has been the intellectuals who led the revolution, and later held the helm of power.<sup>17</sup>

The American social scientists, on the other hand, generally do not show much admiration for the working classes. Their attitude towards them ranges from contempt and disdain to condescension and plain snobbishness.<sup>18</sup> We have already discussed the industrial psychologists and sociologists about the workers they tried to manipulate.

A critic of Marx, after defending the "middle classes" and giving them credit for having produced a "renaissance in thought and feeling," then turns around and accuses "the masses" for having been the "most consistently anti-intellectual force in history." Then the author directs his attacks on the American "lower classes" who "could perceive truths of justice but were blind to freedom of thought. It was the American lower classes, not the upper, who gave their overwhelming support to the attacks in recent years on civil liberties."<sup>19</sup>

In his widely-read book, Political Man, Seymour Martin Lipset dedicates a whole chapter to "working-class authoritarianism."<sup>20</sup> The working class is said to have tendencies to "dogmatism," "authoritarianism," "extremism," "intolerance," "fundamentalism," and "child-like solutions to complex social problems." But these are all qualities related to the type of education ( or non-education) one has had rather than to the class label he carries. The millionaire who has had no more than primary education, and who is continuously busy adding numbers to his wealth, cannot be expected

to have any different qualities from the above. Of course Lipset does not ignore the education variable, but then why emphasize the working class variable when the other is the essential one? Lipset cites numerous studies from various countries to support his thesis, but curiously enough, these are all capitalist countries. In a system that thrives on minority privileges, and whose educational system offers blatant inequalities, it is absurd to point an accusing finger at the unfortunate victims. This is very much like a group of psychologists who, after exposing a sample of cats to the most cruel and frustrating situations, they induce in them hysterical and aggressive manifestations. But then instead of blaming themselves for wrong behavior, the psychologists blame the cats!

Such an approach of studying the individual or group in a vacuum is predominant in bourgeois social science. The "authoritarianism of the working class" can be explained simply this way: those who get higher education learn more subtleties about the stabilizing Hardened Beliefs, i.e., the rules of the political "democratic" game, civil rights, etc.; those who do not get as much education are only socialized enough to accept the power structure dogmatically without the complex niceties that go with it.<sup>21</sup>

Speaking about the unions, the rank and file, Lipset reassures us, though they have the propensity for authoritarianism, this is "unimportant in predicting their behavior as long as the organizations to which they belong are loyal," "anti-communist," and "better defenders and carriers of democratic values than parties based on the middle class." (emphasis added)<sup>22</sup> In other words, the authoritarianism, chauvinism, and simplified militancy, as long as the workers are loyal, and these tendencies can be channeled into the defense of capitalism ("democracy"), are desirable.<sup>23</sup>

This is a most revealing twist which makes it clear that loyalty to the capitalist class is the issue, and not democracy. It is also interesting that the labor unions, after having been fought bitterly for years by the ruling class and their hired theologians, now that they have become the right arm of capitalism have been not only accepted, but celebrated as "pillars of democracy." The authoritarianism of their structure, and the dominance of many among them by the worst criminal elements are all acceptable since they have all been "cleaned out" of the only crime that really matters: Communism.

#### The Cultural Mobilization:

After World War II, faced with the threat of Communism on a global scale, the ruling circles decided that the intellectual was a desirable asset for the survival of capitalism. The co-optation has been accelerating since then. Funds have been channeled through the various private foundations, the Defense Department, the CIA, the Army, and others. Academicians, scientists, writers, artists, actors, teachers, journalists, propagandists of all types were all mobilized into the cultural war. The survival of the capitalist system was identified as the survival of the whole people. It has been probably the largest scale campaign in history, global in its operation. (It must be of significance that the Education Act of 1958 was called the National Defense Act.)

As to be expected, a campaign of such proportion gave undreamed of opportunities to many intellectuals, including many mediocre ones who were promoted into national prominence as experts in their fields. Men with the sole qualification of zeal for the system (possibly plus the formal college degrees) found themselves commissioned to head big research projects, to write books ranging from a critique of Karl Marx to the art of counterinsurgency or the strategy of deterrence.

It is none of our concern here to issue ethical judgments on the behavior of these individuals. Several works have recently dealt with the subject at length.<sup>24</sup> In fact there can be no doubt that most of those who have been recruited sincerely believe in the nobility of the cause, and consider what they have done a patriotic duty. Our concern is with the social phenomenon, the power of the Hardened Beliefs to determine the direction of the whole society. If we aim our attack at individuals, we would be committing the same mistake mentioned earlier: studying the individual or the group in a vacuum. The question is not a matter of personal integrity: the intellectuals, like anybody else, are the helpless victims of the power structure of their society.

Intellectuals, and particularly academicians, not only go through the most rigorous socialization process in their long careers as students, but also success and rich rewards await the ambitious (as everybody is expected to be) in those areas where the defense of capitalism can be bolstered, while punishment and denial await the one who attempts to resist the powerful main stream.<sup>25</sup> Some of those who caught the spirit best (i.e., expressed the most Hardened Stabilizing Beliefs) found themselves assistants to Presidents, felt at the pinnacle of power, and became models for others to follow.

Even those intellectuals outside academia found themselves adopted by the system most lovingly like its prodigal sons, quite often with money pouring over them generously and in an unprecedented way (usually channeled through that most ubiquitous agency, the CIA). If one is hired to sell a certain merchandise, he is in no position to tell people what kind of trash they are buying, or what kind of crook is the manufacturer-- even if he believed this was the case. This is the power of matter over mind.

In 1952, the editors of Partisan Review devoted several issues of their magazine to a symposium of intellectuals entitled "Our Country and Our Culture." "American intellectuals," they declared, "now regard America and its institutions in a new way. Many writers and intellectuals now feel closer to their country and its culture...For better or for worse, most writers no longer now accept alienation as the artist's fate in America; on the contrary they want very much to be a part of American life."<sup>26</sup> Of the twenty-five contributors to the symposium, only three (Irving Howe, Norman Mailer, and C.Wright Mills) were entirely at odds with such complete acquiescence.

When the Millenium Was Here:

After being absorbed by the mass culture industry in the prosperous war and post-war economy, is it any wonder that the nouveau-riche intellectual began to preach that the millenium was already here? What was extraordinary about this phenomenon was that some of those intellectuals whose specialty was supposedly the study of society were led to believe that their own newly-found prosperity was that of the society as a whole in spite of the glaring poverty, unemployment, racism, inequality of opportunity, urban decay, the development of the monstrosity that came to be known as the industrial military complex, etc. The glitter of the new mass-produced gadgets for which the capitalist system got the credit were enough to seduce some of the most sophisticated minds.

Danile Bell, among many others, wrote about "the end of ideology:"

"In the Western world, therefore, there is today a rough consensus among intellectuals on political issues: the acceptance of a welfare state; the desirability of decentralized power; a system of mixed economy and of political pluralism. In that sense too, the ideological age has ended."<sup>27</sup>



Lipset talks with an air of euphoria about a world conference of intellectuals on "The Future of Freedom" held in Milan, Italy in September, 1955. He marvels at the fact that 150 intellectuals in the past representing all positions on the right, left, and center, all came to the conclusion that "the ideological issues dividing left and right had been reduced to a little more or less government ownership and economic planning."<sup>28</sup> The debate at the conference - if any - reduced itself to a liberal-conservative debate. Which meant that any questioning of the absolute right of private ownership of capital was completely absent (except perhaps in the case of some "surrogate Communist") Lipset writes:

"The change in Western political life reflects the fact that the fundamental political problems of the industrial revolution have been solved: the workers have achieved industrial and political citizenship... This very triumph of the democratic social revolution in the West ends domestic politics for those intellectuals who must have ideologies or utopias to motivate them to political action."<sup>29</sup>

As late as 1965, Stuart Chase wrote:

"Most of the world seems to be moving toward the mixed economy pattern. Even Russia is surrendering to the market procedure...in the United States socialism has been by-passed as an antiquated doctrine...We are moving away from both Adam Smith and Karl Marx as architects of ultimate values."<sup>30</sup>

It can be seen that "ideology" in the above is not used in the traditional sense of the word. It is more in line with what Mannheim meant by "utopia," i.e., "an orientation which transcends reality and which at the same time breaks the bonds of the existing order..."<sup>31</sup> The end of ideology meant the end of utopian thinking, the end of the search for an alternative to the established order. It also meant the death of "class-consciousness" on the part of the wage-earners. We can also say it meant the final and absolute success of the socialization process in America, and particularly the miraculous way it worked on the intellectuals themselves, some of whom had considered themselves radical and socialist - if not Marxist - only a few years before.

A unilinear evolutionary conceptualization is clearly apparent in this "end of Ideology" literature. Marxism is described as an obsolete dogma. Why seek utopia since the "welfare" state has already bypassed it? The final stage of human development was realized by the "welfare" state. Why worry about the capitalistic order since the capitalists have proved to be so good and generous to workers - and intellectuals? If there had ever been any classes, what they really needed was harmony and compromise (in the best spirit of Carnegie and Coolidge), and not an apocalyptic class war. Do not interrupt the bliss. Don't let anyone rock the boat. The intellectuals never had it so good.

The Art of Obfuscation:

The genius of the system is that it creates the illusion that the masses decide who their government is going to be, and what kind of policies it is going to follow. While the socialization of the masses, as I have shown, strongly defends the right of the few to unlimited wealth, it does not identify these few as the ruling class. This way the ruling class is rendered unidentifiable if not invisible. Actually the main line is that there is no such thing as a ruling class in America. The only ones who rule, it is maintained, are those elected by the people, or those appointed by those who are elected. Such is the art of obfuscation.

The first wise move in this direction was the abolition of the titles of nobility. Not only did this render the ruling class invisible, but it also made it seem as if equality was accomplished. Many other moves in this direction were followed, some intentionally, others accidentally, but whatever proved useful was kept.

The separation of the study of politics (and sociology) from the study of economics has proved most useful for the cause of obfuscation. It

allowed the political scientist to become a publicist for "democracy," while the economist became a publicist for "free-enterprise," with very little criss-crossing between the two. The relationship between wealth power and political power is obfuscated in this artificial compartmentalization. The political scientist may study the influence of the "pressure-groups" on decision-making in politics, and this may include the "economic notables," but great care (and hair-splitting) is taken to prove (or disprove) the "pluralistic" model of democracy. The post-Keynesian economists do discuss the role of government in the economy, but it is hardly made clear how the power of capital manipulates government in its own interests. This is a no-man's land that few individuals from either discipline are willing to tread.

Sometimes even some of the critics of the system have helped (unintentionally) the cause of obfuscation. C. Wright Mills and Floyd Hunter are good examples. Their preoccupation with the detective mystery game of "who makes the decisions" (whodunit) helped obfuscate the power that inspires, motivates, and controls the making of decisions.

The following are some of the means of obfuscation which have served as the best smoke-screen for the ruling class:

1. The Corporation: The impersonal corporation may have overshadowed the "rugged individualism" of the celebrated entrepreneur, but in as far as the obfuscation of the class line, this could have been the best that has ever happened for the salvation of capitalism since the elimination of titles.

As in the case of the absentee slumlord, in many cases, few wage-earners now know who owns their company. Unlike his predecessor, who in the past was given such ugly names as "the robber baron," the capitalist

of today can operate smoothly and more efficiently from within the maze of the corporation (equipped with the smoothest public relations department), surfacing to the public eye only as a "civil leader" or a great benefactor.

The personality of the executive has now come to the fore. The executive, for all appearances, is the one who makes decisions. He may or may not be a capitalist, or he may be on his way of becoming one. But here again, the same as in governmental institutions, the preoccupation with decision-making rather than with the guidelines for decision-making confuse the supreme role of the owner of capital in the corporate organization. The corporation is pictured as a pyramidal hierarchy of employed managerial experts running it, with employees supervising other employees, and even hiring and firing them. For all appearances the corporation does not seem to differ at all from the publicly owned organization. The person who may own some 70% of the company may have his name on the payroll list as simply another employee among the top executives, meekly receiving a salary just like everybody else. The illusion is created that everybody in America is, or has the potential to be both a wage-earner and a capitalist at the same time. We have already discussed the myth of "people's capitalism" which helped perpetuate the same illusion. The old widow who had inherited a few stocks of AT&T that pay her some \$200 a year in dividends is thus put in the same category as the millionaire. At the same time, the man who loads the trucks in the warehouse is another employee the same as the president of the company. Is it surprising that the class structure in the minds of millions has been so confused? Even some academicians have been led to declare that capitalism has all but disappeared.

"The capitalist system?" writes Edmund S. Glenn, "It is, if anything, mellowing. Some (and I am one of them, as was the late Harvard economist

Sumner Slichter) even say that capitalism has all but disappeared, at least from the industrialized countries."<sup>32</sup>

John H. Kautsky writes cheerfully: "Ownership, being vested in legal fictions like corporations and the state, has effectively disappeared and industrial labor and poverty may ultimately disappear as a result of automation and material abundance."<sup>33</sup>

It is hard to know what these gentlemen really mean. If capitalism has disappeared, or almost did, then why are we so intent on defending it? It would seem that the disappearance of the little grocer at the street corner is taken to mean the disappearance of capitalism. To Kautsky, the "fiction" of the corporation seems to have overruled the reality of ownership.

2. The Class Concept: The concept of class as used in the West is one of the most potent forces of obfuscation. In bourgeois society the idea of class is generally tinged with elitism and snobbishness. It is usually based on status which depends on the type of work, the amount of income, the number of years of education, the style of life, and so on. Sometimes the concept is based on the way individuals view themselves (subjective). Other times it is based on the way other people view them (objective).

The most well-known work on the subject is that of Warner and Lunt.<sup>34</sup> The authors, basing their concept on empirical data (which usually means interviewing people and punching their answers on cards, etc.), they "discovered" that America did have its class structure. However, it was also discovered that wealth was not the only criterion by which people judged to which class they belonged. Therefore the class notion based on economics was dropped.

So, it turns out, the class concept here is used to mean what various people think of each other. Is so and so superior, inferior, or equal to me? As a result of this survey, Warner and Lunt came up with their famous

stratification: upper-upper, lower-upper, upper-middle, and so on down the line.

What these findings show, if anything, is that Americans lack class consciousness in the Marxian sense. The value of this to the system is considerable. With such obscure class distinctions, an illusory picture of a hierarchichal ladder is created - where people are supposedly given the opportunity to climb upwards if they only use their talents and guts. This way every class feels superior as long as there is another class below it. It is only the lowest class of them all that is deprived of a somehow prestigious position. It should be obvious that such a notion of class (which is propagated through practically all the socializing agencies) creates the right medium for racial prejudice. The lowest class among the whites can still credit itself for its whiteness - as long as whiteness remains a symbol of status. Antagonism is thus dissuaded from between capitalist and wage-earner to that of each class and the one below it or above.

The low class white-collar or blue-collar white worker - who usually refers to himself as "middle-class" - now feels threatened most by the rising black man. Instead of blaming the capitalist system which thrives on the competition of the various groups of workers, he blames the black man for his sheer attempt to survive. The petty bourgeois who is being disappropriated by big capital blames his fate on the "socialistic" government, and its "bureaucracy in Washington." The irony is that he sees the Rockefellers and the Mellons who seem to support the "welfare state" as socialists, and not as big capitalists swallowing little capitalists - exactly in accordance with the law of the capitalistic jungle.

Both the worker and the petty bourgeois see the pittance paid to the welfare recipient as the source of their financial difficulties and feelings

of insecurity.\* There are hundreds of publications, radio and television broadcasts, and local and national politicians (mostly sponsored by big capital!) that tell them just that every single day.

On the one hand the black man is accused of being lazy; on the other, he is looked upon as a threatening competitor in the job market. While this "class war" continues at the lower levels, capitalists continue piling up more wealth to the applause and admiration of all.<sup>35</sup>

Another sociological work which excels in this art of obfuscation is that of Dahrendorf.<sup>36</sup> Here again the premise is that ownership of the means of production in this "post-capitalist society" is no longer the source of authority. Class is based on conflict between the various groups, and the various groups strive mainly for "authority" within the organizational structure of the society. The idea of a classless society is rejected since no society can be conceived without a distribution of authority. So in this type of conceptualization, there is no limit as to the number of "classes" which may even superimpose on each other. In a society of fifty associations, there may be at least a hundred "classes" considering the number of conflicts within each association, not to consider those outside it. So now we may assume there is conflict between labor leaders and rank and file, between labor leadership and management, between teachers and students, faculty and administration, the executive and legislative branch of government, and so on ad nauseum, each one of these making a separate class (why not add between males and females, husbands and wives, fathers and sons?)

It is hard to see the analytical purpose or usefulness of such a conceptualization of class. It does, however, help confuse the role of ownership of capital in the configuration of power by accepting at face

---

\*At the same time these people see nothing wrong with spending billions of dollars on wars and "defense" for the protection of the system (which in this case is referred to as America.)

value the fictitious legal structure. It helps promote the desirable features of conflict and pluralism in a capitalist structure. When it claims it is not possible to achieve a classless society, the message is: why try to work towards any? Why not instead enjoy our present games of conflict and competition, and try to climb the ladder within the present hierarchy?

Actually this model can be said to be an extension of the Djilas most highly promoted model<sup>37</sup> about the Soviet Union. Briefly, the Djilas thesis is that the Soviet Union has a new ruling class of bureaucrats who have taken the place of the previous ruling class they overthrew. The weight of this argument (as well as its value to capitalism) is that the overthrow of the capitalist (or feudal) class does not create a classless society. On the contrary, it may even bring about a worse class (so we may as well preserve what we got). The sleight-of-hand in this argument is using the Marxian concept of class for the class that was overthrown, and then turning around, and using the bourgeois concept of class for the one that took over. They are not the same thing. Instead of the ownership of the means of production as the criterion in the first concept, it is the legal holding of authority in the second. According to the latter, it can be claimed that there is a ruling class as long as there is government or any form of authority.\*

---

\* Granted that the Soviet Union - particularly in its Stalinist phase - does not present the best model of a "dictatorship of the proletariat," it must be remembered that in the Marxist model, it is not claimed that a truly classless society can be achieved soon after the destruction of the bourgeoisie, and the Soviets do not claim to have reached that stage as yet. As to whether there is an antagonism between the Soviet people and their bureaucracy, as the thesis maintains, is none of our concern here.



Djilas provides all the elements needed for the Dahrendorf thesis where it becomes a question of conflict between those who issue orders, and those who receive them. As to the sources of conflict - if any - and the nature of the interests involved, these become of no consequence. There lies the art of obfuscation.

3. The Industrial Society: Behind the means of obfuscation treated above, there lies the most promoted concept, the so-called industrial society. Such a society is supposedly post-capitalist as well as post-socialist, post-Adam Smith as well as post-Marx. Now this immediately gives the notion an air of scientific neutrality (one name on the right and one on the left maintain the balance). The main characteristic of this society of course is industrial development. At such a stage, it is maintained, the society faces the same problems regardless of what economic or political system it adopts. Therefore (and this is the heart of the matter) it is not important who owns the productive forces of the society since the problems faced will have to be solved more or less in the same "pragmatic" way. Here again, it is ignored which values take priority in these "pragmatic" solutions. Will social benefits to the whole society, for example, take precedence over profit-making for a few individuals? Will the "solutions" be the same if, say, education and the post-office were put in the hands of private interests? Will the television channels and the radio waves be used in the same way had they been publicly owned? Would the solutions to medical needs be the same had medicine not been such a profit-making business? Such pertinent questions are usually avoided by the apostles of the "industrial society." What lies underneath all this "pragmatic" thinking is the absolute acceptance of the Basic Belief, and the unquestioning of the traditional unequal distribution of human valuables. What remains then

is the management of things - which has to follow the same physical laws if it is to be solved scientifically.

The notion of "convergence" is usually part of the concept of the "industrial society." The capitalist system, it is maintained, has accepted the "mixed economy." The socialist system in the Soviet Union, on the other hand has accepted such ingenious capitalist devices as interest, profit, rent, market, etc. (usually with distortion as to the Marxist views on these matters, and no explanation as to how these devices as applied in a socialist system differ from the way they are applied in a capitalist one). This way all the faults and failures of capitalism are blamed on the advancement of technology, and this is bolstered by pointing to the fact that the Soviets are facing certain problems of the same nature.

W.W. Rostow, whose famous book related to the subject (The Stages of Economic Growth)<sup>38</sup> made him so prominent as to become an aide to the President, called this final stage of human development "the age of high mass consumption." With so many television sets, telephones, and automobiles, America had reached the "post-maturity stage," according to Rostow. Communism, it turns out, is nothing more than the "disease of the transition." All the Communists are trying to do is to become like us, cars and all. They have been suffering from the pains of maturing. It becomes clear in the light of this diagnosis that once the Russians finish stocking their homes and backyards with all the gadgets we have, they will drop this adolescent foolishness of Communism. Thus the industrial society becomes an end in itself. What could be more heartening to the bourgeois mind?

Galbraith, one of the major voices of the "mixed economy" also plays on the same major theme, that the ownership of capital in the industrial society has become of secondary importance.<sup>39</sup> Real power, according to him,

now extends from the top leadership of the corporation all the way down just short of labor, and embraces a great number of individuals with a variety of talent for which Galbraith found a good name: "the techno-structure."

The literature on this theme, because of its great value of obfuscation, is endless. Its main fault is that it confuses formal authority in decision-making with real power. (I have already spoken on this earlier, and there is no need to repeat it here.)

More recently, it was suddenly publicized that the industrial society was plagued with the problem of polluting its environment. In spite of the seriousness of the problem, it has been capitalized upon immensely by the spokesmen of the ruling class. Now only is it used to divert younger people from their questioning of the system (let alone its use as a selling gimmick or a public relations device), but also to promote the theme of the "industrial society." Here is a problem where everyone can be blamed, from the big corporation that pollutes a whole great lake to the housewife who buys beverages in disposable cans. Many academic experts in the field have been repeatedly pointing out that pollution is the problem of the industrial society, and has nothing to do with capitalism. Many among them have been careful to remind their listeners that the Soviets have also polluted rivers and lakes. What they fail to mention, however, is that a society with centralized planning has a much greater potential to solve extensive problems of this type than a society where "rugged individualism" is free to exploit and plunder the earth at its heart's content.

4. Racism: Ironically some of the concepts formulated by the protesters themselves may unintentionally help the cause of obfuscation. "Racism" is an important case in point.

The report of The National Commission on Civil Disorders stated eloquently in 1968: "Our nation is moving toward two societies, one black, one white-separate and unequal."<sup>40</sup> Racism as a realistic description of a phenomenon is a valid concept. However, to develop more awareness of its existence may only intensify it. A counter-racist movement on the part of the blacks will only help fragmentize the wage-earners, precisely what the power structure requires. A racist consciousness will help kill class consciousness. A racist conflict per se will only help to obfuscate the class line, and will not change the distribution of wealth and power. The ruling class can always use the same old formula it has always used to solve (and maintain) the problems of divisive conflicts: tokenism. This clever device does not cost the ruling class anything, for, by rewarding a few "representatives" of a minority, they can always charge the cost to the wage-earners of the other minorities. This way the conflict is kept at a low mass level.

It is only when race consciousness becomes understood as class consciousness would it become challenging to the Basic Belief, and as such to the ruling class itself.

#### THE CRITICS:

In describing the Hardened Belief concept in the first chapter, I mentioned that the more hardened the belief the less the challenge to it is likely to be expressed. In this Basic Belief we have been discussing it is very easy to mistake dissenting views on peripheral details for attacks on the core of the belief itself. While attacks on the core have not been entirely absent - as I shall show later - criticism in America has been generally centered on persons rather than on Basic doctrines. There has been a lot of dissent, but very little heresy. There have been

reformers, do-gooders, welfarers, muckrakers, passive resisters, pacifists, puritans, moralists, and crusaders of all kinds, but rare among these is the one who every questioned the sacred rights of unlimited property. Almost every challenger to these rights had to be influenced by some brand of Marxism, an imported school of thought which, to all probability, could not have been developed within the American milieu itself. Utopian socialism which can be looked at as a descendant of Christian socialism could have developed here, but a Marx had to develop in a more mixed milieu where contact with more diversified ideas was more probable, and where the dominance of money interests on this area of belief was less total.

In America the Basic Belief has been so hardened that the most glaring contradictions of capitalism could not have led to its rejection - that is if we assume that these contradictions could ~~not~~ have been detected in the first place.

Nothing can be more beneficial to the established order than those critics who may sound as if they are tearing the system apart while always reaching the conclusion that there can be no better alternative to it, or that "we have to work within the system in order to change it." Since man, so the argument goes, as the Bible tells us, is born in sin, and he can never be perfect, neither can his system. The conclusion is that this is the best of all possible worlds, with imperfections here and there, which we must try to improve as best we can. Only God and His celestial system are perfect. This way the critics give the status quo strength through elasticity that the plain-faced promoters cannot give.

After Ralph Nader's campaign to make General Motors "more responsible to the public" through acting within the corporation's annual stockholders'

meeting, John D. Rockefeller IV was reported to have commented this way: "To view this campaign as an attack on business is to view Congressional reform as an attack on Congress...In each case the persons leading those reform efforts seek to preserve those institutions through constructive change."<sup>41</sup> All we can say is that Mr. Rockefeller knows what he is talking about. Ralph Nader is the descendant of a long line of reformers and muckrakers in America. Such authors as Henry Demerest Lloyd, Lincoln Steffens, Gustavus Meyers, Upton Sinclair, Mathew Josephson, Ferdinand Lundberg, Drew Pearson, and many others have all attacked capitalists but not capitalism.

To give a few recent examples:

Michael Harrington is known as a socialist. He gained fame after the publication of his widely-read book on poverty.<sup>42</sup> Harrington did a remarkable job exposing the wide-spread poverty in America at a time when everybody was celebrating the "affluent society."

Harrington points out, for example, to some of the forces within the system that purposely perpetuate poverty. The ruling class in the South, for instance, has a vested interest in the maintenance of poverty and underdevelopment in the region. Cheap and unorganized labor can lure new industries to the region for the enrichment of the local leaders. The poor are systematically underrepresented in America, the author reports. In 1961, the laundry workers were dropped out of the minimum wage law as part of a deal with the conservatives. Nobody has to worry about the political wrath of the poor for they do not have any. What is the solution to all this?

Harrington responds:

"There is only one institution in the society capable of acting to abolish poverty. This is the Federal Government...In saying this I am only recording the facts of political and social life in the United States."<sup>43</sup>

In other words, we cannot go any further than the New Deal. The political and social life which is the present reality allows us to go that far. This is the final and unchangeable reality. What remains unanswered is this: when the poor are so powerless in this type of government, how can they get government to do this for them? When a government takes the present distribution of wealth as God's law of the universe, how much can we expect it to change that distribution? Harrington's approach is to reawaken the conscience of his fellow men in the old Christian tradition:

"How long shall we ignore this underdeveloped nation in our midst?  
How long shall we look the other way while our fellow human beings suffer?  
How long?"<sup>44</sup>

Had Harrington been more realistic, he would have tried to answer the capitalist's more burning questions: 1. How much does it pay? 2. How much threat do "these people" pose to the free-enterprise system? If the author can come up with pretty high figures for both questions, there might be hope for this kind of charity (for that is what he is really asking for). Otherwise it is only noble to have tried, but failed.

Another recent critical work is The Case Against Congress by Pearson and Anderson.<sup>45</sup> This is an intriguing and informative expose of the close financial relationship between business and members of Congress. What the authors fail to show, however, is that what happens around Congress is not simply a question of individual morality or personal integrity (though there can be no doubt that some may be capable of being more immoral than others), but that the whole system is built in such a way that no one can become a member of Congress without his indebtedness to the power of wealth. If we have to accuse anyone of immorality, we have to accuse the whole system. But that is beyond what Pearson and Anderson are willing to go. On the contrary, they make sure to dedicate a whole chapter on "The Good Guys"

so that we do not lose our faith in the system. Who are "the good guys?" Three Senators are mentioned: Fulbright, Mansfield, and Aiken. A couple of others are mentioned in passing, but that is not too many "good guys" out of a body of 535 members. On top of this, let us meet "one of the most conscientious members:"

"J. William Fulbright...votes down the line for the oil and gas interests. Talking privately to friends, he once explained apologetically that he could not be re-elected in Arkansas if he bumped his head against the powerful oil bloc."<sup>46</sup>

Senator Fulbright justifies his voting behavior by stating that he makes a better Senator than others who would take his seat. How can we disagree with that?

Another outstanding work in this category, and to which I have already referred, is Lundberg's The Rich and the Super-Rich.<sup>47</sup> Lundberg has a penetrating eye for detail together with a charming sour style. He sharply focuses on the role of concentrated wealth in the American political system, and the book contains a dazzling amount of behind-the-scenes information.

However, it is unfortunate that this book does not rise very high above the level of the expose in spite of its excellence. In many instances there is an air of petty gossip, a confused mixture of contempt of and fascination with, the giants of capital. And in spite of all this rich and sophisticated exposure, Lundberg ends up as an apologist for the capitalist system. He repeatedly reassures the reader that he is not a leftist, a Marxist, or a socialist, but a loyal American who, like everyone else, believes in capitalism. What is he against then? Well, he is against capitalists who behaved outside "the rules of capitalism."<sup>48</sup> What are the rules of capitalism? Christian ethics? This is not made exactly clear. But Lundberg writes several hundred pages to show clearly that capitalist rules and



capitalist laws are made by capitalists and for them. The laws of capitalism are loud and clear: competition, self-interest, grabsmanship, and "the survival of the fittest." Why condemn the winners for a few acts that were considered fouls by the losers who were playing the same game? This is like glorifying war, and then condemning the warriors for killing their enemies. Capitalism is war. How can the author accept the ideology of capitalism without accepting the rules stated by the ideology itself? The way Lundberg describes capitalists, it is hard to find a single case where the ideal rules (that the author seems to have in the back of him mind) are not broken. This should come as no surprise since obviously the author's ideals conflict with the very ideology he claims to believe in.

We can see here the vestiges of religious interpretations of individual action, where the individual is seen as an isolated entity serving either the forces of good or those of evil. When we look at capitalism, we are looking at a whole system of belief that individuals are socialized into, and which is going to determine their behavior. Those who have advocated the abolition of capitalism do not subscribe to the simplistic notion that "all social problems stem from the economic system," nor do they claim the "socialism will automatically produce good results," as stated by Lundberg (emphasis in original), and as repeated by many others. Those who have led the movement toward socialism have been saying something like this on this issue: capitalism is not conducive to a rational, peaceful, or just society. You cannot teach people to live like brothers, and then present them with a social jungle where the winners are supposed to be the fittest. You cannot destroy the undesirable Hardened Beliefs of capitalism without destroying the economic system that nourishes them. Abolishing capitalism will not automatically create a rational and just society. It will be

removing the monstrous block that stands in the way of moving in that direction. After gradually removing the Hardened Beliefs produced under the present system, a new and long process of resocialization will have to take place before the new society will be able to solve its social and environment problems. Under the fatalistic anarchy of capitalistic cut-throat competition, a rational comprehensive approach to human problems cannot take place.

In our time, we can add that the problem is no longer restricted to the improvement of the working conditions of the workers (though these are still very important) which, it is claimed, can be corrected through "piecemeal legislation," but it has become a question of humanity saving itself through adopting a rational and scientific approach to such problems as overpopulation, pollution of environment, nuclear bombs, production of food, etc. All such problems have to be solved through cooperation on a world-wide basis. There can be no hope of solving them through the capitalistic methods of competition and aggressiveness.

As is common with the other apologists, Lundberg blames the "public" for the neglect of social problems. "It is the irrational populace," he claims, that impedes the capitalists from "advancing to the solution of many basic problems..."<sup>50</sup> The powerless masses, misled and manipulated every day of their lives, are again used as the scapegoat for all the blunders and foolishness of their leaders. An "irrational populace" is only the product of the irrational socialization for which the ruling class and its agencies should be responsible.

The "public" has been repeatedly charged with such matters as the production and marketing of millions of tons of worthless fluff each year (they do buy it don't they?), the election of mediocre Presidents and other

governmental officials, the pollution of environment, the low quality education, the infantile television programs, the shallowness and artificiality of culture, and so on. If the "public" is so stupid, the argument usually goes, then the "public" deserves to be cheated and deceived. The average man, in other words, is expected to be an expert on every subject from mouth-wash to literary works, from international relations to ecology, from the usefulness of ABMs to sociology and politics; and all that despite the miserable education he is usually offered. This is where "democracy" serves its purpose: for whatever goes wrong, or is inherently wrong with the system, the "public" can be blamed.\*

To get back to Lundberg, he, like the other critics, sees clearly the defects of capitalism, and he vaguely recommends some "politico-economic" revision,<sup>51</sup> but again the most common apology shows its head: "Every system is bound to be far from perfect."<sup>52</sup> The big question such a common apology does not ask is: how far?

There is one common feature among intellectuals who are critical of capitalism in America: while seeing its deficiencies, they cannot visualize an alternative to it; so they resign themselves to live with it. They

---

\* On a radio panel show, two social scientists of national fame eloquently discussed the problems of ecology and pollution. When a listener called asking as to what the average citizen can do to halt this impending doom of pollution. The answer of the articulate social scientist was quite positive: in a democracy people elect their leaders, but as long as they continue to vote for the "idiots" there cannot be a solution. The public should learn how to select its representatives. So there! What this learned gentleman did not explain is how the public can go about electing its millionaires (pardon me, its philanthropists), the managers and lawyers they hire to run their business, and the political lackeys they handpick to run for office - that is, assuming the public developed an expertise about the problems of ecology, among others, and developed an extrasensory perception as to tell which one of those was telling the truth about what he was going to do once he got elected!

somehow believe - or hope - that through some vague evolutionary process, the capitalists will be reformed, and become more responsible to society, which is much like hoping that generals and trained soldiers in war will somehow become more humane, cease the killing and destruction, love their enemies, and take good care of them. They are like someone criticizing slavery while wanting to preserve the institution, but begging the masters to be nicer to their slaves.

An important book that points to many of the shortcomings of American capitalism is that of Heilbroner,<sup>53</sup> and it expresses the resigning attitude quite well.

"By this I mean that its (business) legitimacy is now virtually complete, its acceptance without exception. For perhaps the first time in American history there is no longer any substantial intellectual opposition to the system of business nor any serious questioning of its economic privileges and benefits."<sup>54</sup>

Given this apparently unalterable situation, what is to be done about all the shortcomings of monopoly capital?

Well...the Federal Government...What else?

"Secondly the gradual liberalization of the business ideology, to which we are hopefully looking forward, should also ease opposition to measures that patently improve the quality of society without substantially affecting its basic institutions of privilege." (emphasis added)<sup>55</sup>

When this becomes the attitude of some of the most sophisticated critics of the economic system, we can safely state that this is symptomatic of the hardening of the belief in the whole society.<sup>56</sup>

Footnotes

Chapter IV: The Intellectuals as Stabilizers: The Triumph of Matter  
Over Mind

1. For a good sampling of those definitions see G. Eric Hansen: "Intellect and Power: Some Notes on the Intellectual as a Political Type" in The Journal of Politics, May, 1969, pp. 311-328.

2. Christopher Lasch: The New Radicalism in America (1889-1963): The Intellectual as a Social Type, Alfred Knopf, 1965, p. ix.

3. For an interesting discussion of this thesis, see Chapter 9 in Ibid.

4. Karl Mannheim: Ideology and Utopia, Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace & World, New York, 1936, pp. 153-164.

5. Arthur Koestler, an ex-Communist, who later wrote books of repentance (which of course paid him well) describes a typical situation of this kind with the German paper with which he was employed:

"The manner in which the Ullstein fired me may be called rather decent or an example of bourgeois hypocrisy; it depends on the angle from which you look at it...I expected to be called in any minute to Verlagsdirektor Muller. I had my defense prepared; yet I had the boy to tell me any political gossip...Everybody discussed politics and exchanged gossip with his friends; and my political sympathies were no concern of the firm as long as they did not interfere with the discharge of my professional duties - etc. etc. . . .

"However days passed and nothing happened. Then a week or ten days after...I found one morning a letter from the firm on my desk. It stated with extreme courtesy, that in view of the general reductions of staff made inevitable by the economic crisis, etc., etc., it was necessary to dispense with my further services on the editorial staff...."

See Arthur Koestler: "The Initiates" in Richard Grossman, ed.: The God That Failed, Harper Colophon Books, Harper & Row, New York, 1949, p. 40, 41.

6. Alexis de Tocqueville: Democracy in America, A Mentor Book, Richard D. Heffner, ed., The New American Library, 1956, p. 117, 119.

In my view, de Tocqueville exaggerates his point when he talks about inadmissibility of controversy in America. The lack of controversy is only in the area of those commonly hardened beliefs. In the case of the monarchy once the population has been socialized about monarchichal power, they will not allow any controversy about the King.

7. A printed pamphlet issued by the National Council of Teachers of English, The Committee on Censorship: "Censorship Controversy," Nov., 1953, p. 10.

8. de Tocqueville, op.cit., p. 118.

9. I owe most of the above information to Loren Baritz: The Servants of Power, Wesleyan University Press, Middletown, Connecticut, 1960, passim. This work cites several other works on the subjects.

See also William H. Whyte, Jr.: The Organization Man, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1956. Mr. Whyte describes the General Electric Co. School in which the new managerial and engineering recruits take a course called HOBSON (How our business system operates) "originally developed by Du Pont to inoculate blue collar employees against creeping socialism..." p. 121.

Mr. Whyte describes most interestingly the personality tests used by most corporations, mainly to detect who best fits the "organization man" type, or who can be most loyal to the company and the economic system as a whole.

My comments on the subject should not be taken as a condemnation of all psychology. It must be mentioned that several industrial social scientists did not agree with many of the conclusions of their colleagues. Such noted psychologists as Kornhauser and Allport criticized the tendencies of industrial psychology for its obvious bias toward business.

10. Lucian W. Pye: "The Politics of Southeast Asia" in Gabriel A. Almond and James S. Coleman: The Politics of the Developing Areas, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960, p. 133, 134.

See also the same author in Politics, Personality, and Nation-Building, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1962, where Burma's problems are described as personality crisis of the leadership.

11. Christian Bay: "The Cheerful Science of Dismal Politics" in Theodore Roszak: The Dissenting Academy, A Vintage Book, Random House, 1967, 1968, p. 220.

12. The embodiment of this spirit is probably best represented by John H. Bunzel: Anti-Politics in America, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1967.

Among the non-academic works, but which was a pioneer in playing more or less the same tune, is Eric Hoffer's well-known book: The True Believer, Harper & Row, New York, 1951.

13. E.G., David Apter describes what he calls the "mobilization system" this way:

"Countries of this type in Africa...have regimes that incline toward the belief that in order to produce the "new Africa" the structural precedents of African society, especially the stratification structure, must be radically altered and a new system of loyalties created around the idea that economic progress is the basis of a modern society. For such changes, the consummatory values of the system must validate hierarchical authority and invalidate consent groups."

On the "instrumental" or "reconciliation" system, Apter writes:

"Instrumentalism is the reconciliation type directly related to pyramidal authority through which power and belief are distributed in such a way that the entire system is based on conflict and competition."

David E. Apter: The Politics of Modernization, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965, p. 258, 262.

14. For example, according to Robert E. Merton (as paraphrased approvingly by Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson): "it (bossism) humanized and personalized assistance to the needy; afforded businesses, including illicit ones, privileges that they needed in order to survive; provided a route of social mobility...; and was an antidote to the constitutional dispersal of authority."

Edward C. Banfield & James Q. Wilson: City Politics, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1963, p. 126.

For more recent variation on the same theme, see James C. Scott: "Corruption, Machine Politics, and Political Change" in The American Political Science Review, Dec., 1969, pp. 1142-1158.

15. For a rather comprehensive critique of the social scientists' attitude toward the developing nations, see Charles C. Moskos, Jr. and Wendell Bell: "Emerging Nations and Ideologies of American Social Scientists" in The American Sociologist, May, 1967. For an excellent analysis of bourgeois ideology in general, see Robin Blackburn: "A Brief Guide to Bourgeois Ideology" in Alexander Cockburn and Robin Blackburn, eds.: Student Power, Penguin Books, 1969, Middlesex, England, pp. 164-213.

As a sampler I offer the following:

Joseph J. Spengler, an economist, writes:

"The bureaucracy, can do...what is required and provide an environment generally favorable to foreign and domestic enterprise only if its values and attitudes are appropriate. It must appreciate the strategic importance of the private sector...; it must look upon the entrepreneurial elite as an ally instead of as a competing and less prestigious elite; and it must contribute to the dissipation instead of to the re-enforcement of values which derogate entrepreneurship."

Joseph J. Spengler: "Bureaucracy and Economic Development" in Joseph La Palombara, ed.: Bureaucracy and Political Development, Princeton, N.J., 1963, p. 228, 229.

16. For example, see Joseph La Palombara: "Notes, Queries, and Dilemmas" in *ibid*, pp. 34-61.

La Palombara writes, "To do this in the newer states - to develop a national bourgeoisie - would require the genuine integration and assimilation into the social system of the new harassed, bedeviled, and persecuted pariah entrepreneurial groups." p. 58.

17. For example, James S. Coleman writes: "This uncritical equating of education with special rights and legitimacy has endowed the educated African with an exaggerated sense of superiority...Politics have been permeated with the presumably uncontested assumption that the educated have a divine right to rule." James S. Coleman: "Sub-Saharan Africa" in Almond & Coleman, *op.cit.*, p. 283. (This is natural. When the intellectual poses a threat to the rule of the bourgeois or the tribal chief, the American intellectual will have to side with the latter two against the intellectuals).

Myron Weiner writes: "One disquieting factor is the role being played by the younger people in extremist politics...Leftist parties have considerable influence among school and college students..." Myron Weiner: "The Politics of South Asia" in *Ibid.*, p. 228 (Anything that threatens the rule of the bourgeoisie is disquieting, deviant, and extremist.)

Carl H. Lande writes: "It is of some importance that most of the educated middle class and its leaders are not and do not regard themselves as being an "intelligentsia" in the continental sense, but rather as practical men: skilled professionals, technicians, and entrepreneurs. They display little interest in theory, but take much interest in practical politics as a means of achieving practical results (how heartening!). There is a small group of academicians and newspapermen, neither of whom constitutes more than a minority in their professions - though a vocal vminority - who, lean in the direction of a Marxian point of view..." (horror!) Carl H. Lande: "The Philippines" in James S. Coleman, ed., Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1965, p. 339.

On the intellectual as a pathological type, alienated, authoritarian, guilt-ridden, and thirsty for power, see Lewis S. Feuer: Marx and the Intellectuals, Anchor Book, Doubleday and Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1969.

18. The academicians present an interesting case of "false consciousness" in the United States. Except for the exceptional cases who have been moderately rewarded by the system, the vast majority among them (who waste the best years of their lives in the endless pursuit of their discipline) are not rewarded as much as many policemen or many of the unionized members of the labor force.

19. Lewis S. Feuer: "Introduction" to Marx & Engels, op.cit., p. xv, xvi.

20. Seymour Martin Lipset: Political Man, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., pp. 87-126.

21. For the difference in approach to socialization between the "middle" and "upper" class schools and the "lower" class schools, see Edgar Litt: "Civic Education, Community Norms, and Political Indoctrination" in American Sociological Review, Feb 1963, pp. 69-75.

22. Seymour Martin Lipset: Political Man, op.cit., p.123, 124.

23. In opposition to the Lipset thesis, in a study by Maurice Zeitlin, based on a survey of a stratified random sample of Cuban workers in 1962, it was found that of the workers interviewed, 73% "clearly and without hesitation" said that the revolution must be generous to its enemies, and that he should be counseled and no more. Only 27% said that criticism of the revolution ought not be tolerated by the government.

See Maurice Zeitlin: Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class, Princeton, 1967, Chapter X.

Some other social scientists questioned Lipset's thesis about the authoritarianism of the working class, and produced their own surveys which showed the contrary. The main weakness of all these studies is their ambiguity as to who exactly belongs to the working class and who does not.



The class theories they follow are based on status rather than the ownership of capital (see below). As examples of this stand, see S. M. Miller & Frank Riesman: "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Critique of Lipset" in British Journal of Sociology, Sept., 1961.

Also see Lewis Lipsits: "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Reevaluation" in American Sociological Review, Feb., 65.

24. On this topic the reader is referred to the following:

Irving Louis Horowitz, ed.: The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, The M.I.T. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967.

James Ridgeway: The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis, Ballantine Books, New York, 1968.

Christopher Lasch: The Agony of the American Left. A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1966, 1967, 1968, especially Chapter Three, "The Cultural Cold War: A Short History of the Congress for Cultural Freedom:

David Horowitz: "Sinews of Empire" in Rampart, Oct. 1969, pp. 33-42.

Bettina Aptheker: Big Business and the American University, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1966.

25. In addition to the above, concerning the application of punishment and repression on the rebelling academician, see Kathleen Gough: "World Revolution and the Science of Man" in Theodore Roszak, ed.: The Dissenting Academy, op.cit., pp.135-158.

26. See Richard Hofstadter: Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963, particularly Chapter IX: "Business and Intellect" and "conclusion" quote on p. 394.

27. Daniel Bell: The End of Ideology, A Free Press Paperback, A revised edition, The Free Press, New York, 1962, p. 403.

28. Seymour Martin Lipset: Political Man, op.cit., esp. Chapter 13, pp. 439-456, quote p. 441.

29. Ibid., p. 442, 443.

30. Stuart Chase: "American Values: A Generation of Change" in Public Opinion Quarterly, Fall, 1965, pp. 357-367.

31. Karl Mannheim: Ideology and Utopia, op.cit., p. 192.

32. Edmund S. Glenn: "The University and the Revolution: New Left or New Right?" In Gary R. Weaver, ed., The University and Revolution, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969, p. 100.

33. John H. Kautsky: Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries: Nationalism & Communism, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1962, p. 28.

34. W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt: The Social Life of a Modern Community, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1941 passim.

35. For a recent revealing report based on Gallup polls to detect the mood of "the middle white American," see "The Troubled American: A Special Report on the White Majority" in Newsweek, Oct. 6, 1969.

36. Ralf Dahrendorf: Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Cal., passim.

37. Milovan Djilas: The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System, New York, 1957, passim.

38. W. W. Rostow: The Stages of Economic Growth, A Non-Communist Manifesto, The University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1960, passim.

39. John Kenneth Galbraith: The New Industrial State, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Mass., 1967.

40. U.S. Riot Commission: Report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, The New York Times Co., New York, 1968, p. 1.

For other works on the theme of racism, see Stokely Carmichael and Charles Hamilton: Black Power, A Vintage Book, New York, 1967.

Charles Silberman: Crisis in Black and White, Random House, New York, 1964.

41. As quoted by the Chicago Sun-Times, Sunday, May 17, 1970: "Industry's Debt to Society."

42. Michael Harrington: The Other America, Penguin Books, Baltimore, Maryland, 1962.

43. Ibid., p. 168.

44. Ibid., p. 170.

45. Drew Pearson and Jack Anderson: The Case Against Congress, Pocket Books, New York, 1968.

46. Ibid., p. 425, 426.

47. Ferdinand Lundberg: The Rich and the Super-Rich, A Bantam Book, Lyle Stewart, 1968.

48. Cf. Ibid., pp. 770-785.

49. Ibid., p. 773 (*italics in original*).

50. Ibid., p. 775.

51. Ibid., p. 934.

52. Ibid., p. 774.

53. Robert L. Heilbroner: The Limits of American Capitalism, Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, New York, 1965, 1966.

54. Ibid., p. 55.

55. Ibid., p. 83.

56. For another work that perceptively criticizes some of the ills

of capitalist society, and attempts to destroy some of the myths of its ideology, and yet reaches the same conclusions as the above, see Bernard D. Nossiter: The Mythmakers, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964, esp. see p. 69 where the author makes a stand against any "extreme statist remedies," and Chapter Eight, where the author becomes the victim of the very myths he had tried to destroy.

## Chapter V

### THE SUPPORTING BELIEFS

As I mentioned in Chapter Three, the Basic Belief and the Supportive Beliefs are linked together in a mental "molecule" which, when hardened, serves as programmed energy for a predictable support of the power structure. The separation of the "atoms" from each other in this discussion is artificial, and done only to facilitate analysis. It is also worth mentioning that such a "molecule" may have more "atoms" in its structure than the ones we are discussing in this chapter. Any belief that, for one reason or another, had been hardening on a large scale within a society, or even within a portion of it, can be linked to the Basic Belief to become another Supporting Belief, and part of the "molecule." I have already mentioned, for example, how social Darwinism was made to serve as another Supporting Belief. Even though social Darwinism has been discredited, its principles are still used directly in bolstering the Basic Belief - even among those who strongly deny believing in social Darwinism.

Thus the composition of the "molecule" may vary within the same society from one faction to another as well as from one era to another. Only the Basic Belief has to remain constant if the same power structure is to continue. The Supporting Beliefs that will be discussed in this Chapter will only be the ones that seem to be the most potent as well as the most common in the American society at the present time.

NATIONALISM (PATRIOTISM, AMERICANISM):

When Aristotle wrote that people must be brought up to love their constitution, he was concerned with the stability of the power structure. A constitution legitimizes such a structure and sets the rules to operate within it. Once people are committed to love their constitution, they are automatically committed to accept and defend their ruling class. Constitution is but one of many abstract ideas that are invoked in instilling the nationalistic beliefs.

Hans Kohn<sup>1</sup> and some other historians think that nationalism as we know it started in the eighteenth century, particularly with the French Revolution, though its roots stretch back into antiquity. Perhaps the bourgeoisie of the French Revolution was capable of mobilizing more people than ever before to defend the new ruling class by using the symbol of "patrie."

Even though the concept of nationalism is usually associated with the nation-state, its use does not have to be restricted to such a formal body. Nationalism should be thought of as a strong identity with and loyalty to a structured group of people that is traditionally and historically determined. The nation-state may or may not exist as a formal structure, or it may become an aspiration for the future. Even though nationalism can be described as group-consciousness, it must be kept in mind that not any group-consciousness is nationalism. Nationalism's uniting force may include such things as constitutions, flags, national anthems, charismatic leadership, a real or mythical ancestry, a real or mythical history, a racial stock (mythical or real), language, culture, religion, traditions and customs, a fatherland (which may include an attachment to its rivers, forests, mountains, lakes, etc.), or simply a common enemy. In brief,

the uniting force behind nationalism is what the socializing agencies within the group decide it should be. It can be any of those mentioned, or a combination of them.

The idea of nationalism, it must be emphasized, is an acceptance of the power structure within the group. Its defense is against the outside enemy, and for the preservation of the status quo within. In this respect nationalism in itself is a conservative force, and not a revolutionary one. Any revolutionary movement that rides on nationalism can become self-defeating if it depends solely on the nationalistic sentiment.

Since nationalism is, like all other beliefs, a product of socialization, in order for it to develop and survive, it requires a network of communication among the members to be included in the group.<sup>2</sup> It can become a more potent force whenever there is a clash between the "US" and the "THEM." In modern times, a nationalistic identity can be extended to more people than ever before through the propagation and strengthening of certain common beliefs and symbols through the use of the modern means of communication.

With the modern means of communication, old and dead identities can be resurrected and revived, new identities can be created, new nationalisms can be built on a more extensive scale, and without destroying the old and narrower ones. An African nationalism can be created without destroying Nigerian or Ghanaian nationalism. An Arab nationalism can be resurrected without destroying Egyptian or Algerian nationalism. It is a false notion that nationalism has to be based on a single loyalty in order to be a potent force. An individual in the United States can be a loyal American while, at the same time, remain a loyal Italian, Jew, Irish, and so on. Nationalism, in other words, can exist as a hierarchy of loyalties. Multiple loyalty to groups is possible the same as multiple loyalty to

individuals as long as there is no conflict between the Hardened Beliefs that bind him to one and those that bind him to another.

Usually nationalism intensifies under circumstances of danger, persecution, feelings of inferiority of a group who has already developed a common identity. For the unity of action in the face of the common threat, the feeling of nationalism is rewarding, and thus self-reinforcing, which means it is likely to become a Hardened Belief. This may be one reason why throughout history, it has been considered a noble and desirable feeling.

For any propaganda to be effective, it has to be linked one way or another to already Hardened Beliefs. This is sometimes unfortunate, for, under revolutionary situations, new socializing agencies may find themselves forced to capitalize on some Hardened Beliefs they may consider obsolete. Ironically they find themselves promoting the very beliefs they meant to eradicate. A new elite - or class - must show that it represents the people that go under a certain identity, and has to invoke some symbols for which the people have already been conditioned. Under the circumstances, when the new forces are fighting for survival, it may be unwise to attempt an immediate reversal of socialization.

Thus we find nationalistic beliefs exploited by the bourgeoisie as well as by the Marxist mass movements. But while the former use nationalism for the preservation of the status quo, the latter use it for the destruction of the status quo. Basically, nationalism is a means to an end, but eventually, once it hardens, it may become an end in its own right. Naturally we must expect this to be more so in a more stabilized system. When a Marxist movement uses nationalism, it uses it with caution as a temporary tactic in an emergency situation, a tactic to be dispensed with as soon as the situation is stabilized. Therefore it would be a superficial analysis

if Marxist mass revolutions are simply dispensed with as nationalistic movements.<sup>3</sup> That sometimes what was meant to be a temporary tactic may, with time, become harder to eradicate, and thus becoming a more permanent feature than was planned, there can be no doubt. But that is the inherent problem of all Hardened Beliefs. Even with intensive reeducation, they cannot be expected to disappear overnight. And as long as the conflict between socialism and capitalism continues, it may be expected that nationalism will have a longer life than planned in the socialist countries.

While it is to the advantage of the capitalist class to have multiple divisions within the society, nationalism lies at the uppermost level in the pyramid of belief, and serves as a unifying force against the common enemy that may threaten the whole power structure. It also serves as another ingredient in the obfuscation of class identity. Ever since Marx and Engels spoke of the workers as having no country, the ruling classes, through their socializing agencies, have seen to it that the workers do have a country. The Communist Manifesto probably led more to ruling class consciousness than to working class consciousness. Several wars during which workers fought each other while those for whom they fought mostly watched, have proven the immense value of the nationalistic belief - the the ruling classes.

In America the Revolution created a spirit of unity and a new identity, and these were later used for the support of the new highly promoted legal structure. A cult of personality was built around George Washington, but his charisma was associated with the constitutional framework of the new nation. All attempts were made by his political, intellectual, and religious contemporaries to make Washington the quintessence of all the good qualities of the nation. His idealized image strengthened the image of the office



he represented as well as it did his own person.<sup>4</sup> The fact that he was the wealthiest man in America at the time established an association between wealth and high political office. Wealth, prestige, and power of course had always been associated; now all were tied with the esteemed presidency itself.

The President, from the beginning, became thought of as a representative of the "will of the nation" rather than the will of the privileged class - and that was at a time when he was elected by no one else but the privileged class. Later on when the popular vote was introduced, the belief in the Presidency having the whole nation as its constituency gained more ground. Probably the most remarkable achievement of the Constitution was that it created acceptable game rules for the peaceful transference of power from a group of individuals to another, and without the discontinuity of class rule, all this while avoiding the resort to the European system of heredity. With the passage of time, this oldest of all modern constitutions has been gathering strength. In a secularized school system, generations of teachers raised in the theological traditions instilled the same spirit of faith and devotion into this document, a spirit which they would have applied to the holy books.

It is true that some studies have shown that a great number of Americans show an undemocratic attitude, an authoritarianism towards opposing groups, or are not willing to apply some of those freedoms of the Bill of Rights to their opponents.<sup>5</sup> But it must be remembered that the Constitution was not meant to be democratic in the first place. The Bill of Rights may be considered as a collection of afterthoughts to the Constitution, some of which may not correspond very well with the Constitution's spirit.<sup>6</sup> Many (though not all) of the Amendments in the Bill of Rights may be viewed

as no more than protections of the propertied class against the potential dangers of government which could become dominated by the masses. Thus a lack of willingness to apply some of the stipulations of the Bill of Rights does not constitute a lack of faith in the Constitution as a whole.

The belief in the Constitution is a belief in the nation, a belief required of every citizen, a belief that has been nourished and sustained for almost two centuries. What is constitutional is not only equivalent to what is lawful, but also to what is good, right, and moral.

The constitutional institutions are supported, except for few exceptions, by the most estranged and least socialized among the population. A recent study, for example, conducted in Los Angeles after the Watts riot of 1965, showed that while as many as 45% of the blacks felt that their elected officials could not be trusted (as contrasted with 17% of the whites), still 82% of the blacks thought that U.S. Congress represented them well or a little, and only 10% of the blacks thought it did not. Thus the author of this study justifiably gives an optimistic evaluation: Los Angeles negroes did not withdraw from the arena of national partisan politics after the riot." Such a loyalty to the constitutional institution remains in spite of the fact that "blacks have actually been rather sympathetic to the rioting."<sup>7</sup>

As to the Presidency, it is probably the most glorified institution on earth. Since Washington, many Presidents have come and gone, many of them obvious mediocrities by any standards, all of them criticized bitterly as individuals while in office and after, and yet the Office itself remains without blemish. Americans cannot visualize their country surviving one day without a President. Every school book, from the primary school to college, tells the student about the awesome responsibilities of the Presidency, together with the long list of Presidential functions. Historians,

school teachers, politicians, journalists, office-seekers, etc. have all collaborated for the perpetuation of the Presidential mystique. The fact that the President must in the end make the final decisions that could mean the survival of the whole nation, if not the whole world, is looked upon with pride, admiration, and fatalistic surrender (instead of concern and fear when such a "lonely" man could well be psychotic). The way "lonely" Presidential decisions are made are described very much like that of a prophet receiving his call straight from God. A writer, for example, describes the mysterious phenomenon (when President Truman decided to enter the Korean war) with a mixture of romantic and biblical imagery:

"Always the wind of doubt must howl around the lonely peak of Presidential responsibility and especially at four in the morning. But Mr. Truman's reaction was prompt: Go ahead and send the troops."<sup>8</sup>

It may be of significance that in the annual Gallup poll as to the most admired man in the whole world, for 18 years out of 22, the person topping the list has been a President, and the four exceptions were three times for MacArthur who was a war hero (another glorified personality since George Washington), and once for Eisenhower who was an ex-President as well as a war hero.<sup>9</sup>

The electoral process is one of the most important factors in the hardening of the nationalistic belief. It has been repeatedly said that the President represents the "will of the people." What this really means is that in order for anyone to become President, he must express the most Hardened Beliefs of the population as a whole. Since those Hardened Beliefs are but the product of the system's socializing agencies, and the messages that the ruling class decides are worth spending money on, the President (even if we disregard the fact that he is handpicked by the moneyed interests to start with) will automatically represent the interests of the ruling class.

Even though of late, public relations has become more or less a science, wherewith the candidate can, with more certainty, tell each section of the population exactly what it likes to hear (push the right button), the "packaging of the President" would be much harder if he himself were not the very embodiment of those most common Hardened Beliefs,<sup>10</sup> He would never even be considered unless he had proved himself on many occasions to be just that whether in word or in action. Any political aspirant, whether for President or any other political office at any level of government, must be a true believer in its political and economic system. Anyone who wants to venture any alternatives may as well be more realistic, and look for a more fruitful pursuit.

The frequent political campaigns, and particularly the Presidential ones, serve, among other things, the reinvigorating of the faith, the same as attending church on Sundays. Voting has been urged as the duty and obligation of every citizen for generations, so much so that the average "good" citizen in America may feel as guilty for not going to the polls as when he does not eat turkey on Thanksgiving Day.<sup>11</sup> It is common knowledge that "participation in politics" increases with education and the rise in the socio-economic strata. Indeed this is one of the most notable "discoveries" of modern political science. What concerns us about this here is the fact that those who have been most exposed to the socializing agencies, and who are the more highly rewarded by the system are the ones who are more likely to maintain the faith in "working within the system in order to improve it."

The subtle achievement in this area of belief is remarkable. The belief in the political system has been a very hardened one, and so is the belief in the economic system, but the link between the two is left transparent, and hardly visible to most citizens, even though it is a powerful

link. The electoral process is a powerful device for making the masses bear the responsibility for the defects inherent in the capitalist system itself. That is besides its serving to bolster the power and legitimacy of the capitalist class. Indeed so invisible is the link that such statements would be automatically shrugged off as "simplistic Marxist propaganda."

The Extension Beyond the National Lines:

Even the link between the economic system and colonialism or imperialism is often ignored. Those who view international relations in the "realpolitik" frame of reference view the nation-states as immense aggressive monsters standing at each other's throats to prevent each other from unleashing their power of destruction. Such an endless grim soap opera is presented as a game that is played for its own sake. Such an approach should be viewed as a perception of reality rather than objective reality. But objective reality in human interactions cannot be separated from subjective reality. When the decision-makers of the nation-state are inculcated with such a belief, their interactions with other nation-states would be driven by it.

Hans Morgenthau, among others, speaks of this continuous search for power and more power among nations as an inevitable law of nature.<sup>12</sup> Statesman, according to him, "think and act in terms of interests defined as power, and the evidence of history bears this out."<sup>13</sup> Morgenthau argues that "there is an astounding continuity in foreign policy which makes American, British, and Russian foreign policy appear as intelligible continuum, by and large consistent within itself, regardless of the different motives, preferences, and intellectual and moral qualities of successive statesmen."<sup>14</sup> He does recognize what he calls the political and cultural context within which foreign policy is formulated,<sup>15</sup> and yet this "context"

is soon forgotten, and international relations are interpreted as a never-ending contest for power.<sup>16</sup>

Thomas Schelling, a scholar who represents the latest breed of strategists in the best spirit of Machiavelli and Clausewitz likes to compare rival international politics to the game of "chicken" where two motorists head for each other on a collision course, and the one who swerves aside first is called "chicken," and is jeered by the spectators, and loses the game.<sup>16</sup>

The history of international behavior so far does give some justifiable ground for the power game model. The recent history of U.S. policy in Indochina that has been followed faithfully by four successive Presidents does give credence to the Morgenthau thesis of "continuity." But what was it that determined that this potential national energy called "power" should consume itself in Indochina? (Morgenthau himself does not think that this should have been the case in the light of "the national interest" model, but the fact remains that it has been so.) What are the criteria that determine the time and place for the pursuit of these mysterious "national interests?" Does the ideology of nationalism in itself help explain that a war should be fought in Indochina rather than Indonesia, France, or the Bahamas? What makes this more of a puzzle is that the decision-makers may themselves be confused about their own motives, which of course makes it more confusing to the social scientists. In the case of the "four Presidents" the balance of power against China is stated as the justification for fighting Communism, while fighting Communism is given as a justification for the maintenance of the balance of power. The first argument is used when the spokesman is accused of being ideological (thus not a "realist"). The second argument is used when the spokesman is faced with the accusation of not being "pragmatic" (you cannot be pragmatic when

you get defeated).

The quandry may be better grasped if we treat both nationalism (in the context of other nationalisms) and anti-Communism as two Hardened Beliefs that are linked together in the American mind, both supporting the Basic Belief. Since Presidents and other decision-makers, as I mentioned earlier have to be the embodiment of the most common Hardened Beliefs, it should become easier to see why all four Presidents could not but follow the same policy.

When the international setting is perceived as a great big jungle, where only greater opposing power can prevent the plunder of another country, this can be viewed as an extension of capitalist relations within the nation-state, where "the survival of the fittest" is the guiding principle. A big power is expected to act in the true spirit of "rugged individualism" towards other nations, for that is her natural right.

Max Weber, who may justifiably be considered the high priest of bourgeois social science,\* and who spoke in the name of the ruling class, was well aware of this, and never tried to hide the fact:

---

\* There is hardly a concept or attitude in modern political science or sociology that does not have its roots in Weber's work: the Machiavellian attitude towards politics or international relations, the separation between economics and politics, instrumentalism and rationalism versus utopianism ("the ethics of ultimate ends"), anti-Marxism and anti-socialism, elitism, the admiration of the business class and politicians, the glorification of war and the hate of revolution, theories of modernization, the emphasis on the means rather than the ends, power to be pursued for its own sake, system equilibrium and stability, the nation-state as an ultimate value, the rationality of capitalism, the typological approach to sociology, a cynical attitude towards the quality of life of the masses, the willingness to put science at the service of power, etc.

Weber's successors, however, never attain the subtlety, insight, or depth of the master. Many of them did nothing but add vulgarity and superficiality to his original concepts.

"In the last analysis, the processes of economic development are struggles for power. Our ultimate yardstick of values is 'reasons of state,' and this is also the yardstick for our economic reflections..."<sup>17</sup>

In the words of Gerth and Mills, "...in the middle nineties, Weber was an imperialist, defending the power-interest of the nation-state as the ultimate value and using the vocabulary of social Darwinism."<sup>18</sup>

On the economic foundations of imperialism, Weber explains it this way:

"By forcibly enslaving the inhabitants, or at least tying them to the soil (glegae adscriptio) and exploiting them as plantation labor, the acquisition of overseas colonies brings tremendous opportunities for capitalist interest-groups."<sup>19</sup>

"The safest way of guaranteeing these monopolized profit opportunities to the members of one's own polity is to occupy it or at least to subject the foreign political power in the form of a 'protectorate' or some such arrangement. Therefore, this 'imperialist' tendency of expansion, which aims merely at 'freedom of trade.'"<sup>20</sup>

At the same time the nationalist belief in Weber was so completely hardened that it became the final criterion for any human action, a zone in which all objectivity, reason, and morality end. This is how it was expressed in his own words:

"Here (nationalism) we reach the frontiers of the human reason (Begriffsvermogen), and we enter a totally new world, where quite a different part of our mind pronounces judgement about things, and everyone knows that its judgements, though not based on reason, are as certain and clear as any logical conclusion at which reason may arrive."<sup>21</sup>

It can be argued that capitalism is not the only belief that can lead to imperialism. The belief in imperialism for its own sake, or simply as a symbol of national prestige, can become a motivating force for expansion. A religion that seeks to convert the whole world through brute force, once established, may act as an imperialist power. However, as was mentioned in Chapter Two, it would be much more difficult to harden a belief which contradicts the basic human needs. The struggle for power for its own sake



can bring only punishment, and little reward, which would make it almost impossible to sustain as a belief, or harden on a large scale. The rewards must at least be obtained by the ruling class who will have to be motivated enough in order to motivate the masses. Throughout history we find the most noble religious or social movements motivated by the war booty or some other economic incentives, and one wonders whether they could have ever taken place without these. Thus, while, without the material rewards, imperialism cannot be ruled out completely, we can safely postulate that it would become most unlikely.

It can also be argued that under socialism, imperialism may not be abolished. This may be so if nationalism continues to be a Hardened Belief, and in such a case the whole nation-state would act as a great capitalistic corporation. However, it must be quickly added that nationalism as an ideology will be given a good chance to weaken and eventually disappear in a socialist world based on cooperation. Most of the socialist regimes that exist now are still in a primary stage of development exposed to great dangers by a powerful capitalist world, and the fact that they still act as traditional nation-states is no proof that such will continue to be the case. Marxist ideology is internationalist in its scope, and it rejects any form of exploitation whether on the individual or national level. But it would be naive to assume that this can be accomplished in a short time, and without an intensive education on a world-wide scale. Thus, while the abolishing of capitalism is not in itself an automatic guarantee that imperialism, international anarchy, infantile intrigue, and war will all come to an end, it can be also stated that as long as capitalism and its ideology survive, there cannot be the slightest hope for these ills to disappear. The economic variables cannot and should not be separated from

the ideological variables, for ultimately they are both ideological. We cannot remove the capitalistic ideology while preserving the practice of capitalism.

When monopoly capital becomes global in its search for markets, raw materials, and cheap labor to be exploited, and the rewards are so high so as to keep reinforcing the belief in global capitalism, and when governments will have not only to protect such extended property, but to prevent any trend towards nationalization anywhere in the world, it can be clearly seen that imperialism and war are the sine qua non of monopoly capital.<sup>22</sup> It is quite true that imperialism has existed long before modern capitalism, but it has always taken place under an exploitative class rule of one kind or another.

It would be a shallow analysis to explain imperialism as a rational calculated scheme plotted by an elite of big capitalists (in cooperation with top militarists), and dictated to the political decision-makers. It is also a futile argument to show that some of the biggest capitalists are crying for peace at a certain time, or that the working class members are more chauvinistic or more imperialistically-minded than members of the capitalist class (which indeed may be the case). Unless we look at these phenomena in the light of the socialization process which is determined by the structure of power, we cannot understand the relationship between capitalism and imperialism.

Let us refer to the Vietnam war again in order to illustrate. Here is an example of an imperialist war which has supposedly created a great deal of division in the United States. The fact is, however, that there were very few dissenting voices in the whole country when it first started. Almost everybody was enthusiastic about "flushing out" the Communists. It had been a well-established, well-accepted U.S. policy to send its "fire brigade" (as the late President Kennedy put it) anywhere in the world to stop "Communist aggression." Such reaction to Communism had long become

instinctive. It is this Hardened Belief that had been generated for the protection of the global capitalist system that makes such a war unavoidable, and not the decision-making that could have differed slightly in tactics, but not in goals regardless of who was President at the time. In the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution where both national honor and the Communist threat were involved, almost the whole Senate gave the President a free hand to act. As to the population at large, a Gallup poll is most revealing. The same question has been asked: "In view of the developments since we entered the fighting in Vietnam, do you think the United States made a mistake sending troops to fight in Vietnam?" (It is unfortunate that this item was asked first in August, 1965, when the war was already proving a disappointment.) This is how the results went:<sup>23</sup>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>No opinion</u>
August 1965	24%	61%	15%
March 1966	25	59	16
May, 1966	36	49	15
Sept., 1966	35	48	17
Nov., 1966	31	51	18
Feb., 1967	32	52	16
May, 1967	37	50	17
July, 1967	41	48	11
Oct., 1967	45	44	10
Dec., 1967	45	46	9
Feb., 1968	46	42	12
March, 1968	49	41	10
April, 1968	48	40	12
Aug., 1968	53	35	12
March, 1969	52	39	9
Sept., 1969	58	32	10

These figures show clearly that the American people were turning against the war gradually as it was becoming more and more realizable that the war could not be won. Only brute force was forcing the Hardened Beliefs to change their course. The more nationalistic minds, until the present (late 1970) are not convinced that U.S. might can ever lose a war. They

insist that it is losing it simply because it does not want to win it (no-win policy).

That the U.S. is the greatest country in the world, and that it has never lost a war are some of the most cherished Hardened Beliefs. The fact that the U.S. has never lost a war in the past infers that it should not lose one now or in the future.

In another Gallup poll in March, 1970, a representative national sample was offered four plans for Vietnam. This is how the plans read, followed by the percentage of people supporting each one:<sup>24</sup>

Plan A: Withdraw all troops from Vietnam immediately	21%
Plan B: Withdraw all troops by end of 18 months	25%
Plan C: Withdraw troops but take as many years to do this as are needed to turn the war over to the South Vietnamese	38%
Plan D: Send more troops to Vietnam and step up the fighting	7%
No opinion	9%

What is also worth noting in this poll is the fact that has been repeatedly established in polls of this type: those with higher education are more supportive of official policies than the population at large.

This is how the figures went for those with college education:

Plan A:	18%
Plan B:	28%
Plan C:	43%
Plan D:	6%

It is immediately noticeable that the plan that gets the most support is the official plan of "Vietnamization" that is supposedly followed by the Nixon Administration. This plan is designed to do both: continue the fight against the Communist enemy, and preserve "the national honor."

The President in the meantime, who is the promotional head of the "Vietnamization" plan, according to Gallup polls in 1970, continues to be supported by about 50% of American adults who "approve of the way he is handling his job as President (versus about 30% who disapprove). For a President who was elected by hardly over 50% of the votes, and who, as far as the war is concerned, has achieved nothing but token withdrawal of troops (let alone the extension of U.S. involvement in Indochina and the rest of Asia), such a support should be considered phenomenal. It is symptomatic of the strength of the nationalistic as well as the anti-Communistic beliefs.

It has never failed. Every President worth his salt knows full well that the public will respond favorably whenever the "nationalistic button" is pressed (Do you want the greatest country in the world to retreat without honor in the face of a fourth-rate power?). The results above, after years of tragedy in Indochina, bear witness to this fact.

Young men get killed in Vietnam. Other young men and women at home demonstrate to protest the war: "Bring the boys home!" The "boys" themselves who are getting killed - or crippled - in Vietnam are very angry at those "unpatriotic bums" who are to blame for losing the war. The parents of the "good boys" in Vietnam are also very mad at those who want to bring their boys home "without honor" and "without victory." This is nationalism in action. To be more precise, this is a remnant of an ancient war culture: there is honor in routing the enemy and shame in defeat. To expose oneself to danger is bravery; to "scuttle and run" is shameful cowardice.

The usefulness of this war culture to the ruling class is immense: it forces the masses to support wards whose main aim may be nothing more than the preservation of the power structure that oppresses them;

it ascertains their support regardless of the justice or morality of the war itself, for the values of the war culture have been given priority over all other values. No less an authority than the devout John Foster Dulles has written: "We must plan and act on a grand scale. We must do mighty deeds, such as inspired only by war itself."<sup>25</sup> Idealist Woodrow Wilson declared: "When men take up arms to set other men free, there is something sacred and holy in the warfare, I will not cry 'peace' as long as there is sin and wrong in the world."<sup>26</sup>

The values of the war culture have nothing against US "punishing" THEM for the very same deeds we would commit ourselves if we were in their place. We punish the Vietnamese for setting up defense against our planes who want to destroy them\* Such Homeric stanzas as the Dullesian and Wilsonian ones are rooted in the traditional war culture that assumes there is something glorifying about war, a cleansing quality about blood shed on the battlefield, a righteousness and nobility on OUR side, an evil on THEIR side.

Since imperialism is an extension of the Basic Belief in the right to unlimited ownership at home, the nationalistic ethos becomes the best servant of imperialism when capitalistic ownership extends over the globe.

---

\* In fact the belief in punishment (or the threat of punishment) and reward lies behind all the thinking of the scholar strategists (i.e., see Schelling's book, Arms and Influence, op.cit.). The naivete of this faith in the effectiveness of punishment and reward is that it seems unaware of the enemy's hardness of belief. Punishment and reward will cease to be effective once the belief has completely hardened. In the case of the struggling Vietnamese whose new generations were born and raised in the shadow of wars of national liberation, we must expect the hardness of their belief in the justice of their cause to be total. And yet, we insist that the least compromise on our part must be accompanied with the threat of punishment so that the enemy will keep thinking that we are negotiating "from a position of strength."

The same way the American government is set up by capital to protect capital, so are scores of governments around the world set up by U.S. capital (or at least sustained by it in the case of the more traditional ones who show cooperation) quite often in direct opposition to the interests of the impoverished masses (is it any wonder that many of these governments cannot stand on their own feet one day without direct American military aid to protect them against their own people?) The same as within the U.S. itself, so are millions of American dollars spent within each of these countries to promote the belief in "free enterprise" and loyalty to the nation - which usually means loyalty to the government that protects American capital.

Americans who personally do not own any property that they can call their own have been led to speak of the whole world as if it were their own backyard: if we lose Vietnam, we shall lose Thailand and Cambodia, the same way we lost China; then we shall lose Indonesia, Japan, the Philippines, and so on... It is indeed going to be a tremendous job for 5% of the world population to protect such world wide "property." We can speculate that a great deal of the nationalistic spirit is going to be needed for such "mighty deeds" on such a "grand scale."

There is not the slightest sign that this situation will change for a long time to come. Even the most tearful critics of the Vietnam war in the Senate make it clear that the U.S. should pull out of Indochina because it is wasting its capability to wage or threaten war somewhere else where the stakes may be higher - such as in the Middle East. In May, 1970, some 75 Senators, including some of the most notable doves on Vietnam volunteered to offer the President advice to send Israel the 125 jets she had requested because, the Senators declared, they were worried the Russians might interpret the division in America over Vietnam "as a

sign that our nation will not take effective steps to protect our vital national interests in the Middle East."<sup>27</sup> It might be added that many of those same Senators cannot bear the idea of U.S. might pulling out of Vietnam without some kind of a self-deceptive face-saving symbolic device that will somehow blunt the appearance of defeat. It thus becomes clear that the cry for the pullout from Vietnam is only an expedient solution for a war that did not pay. The nationalistic spirit has not softened. The imperialistic tendencies have not mellowed.

The nationalistic ideology has always been used with great subtlety. Nobody dies fighting for the property of Standard Oil, the United Fruit Company, or the Rockefellers, but for "America," for "freedom," "democracy," and against "godless Communism." Aside from the military establishments (whose achievements in this area are commonplace knowledge they need no further comment), the schools, and other governmental agencies, many corporations, Chambers of Commerce, and many other "voluntary" associations take it upon themselves to keep the nationalistic spirit burning. H.L. Hunt, the multi-millionaire from Dallas, for one, sponsors a radio program called "Freedom Talk" that is heard daily over 331 radio stations across the land (Hunt who prides himself for having never done anything except for profit sells every three copies of "Freedom Talk" for a quarter, all this while advertising the Hunt products "which use patriotic media."). The Readers Digest, among other things, has distributed millions of flag decals in 1969. Some oil companies send beautiful flag decals with their bills, advising the customers to display their flag proudly. Some of the big radio stations advertise for a free flag that you can obtain for the asking. A great deal of "Americanism" is going to be needed to protect such world-side property, and those who own it seem to be well aware of this.



ANTI-COMMUNISM:

This negative belief is probably the most powerful Supporting Belief in America. Perhaps the following dialogue taken from a "Feifer Fable" presents a fairly accurate picture:

Two bland faces exchanging views:

- "- Vietnam is dead as an issue. The real issue is ecology.
- But what can we do about it?
- We have to control the environment.
- But how can we do that?
- We have to control pollution.
- But how can we do that?
- We have to control industrial waste.
- But how can we do that?
- We have to control industry.
- Oh, you mean socialism.
- Ecology is dead as an issue."<sup>28</sup>

What could be more valuable to a system than the complete rejection of its opposite? If capitalism has glaring defects that cannot be hidden from anyone, and yet any alternatives to it are rejected a priori, what else can one do but try to manage somehow in this best of all possible worlds?

Anti-Communism in America is not restrictively directed to Communist Parties, the Soviet model, or any other particular model of socialism; it is nothing less than a rejection in toto of any alternative system that may even partially interfere with the complete freedom of capitalist enterprise, let alone disappropriation. The labelling of the New deal policies as "socialistic" and "collectivistic" is a typical case in point (not to speak of the John Birch Society who, in all seriousness, accused Eisenhower of being a Communist).

Anti-Communism, as we know it, is a recent phenomenon, but, as I pointed out in Chapter Three, the fear of the rise of the masses has been the bugaboo of the ruling class from the very first days of the Republic. A conscientious and well-directed campaign to inject the fear of Communism

into the masses started during and after the Russian Revolution. After simmering down a little during the New Deal and World War II years, it was intensified to an unprecedented pitch during the Cold War, and reached its climax with the famous McCarthy Inquisitions (which does not have to be the last climax to be reached).

Anti-Communism did not restrict itself to intensive propaganda campaigns through all the socializing agencies, but also instituted a pervasive system of repressive measures against those who expressed non-conforming ideas, or engaged in non-conforming political activities. It is beyond the scope of this study to go into the rich historical record of Anti-Communism in America. Suffice it to mention briefly a few highlights just to refreshen our memory on the matter:

1. Together with other capitalist countries (Britain, France, Japan), the U.S. sent several thousand troops to Russia to interfere against the Revolution. Though the action was undecisive and ambiguous at first, it eventually became part of the counter-revolutionary forces once it became clear that the Revolution did present a threat to the world-wide capitalist system.
2. After World War I, the American press reached a high pitch of rabid hysteria, and successfully mobilized the masses in a merciless war against the Bolsheviks, the Reds, the Socialists, and all other "traitors."
3. Capitalists, individually, or through corporations, began organizing the patriotic societies. Such societies as the National Security League or the National Civic Federation were sponsored by such luminaries as Macy, Belmont, Gary, Dupont, Morgan, and Rockefeller. These, with other organizations, such as the American Legion and the Ku Klux Klan became most respectable at the time. It was decided that "the best antidote for Bolshevism is Americanism." No less than "100% loyalty" was demanded of all Americans. Any questioning of the capitalist system was tantamount to treason. These societies spread extensive propaganda either through the formal agencies, or directly to opinion-makers and community leaders all over the country (including millions of propaganda leaflets to millions of workers in their check envelopes).<sup>29</sup>
4. Two Acts were passed by Congress, The Espionage Act of 1917, and the Sedition Act of 1918. The latter prohibited the person, under pain of \$10,000 or 20 years in jail, to "utter, print, write, or publish any disloyal, profane, scurrulous, or abusive language about the form of government of the United States, or the Constitution..."<sup>30</sup>

5. Such famous socialist leaders at the time, as Eugene Debs, Victor Berger, and several others were found guilty of violating the Espionage Act, and thrown in jail for many years.

6. Such socialist organizations as the Industrial Workers of the World (The Wobblies) who, among other "crimes," opposed the War brought the wrath of a public already whipped up by patriotic hysteria. The members of the Wobblies became fair game to many loyal, God-fearing communities, and they were tortured, their offices raided, many were lynched, and brutally murdered. Many others were jailed on violation of the Espionage Act, and scores of State Acts custom-tailored to fit every situation at hand.

7. Between 1919 and 1920, under the direction of Attorney General Palmer, thousands of radicals in 23 States were rounded up and thrown in jail, many without the formality of a warrant; many were held incommunicado, and without the right of legal counsel; many were tortured without knowing why. The Attorney General was hailed by the media and the masses as the savior of the nation. 249 alien radicals were shipped out of the country to Russia on board of what was dubbed "the Russian Ark" to the cheers and relief of the millions of Americans who now felt much safer.

8. Meanwhile and later on, labor unions, the same as schools, universities, school text-books, corporations, government institutions, etc. were being purged and "cleaned" of all Communists, Communist sympathizers, fellow-travelers, socialists, socialist ideas or influences, in short anything that could "contaminate" the Basic Belief. This was done with the help of "private" as well as governmental agencies such as the F.B.I. and the C.I.A.<sup>31</sup>

9. The Security and Sedition Acts, the Supreme Court Decisions based on "the clear and present danger" principle, Loyalty Oaths of all kinds that were passed or instituted over the years are too numerous to cite here. Suffice it to say that when it comes to a serious threat to the power structure, the problem is not how to muffle the threat - legally, but which of these numerous laws would be the most fitting for each case. Of course, when the threat is of a trivial nature, a heartening rededication to the First or Fourteenth Amendment is invoked.

10. The Black Panthers who preach class struggle and a Marxist ideology have become the Wobblies of our time. J. Edgar Hoover declared that "the Black Panther Party...represents the greatest threat to the internal security of the country." Hundreds of arrests have been made around the country of Party members. At least two leaders have fled the country to escape similar fates. Two other leaders were murdered in their bed in Chicago at dawn by police raiders.

Anti-Communism is not characteristic of only those that the liberals refer to as "the radical right" or the "lunatic fringe." It has become an essence of the personality of the most liberal as well. As a matter of fact much of the anti-Communism of the conservative has been created and nourished by the liberal ideologues themselves. The far-rightist

differs only in his overestimation of Communistic power in America, his deep suspicion of government, and of many individuals in its higher echelons, and not in his abhorrence of Communist ideology which is supposed to be shared by every true American. In general it can be said that these rightist groups have their anti-Communist belief more hardened than the average American.\*

Perhaps the Stouffer study<sup>32</sup> of the early fifties gives us a rough idea as to the degree of hardening of this belief in America. All signs show that the findings in this study still hold true. According to the Stouffer surveys, 93% of the population cross-section, and 89% of the community leaders thought that an admitted Communist should not be allowed to teach in the high school. If his loyalty has been criticized, but he swears he is not a Communist, 16% of the community leaders would still want to fire him while 22% of the cross-section would. Some of the major findings in this study is that the cross-section is less willing to accord the socialist the right to express his views freely than the community leaders - including businessmen.<sup>33</sup>

In this study the emphasis is more on tolerance rather than on anti-Communism. The higher intolerance in the cross-section may be more due to the education variable rather than the economic or other variables involved. Indeed the study does show direct correlation between education and tolerance (66% of the college graduates are classified as "more tolerant; "under the same classification would fall 53% of those with some college, 42% of

---

\*On a panel television show of a radical right group, a Christian white suburban lady declared that she would kill her own children with her own hands if she knew the Communists have taken over in this country. The others on the panel agreed they would do the same. This should have pleased the late Senator Vandenberg who is reported to have advised President Truman at the start of the Cold War that "we must scare the hell out of the American people about Communism." Indeed so many Americans now are so scared they see red

those with high school, 29% of those with some high school, and only 16% of those with grade school<sup>34</sup>). It is clear that anti-Communism is not based on rational economic self-interests. Indeed rational self-interest in itself cannot harden the belief to such a degree where it becomes defeating to those very interests.

A large majority of Americans thought that Communists presented some kind of danger to this country. These are the figures in answer to the question: How great a danger are American Communists to this country?

Very great	19%	No danger	2%
Great	24%	No opinion	8%
Some danger	38%		
Hardly Any	9%		

In other words, 81% thought that Communists presented danger to a higher or lesser degree.<sup>35</sup>

A survey by the National Opinion Research Center in 1963 showed that 68% of the American people would not allow a Communist to make a speech; 66% would take his books off the public library shelves; 90% would fire him from a high school teaching post; 89% would fire him from a college professorship; 77% would take away his American citizenship; 61% would put him in jail; and 64% would give the government the right to listen to his private telephone conversations.<sup>36</sup>

What is most noticeable in the above is the extra concern and fear in the field of ideas where the overwhelming majority of Americans would simply avoid exposing themselves or their children to the threats of the Anti-Belief. The Stouffer study also showed that the American fear of Communists was in the area of "conversion" more than anywhere else (i.e., sabotage, spying, etc.). Nothing could be a more positive symptom of the extreme

hardening of the belief than this.\*

Another national survey by Free and Cantril conducted in the fall of 1964 (and published in 1968)<sup>37</sup> contained an item similar to that in the Stouffer study above.

How much danger do you think the Communists right here in America are to this country at the present time?

A very great deal	28%	None at all	3%
A good deal	34%	Don't know	6%
Not very much	29%		

The similarities between this and the Stouffer's study conducted some twelve years earlier are striking though the answers are not expressed in exactly the same way. What is to be noted most is the increase of those who think the danger is very great or great, while the number of those do not perceive communism as a danger at all remains a very small minority.#

#### The Content:

The results above should come as no surprise to anyone familiar with

\* In informal conversations with several Americans, I discovered that all those I have talked to strongly insist that they would rather be told the truth in case it is discovered they have a fatal disease. It is interesting that facing one's death is to be avoided less than ideas threatening to his Hardened Beliefs.

# In contrast to the above, it should be heartening to the ruling class to know how much trust and faith the American public holds for their organizations, the big corporations. While the majority of the American people (52% versus 30%) would like to see labor unions subject to more governmental control, some 60% did not think it would be necessary to interfere in the case of the big corporations. Only some 30% showed some concern about "bigness." (Free and Cantril: pp. 129-133) This shows, among other things, the power of the purse on the shaping of beliefs.

the content of anti-Communist propaganda. Communism has been presented as a threat to everything held sacred by the average American, from God, family, and motherhood, to the American flag, the suburban home, and the colored television set, from the right to play ball, or eat cereal in the morning, to the right to think or speak. The anti-Communist barrage has been directed at all levels: from the most pedantic to the most pedestrian, custom-made to fit every taste and pocket-book packaged and promoted to reach every market. It included the attack at Marxism as a philosophy, at Leninism as a program for action, at Marx and Lenin as personalities, at the Soviet Union as THE model for Communism (to bourgeois ideologues Stalin was the best thing that every happened), at the Soviet Union's behavior as a nation-state, at any other country that has "fallen" to the Communists.

The following are a few illustrations:

According to a study by Roland F. Gray in 1964,<sup>38</sup> almost every State in the Union had some kind of policy of preparing courses, recommending, or requiring that a course on Communism be taught in its schools. The aim of such courses is admittedly to assert that Communism is a total evil, and a menace to civilization. The State of California Board of Education statement is among the most moderate:

"...while such study should be objective and scholarly in its approach it should develop clearly the threat of Communism to the free world."

Perhaps the statement of the State of Nebraska is more in tone with the rest. The aim of the course is "teaching the dangers, fallacies, and contradictions of Communism...to help high school students understand that the Communist goal is to enslave the world..."

The State of Louisiana students must realize that "Russian propaganda techniques are the most evil and insidious kind of warfare that the world

has ever known...Russia is at war with America...they are our mortal enemies... America must establish final and complete victory over Communism as its primary goal for the future."

In a previous study I did on the subject,<sup>39</sup> I examined some of the material used in these courses as well as the material in some of the most used history texts (in the State of Illinois). We need not go into any detail on this here except to mention that the general tone of most of this material is that of suspicion, fear, and outright hatred. The major aim is apparently not to enlighten or inform, but to mobilize future soldiers against this new mysterious breed of world conquerors. Some of the publications used in the courses on Communism go as far as to prepare those future soldiers for a possible nuclear showdown. We must stand firm, the student is told repeatedly, in the face of this sinister enemy regardless of the price. One publication states flatly that "we must not be hypnotized by the horrible destructiveness of modern military weapons," and that other instruments, such as economic and psychological means will "have to supplement, not replace American reliance on nuclear retaliation... We must have the stamina to face up to the challenge which history has put on our national doorstep."<sup>40</sup>

In a collection of articles selected by the Readers' Digest, and designed to be used in the high schools, one article defines Communism as "a militant and semimilitary faith...it makes the morality of war its permanent single standard."<sup>41</sup> Another article in the same publication declares that compromise with Communism on the part of freedom should not be an alternative to nuclear holocaust.<sup>42</sup>

Even Brzezinski and Huntington who cannot be accused of lacking in the anti-Communist spirit express some shock at these courses' approach to the subject:



"These courses reflect a recurring fear in the United States that indirect socialization is not enough and that direct ideological politization is needed to instill the proper patriotic enthusiasm."<sup>43</sup>

To try to find out about the attitude of the social studies teachers who are likely to be teaching such courses, in the study I referred to above (n.39), I conducted a small mail survey on the social studies chairmen of a stratified random sample of the schools of Illinois. Among the items that were included in the survey, one statement read as follows:

"I approve of our using military alliances and military power around the world trying to prevent the spread of Communism."

86% of the teachers in the sample agreed to this item. Only 12% disagreed. And this was in the second half of 1967, at the height of the Vietnam war, and at a time when the war was becoming very unpopular.

Perhaps the Hoover Institution on War, Revolution, and Peace typifies some of the fountainheads of anti-Communist literature. This Institution is a subsidiary of Stanford University, a memorial to Herbert Hoover who was also one of its benefactors; it was he who laid down the philosophy and purpose of this Institution:

"The purpose of this Institution must be, by its research and publication, to demonstrate the evils of the doctrines of Karl Marx - whether Communism, Socialism, economic materialism, or atheism - this to protect the American way of life from such ideologies, their conspiracies, and to reaffirm the validity of the American system."<sup>44</sup>

These lofty aims were acceptable to Stanford University, its trustees, and the "value-free" academics who were going to work in the Institution. The budget for this Institution has grown to \$2 million since many generous philanthropists have been satisfied with its published products which reach educational institutions at all levels as well as the public at large.

The Hooverian Weltanschauung:

J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the FBI is the author of a famous book on the "Communist conspiracy" called Masters of Deceit. This book had

28 printings between 1959 and 1968. The respectable New York Times called it "indispensable...the most authoritative book ever written on Communism in America." The Christian Herald called it "the most important - indeed the most imperative book of the decade...powerful and informative and up-to-date." This book has been used in hundreds of schools and read by millions of Americans. For a long time, before the publication of this book, Mr. Hoover had been considered an authority on Communism by the public at large. In the Stouffer study we referred to earlier, 52% of the national sample picked Hoover as "the man whose opinion as to how to handle Communists is respected (as against 16% for Eisenhower, 5% for Joe McCarthy, and 20% for all others).<sup>45</sup>

This is how Mr. Hoover informs his readers about the subject:

"Communism is more than an economic, political social, or philosophical doctrine. It is a way of life; a false materialistic 'religion.' It would strip man of his belief in God, his heritage of freedom, his trust in love, justice, and mercy. Under communism, all would become, as so many already have, twentieth century slaves."<sup>46</sup>

What Mr. Hoover says on the subject is important not only because of his position as an authority, and his vast readership, but also because his approach, his style, and his ideas typify what the average American learns about the subject from hundreds of other sources. His views are reflected in history and civic books, in scholarly works, in newspapers and magazines, in political speeches (all the way from Presidents and generals to mayors and local civic leaders) in radio and television broadcasts, in the military indoctrination courses, in short in all the socialization agencies.

Hoover describes the horror of a Communist doomsday as follows:

"Under communism, a tiny minority, perhaps ten to twenty men, would rule the United States (which would become part of the Soviet Union as the text earlier explained)...The Constitution and all our laws would be abolished. If you owned productive property you would be arrested as an 'exploiter,' hauled before a revolutionary court, and sentenced to a concentration camp - that is if you convinced the 'judge'

you were worth saving at all. All property used in production would be confiscated, thus leading ultimately to total communization, meaning state ownership. This confiscation would include your home, business, bank deposits, and related personal possessions. These would 'belong to everybody.' You have no 'right' to own them under the communist scheme."<sup>47</sup>

What is noteworthy in the above is again the usual lack of differentiation between personal property and the ownership of the means of production. In the first part of the paragraph, the author does mention that what would be abolished is "productive property." But the term is soon used loosely for all property, not excluding one's own home and "personal possessions." Whether such a confusion is intentional or is due to oversight or ignorance is hard to tell, and is none of our concern. As it is, however, the impact hits the millions of readers. It is indeed a clever twist - if it is done intentionally - for, by hitting everybody's pocketbook, everybody is struck by the fright instead of the few who own the productive property.

Hoover's communism is straight out of 1984. It is common knowledge that FBI undercover agents have infiltrated every organization, university, society, or group that may be expressing some "subversive" ideas; the Agency snoops daily on telephone conversations, keeps millions of files on individuals who may have once said the wrong thing at the wrong time. FBI agents have recorded activities of couples in their hotel rooms in order to blackmail them. It has been reported by ex-FBI men that agents may be assigned to spy on other agents in order to assure they all lead a "clean" sex life. For the person who rules this agency with an iron fist, to project this type of world should be quite understandable. Here is Hoover's image of life under Communism:

"Communists want to control everything: where you live, where you work, what you are paid, what you think, what streetcars you ride (or whether you walk)...even the time your alarm clock goes off in the morning or the amount of cream in your coffee, are subjects for state supervision."<sup>48</sup>

Anti-Communism in Action:

In a recently published book,<sup>49</sup> Michael Parenti declares that the United States' perception of the world's political reality - at least since World War II - has been negative. Everybody knows what we are against, but nobody seems to know what we are for, says Parenti. The fact that Parenti is a political scientist, and searching for "political" answers should explain why he is hesitant to identify America's positive purpose.

Actually anti-Communism is no more than an artificial manufactured belief to preserve what America stands for. America stands for the expansion of capital and profit for a very small class of its population, and Communism threatens the very heart of what America stands for. Strange, is it not? When stated that nakedly without all the lofty platitudes, it sounds kind of shocking. But why should it be? After all, when talking about the greatness of free-enterprise, what could be more noble than profit-making? But a nation is something else. Convention demands that a nation must stand for something more than sordid material gain. Therefore the national aim must be carefully wrapped in colored shiny gift-paper. One way of doing this is to promote imperialism as a crusade against evil unless you convince people it is evil?

Therefore Communism and mass revolutions, which are gradually gnawing at the global capitalist system, must be made evil. This, in a nutshell, is what anti-Communism is all about.

The danger of this situation should be obvious. It is rather difficult to convince the masses of the world that their exploitation for the fattening of a few individuals is good for them (your political development is more important than your economic development!). Faced with Marxist ideology, which corresponds with human biological needs, the capitalist class (and its agents) finds itself drowning in money, and bankrupt of ideas. It finds

itself resorting to witch-hunting, deception (which includes self-deception), and above all, brute force. America's obsession with its Basic Belief puts her on an inevitable collision course with the masses of the whole world.

We have to stand firm." "We must be tough." "We must show will and determination." "Power is the only language THEY understand." This has been America's general attitude towards Communism. She "stood firm" during and after the Russian Revolution, and yet the Communists succeeded. America "stood firm" in the face of Stalin after World War II, and yet Stalin became more intransigent, and established "friendly governments" in one Eastern European country after another. When the NATO alliance was formed, Stalin had already achieved his goals in Eastern Europe, but Deterrence had already become a sacred word. It symbolized "will" and "determination." Force had stopped Hitler, and now it was supposedly stopping Communism. The Kremlinologists were telling everyone that both Hitler and the Communists were "totalitarian," and therefore they were one and the same. Since Communism - like Nazism - was out "to enslave the world," but did not go any further than the Iron Curtain, deterrence must have worked. Generations of Americans have been raised on NATO, SEATO, CENTO, etc., symbolic shields to protect America and its "Free World."

Since the Monroe Doctrine had worked so well in Latin America - and immortalized Monroe, now almost every President since World War II has had his own Doctrine, protecting a whole region of the globe, and above all, guaranteeing a place for his name in the history textbooks. Meanwhile, China and a few other Asian nations became Communist, and all without being conquered by "the Bosses of the Kremlin." The reaction was not that perhaps it was not a matter of "firmness" and "determination." Quite the opposite, the reaction was - and still is - that we did not show enough of the same. And new mighty forces were built up, and new alliances formed.

Then Cuba "fell," and all the military "shields," "determinations," and Presidential Doctrines did not prevent this "cancer" from spreading right next to America itself. Need we talk about Korea, the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, and all the rest of the "dominos?" No decision-maker would go as far as suggest that perhaps it is not a matter of "eye-ball to eye-ball," or that Communism was a set of ideas, an awareness, something different from the old conquering armies, or that this type of animal cannot be scared away the way you scare away a wolf or a Hitler.\* But we must be tolerant about America's gut reactions. America's Basic Belief compels her to protect world monopoly capital at any cost; after all the mystifications had failed, if she does not use brute force, what else can she use? This is the tragedy of America's Basic Belief.

The Belief in Religion:

A belief in a god or the immortality of one's soul differs from beliefs of a more worldly nature in that it has to result solely from repeated verbal messages or their symbolic equivalence. No god will ever appear in the sky to declare his existence or enforce his morality. Neither will anyone come back after death and tell his experiences (even though many people with strong faith may insist that they do).

Religion, or the belief in supernatural forces, happens to be one of

---

\* This is not to deny the fact that there have been many cases when brute force or "counter-insurgency" measures did succeed (i.e., Guatemala, The Congo, The Dominican Republic, etc.) in crushing leftist movements, and reinstalling reactionary forces in power, enough cases to reinforce the faith in brute force. The question is: for how long can these "victories" be preserved when all of these regimes have to be continuously protected by American might (and dollars) against their own people?

man's earliest interpretation of a complex universe, but which also proved a powerful means of social control. The supernatural forces have been resorted to by parents to scare their children into obedience as well as by rulers to scare their subjects into subjugation.

Though many religions may have been started by oppressed groups, as indeed Christianity itself began, and though many religions have been used as revolutionary forces against superior oppressors,<sup>50</sup> once a particular religion is adopted by a ruling class, as also happened in the case of Christianity, the religious belief becomes linked with the Basic Belief of class rule, and the same gods that were originally crying for the relief and salvation of the underdog now become the voices of established authority, crying for "law and order."

#### Religion in the American Milieu:

It is a well-known historical fact that America became a haven for a number of religious sects who fled from European persecution to start their new colonies in the New World. This, with other historical and environmental factors (which we need not go into here) made America's destiny tied up with its religious life.

All the European visitors who wrote about America in the nineteenth and early twentieth century were impressed by the influence of religious beliefs on people's lives. De Tocqueville commented "...there is no country in the world where the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America."<sup>51</sup>

A 1957 U.S. sample survey of religious affiliation indicated that over 95% of the population state belief in God and declare an affiliation with some specific religious group.<sup>52</sup> The supply of clergymen has not dwindled much since 1900: there were 1.22 clergymen per 1000 population in 1900, and 1.13 in 1960.<sup>53</sup>

Churches in America are powerful establishments, in many cases acting as big corporations, controlling businesses, taking advantage of their tax-exempt status as non-profit-making organizations. The total amount of assets of the churches cannot be accurately determined, but it has been estimated in the tens of billions of dollars. The Catholic Church is a global financial super-power with its center in the Vatican. According to some estimates, the Vatican's productive capital must be between \$8.5 and 10 billion, with \$3.4 billion in foreign investments, much of which in the U.S. (the Vatican denies the accuracy of these figures, and angrily retorts they are grossly inflated). The Catholic Church as well as all other churches have been doing their share by using much of their untaxed wealth in the deadly struggle for the survival of a capitalist world. The Vatican, according to the above report, has been lately pouring large amounts of capital to help save people's souls from "Marxist materialism."

In the history of imperialism, missionaries have either preceded the armies to "prepare the way," or followed them to save the "heathens'" souls, which of course made the "heathens" domination easier. Towards the end of the nineteenth century, when the United States entered the world arena as a great imperialist power, more than enough ecclesiastics were found to sprinkle the departing armies with holy water. Churchly voices were heard everywhere blessing America's new ventures across the seas to bring the light to the "barbarous" people of the world. The missionary spirit did not limit itself to religious matters, but justified the expansion on evolutionary grounds. This may sound paradoxical, for while the fundamentalists were fighting evolution like the devil, the religionists who were more in the economic and political main stream were trying very hard to synthesize religion with social Darwinism. Among these, Josiah Strong,



a Congregationalist minister decided that the theory of evolution only substantiated the doctrine of predestination. Just like Calvin and Carnegie, so America was handpicked by the Lord to lead the Anglo-Saxons in transforming the world. The Board of Foreign Mission welcomed the expansion as "an ally " The same as imperialism was deemed necessary for the preservation and revitalization of the economic system so some reverends began declaring that expansion was necessary for the preservation of the Church itself.<sup>55</sup>

In America churches compete with each other to win people's souls and dollars in the same competitive spirit of capitalism; they advertise through various media; some of them have set up the gaudiest neon signs and flickering multi-color lights; many own their own radio stations, their publishing houses, magazines, and newspapers; many conduct their own "market research" in various neighborhoods to see how they can win more members to the fold; still others have their own traveling salesmen selling their publications, and winning prospective souls. Hundreds of radio stations across the land carry day and night the shrill voices of dedicated ministers crying for the salvation of men's souls, and the damnation of God's enemies, Communists, socialists, and fellow-travelers. There are also preachers, quacks, and faith-healers of all variety over the radio-waves, many of whom cheerfully announcing that Armageddon is here, hallelujah! Prayers and sermons, just like any other commodities, come in all grades and colors (except the red and pink!) to cater to every taste. What tolerance! Styles of speech range from the learned and pontifical to the incoherent and hysterical (many of the latter, in a non-religiously-oriented society would certainly be under psychiatric care). Several preachers over radio stations and from their pulpits have defended and

justified, among other things, the My Lai massacre, the "tiger cages" in Vietnam (the enemy does it too), and the shooting of students at Kent State (they had no business being there). Others inform their listeners that Jesus fully supported the establishment of his time, and hated revolutionaries (the money-lenders in the synagogue were revolutionary!). At least one fundamentalist preacher was heard trying very hard to prove that Jesus had his hair cut short in a style approaching a crew-cut.

The Billy Graham Crusades to win souls for Jesus have been sponsored by big capital, and Billy himself lives quite "comfortably," and has been the cherished companion of successive Presidents. It must be of significance that Billy Graham has appeared repeatedly among the top ten in Gallup's "Most Admired Men" list, and in 1969, he was second only to President Nixon, ranking even higher than the greatly admired Agnew himself.<sup>57</sup>

Armed with the zeal of faith, religious people make the best soldiers for the defense of "freedom." In an irrational class system that is supposedly regulated by an "Invisible Hand" nothing can be as helpful as a blind faith that fully accepts, and does not ask questions.

Militarism has long been married to religion ("Stand up, stand up for Jesus, Marching as to war"), and the long history of the Crusades and the numerous European religious wars bear witness to this - though we must add that such a trait is by no means typical of the Christian religion along. There is a great historical affinity between the Church and the military. This is mainly because of the similarity in the socialization of their recruits, where the approach is indoctrinational and dogmatic, and the set-up hierarchichal, authoritarian, and formalistic.\* The one defends

---

\* This may not strictly apply to some of the more modern theological seminaries attached to universities where questioning does occur, the faith does weaken, and a growing number of seminarians do become "subversives." More on this in the next chapter.

the established order with the sword, the other with incantations, and both use the power of suggestion. It has been found that none of the top military leaders in the U.S. is without a religious faith. Of the West Point seniors in 1960, all except 13% professed a religious affiliation<sup>58</sup> (13% may sound high, but if compared with a study of male undergraduates at eleven colleges and universities in 1952, where 24% of the students were found to be atheists or agnostics,<sup>59</sup> 13% is relatively low).

Repeated studies have shown that a correlation exists between religiosity and bigotry, authoritarianism, dogmatism, chauvinism, absolutism, and militarism. This should come as no surprise since religious beliefs are based solely on authority, and do not have to be tested with concrete evidence. The very power of these beliefs lies in their divorce from the physical world. This way, during the hardening process, observation of the physical and social environment in itself, even when obviously contradicting the religious belief, will not slow down the hardening. Compartmentalization may occur when the subject is educated in the scientific method. Abstract religious belief is capable of sustaining itself in a separate region of the mind. The American system of education which formally is not supposed to teach religion helps such a compartmentalization to take place since scientific discussions are usually carried out without considering the religious beliefs, while allowing other agencies to carry out religious indoctrination unhampered. The blind acceptance of the believer of such as biblical and church authority automatically makes him more susceptible to the authority of the dominant class which is supported by his church authority. Not only that, but he is also made gullible to accept the fantastic obfuscations and mystifications offered to him by the ruling class agencies.

The deeply religious person can become most dangerous in matters of war and peace, for, to him, life on this earth is of secondary importance. In his dichotomous interpretation of the world as good and evil, dropping nuclear bombs to wipe out the forces of evil is justified even when it becomes fully clear that these "forces of evil" are themselves capable of wiping his side out in the same way. Since the good souls, as the Book says, are saved, while the evil ones are doomed, the death of those who have God on their side is different from those who do not. The latter will perish while the former will live eternally in Heaven.\* Taken in its abstract form, once accepting the premises, such a conclusion is frightfully logical. This is not to allude that such absolutist and fatalistic mental patterns are restricted to religious beliefs. The important point is that in the American case (among many others) religion happens to have played an essential role in the defense of the system. Religion and nationalism, God and country are the two forces blended together in the programming of the fighting as well as the ideological soldier.

In her book on the teaching of social studies in the American schools, published in 1930, Pierce quotes from a civics book designed for the elementary grades of the twenties:

"I am an American. My country is the freest, the richest, and the most beautiful land on earth. My flag is unstained. My Navy is unconquered. My Army defends the freedoms of the world. The faith of America is faith of God and man...I thank God for the privilege of being a child of America. I pray that I may be worthy of the privilege..."<sup>60</sup>

---

\* After the famous Pueblo incident, the Remember-the-Pueblo Committee, a religio-patriotic group headed by a clergyman demanded, among other things, the dropping of nuclear bombs over Korea if all else failed to put the Koreans on their knees, this with the full acknowledgement that the crew we were trying to save would perish as well - not to mention the other consequences of such action.

Some thirty years later, writing for adults, J. Edgar Hoover suggests the following as a counter-offensive to the "deceptive and perverted" ideological study of the Communists:

"In our homes and schools we need to learn how to 'let freedom ring.'... For too long we have had a tendency to keep silent while the Communists ...have been telling the world what is wrong with democracy. Suppose every American spent a little time each day, less than the time demanded by the Communists, in studying the Bible, and the basic documents of American history, government and culture. The result would be a new America, vigilant, strong, but ever humble in the service of God."<sup>61</sup>

Thus a concoction of Bible and Americana is prescribed as an immunizing agent against the Marxist disease. This is a tried concoction which has not failed as yet.

Some Studies on Religiosity:

In a Canadian survey conducted by Pauland Lanlicht (1963) a scale of "religious dogmatism" was constructed, and its results correlated with answers to questions dealing with the Cold War, war and peace, nuclear bombs, etc. The main conclusion was that "religious dogmatism" was associated (significantly) with an acceptance of bigger military forces, being favorable to (or at least not being afraid of) the spread of nuclear weapons, and being distasteful of, if not actually hostile, to a coexistence policy.<sup>62</sup>

In another study by P.I. Rose (1963), an index of religiosity was computed from a series of question about the 437 respondents' "belief in God, church attendance, and how religious they considered themselves to be." Of those scoring high on religiosity, 62% agreed that "Communism is an evil in the world that must be stamped out," as compared with 26% of those low on religiosity. On the other hand, 27% of those lowest in religiosity as compared with 8% of those highest agreed that "Communism is simply a different system which should not be condemned." Of those highest

in religiosity, 32% saw the possibility of war (between Communism and democracy) as "very great" or "great," compared to 11% of those low on religiosity.<sup>63</sup>

A more recent study (1968) by Milton Rokeach examined the value systems of over 1000 Americans. (The sampling and collecting of data was handled by the National Opinion Research Center of the University of Chicago). The sample was selected to represent all adult ages, social classes, and parts of the country. The author was able to conclude the following from this study:

"The general picture that emerges from the results is that those who place a high value on salvation (high religiosity) are conservative, anxious to maintain the status quo and unsympathetic to the black and the poor. They had reacted fearfully or even gleefully to the news of Martin Luther King's assassination ("He brought it upon himself."), are unsympathetic with student protests, and they do not want the Church to become involved with the social or political issues of our society. Considered altogether the data suggest a portrait of the religious-minded as a churchgoer who has a self-centered preoccupation with saving his own soul, and an alienated, other-worldly orientation coupled with indifference toward a tacit endorsement of - a social system that would perpetuate social inequality and injustice."  
(parentheses and emphasis added)<sup>64</sup>

In 1968 a group of psychologists conducted a survey on 1580 Protestant ministers in California. Their findings confirmed the strong influence of what they termed "other-worldliness" on the lack of concern on the part of the religious with the social or economic ills of society. This study divided the sample into 5 groups based on a doctrine index. The least doctrinaire were referred to as the modernists; the most doctrinaire as the traditionalists. On racial problems, 78% of the modernists had given a sermon during the previous year, while only 25% of the traditionalists did. On the UN and world peace, 33% of the modernists did give a sermon, while only 6% of the traditionalists did. On national poverty, 68% of the modernists spoke, but only 12% of the traditionalists did. 75% of the

modernists approved of a minister giving a sermon on controversial political or social topic, but only 12% of the traditionalists did. What is of interest is that all groups thought that their congregation disapproved of such topics (only 7% of the modernists and 4% of the traditionalists thought their congregation approved).<sup>65</sup>

The value of the hardened religious belief is that it creates the automatic defender of the system who only needs to be told that the alternative is anti-religious. Religion offers capitalism precisely what it needs: a fractionation of the "majority" through sectarianism, and at the same time, a unification against the "godless" and "materialist" enemy from without. Religion could have probably been on its deathbed now in the developed countries had it not been for a well-mobilized effort on the part of capital to keep the religious fire burning.

A Gallup poll taken in January, 1970 shows that 75% of the American people think that "religion has been losing its influence on American life." This is a rise from 14% in 1957 when religious influence is said to have reached its peak in America.

Church attendance has also been dropping in the last few years, but not sharply. Between 1955 and 1963 the percentage of adults who happened to have attended church in the previous seven days ranged between 46 and 49%. In 1964, it was 45%, and so it was in 1967. In 1968, it was 43%; in 1969, 42%.<sup>66</sup> Not attending church regularly does not necessarily mean a loss of religious faith, for the church is not the only socializing agency in this area, and those agencies who do not reinforce the faith hardly ever challenge it. It can also be said that church attendance must leave its mark on the individual. It is of interest to note that those with higher education again score higher: their church attendance is 46%;

for those with high school it is 42%; those with grade school 41%. Much of the drop has been in the Catholic Church where attendance has dropped from 74% in 1958 to 63% in 1969, but in spite of a gradual degeneration within this church, it still scores much higher than the Protestant Churches where attendance was 37% in 1969.

In conclusion we may say that while this belief may have been softening slightly, it still remains a potent weapon for the defense of the system.



### Footnotes

#### Chapter V: The Supporting Beliefs

1. Hans Kohn: The Idea of Nationalism, Collier Books, The Macmillan Co., New York, 1944, particularly see "Introduction".

2. Karl W. Deutsch: Nationalism and Social Communication, second ed., The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966, esp. Chapter 5, "Nationality and Social Learning."

3. Such a thesis has been propounded, among others, by John H. Kautsky: Political Change in Underdeveloped Areas: Nationalism and Communism, John Wiley & Sons, 1962, pp. 31-89.

Like most analyses of bourgeois social science, this thesis adopts the appearance or the form, and ignores the main essence. How, we may ask, can a movement whose aim is to destroy the ownership of the means of production can avoid a conflict with foreign powers when these powers are themselves the owners?

For the way nationalism is viewed by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, see Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963, pp. 398-402, 625-630:

"Communists support nationalism only in so far and as long as it serves the cause of winning national freedom and victory over imperialism, and feudalism, and awakening in the masses a sense of their own dignity, which the oppressors suppressed and derided. All preaching of racial or national exclusiveness...as an instrument of national egotism and subjugation of other peoples, or for the struggle against the just demands of the masses cannot meet with the sympathies of Communists." p. 402

4. On Washington's charisma and what it meant to his contemporaries, see Seymour Martin Lipset: The First New Nation, A Doubleday Anchor Book, Doubleday, New York, 1967, pp. 17-68.

5. e.g., See H. H. Remmers and Richard D. Franklin: Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Ill., 1962.

See also public's attitudes on negro civil rights in Lloyd A. Free and Hadley Cantil: The Political Beliefs of Americans: A Study of Public Opinion, A Clarion Book, Simon & Schuster, 1968, pp. 120-127.

Most notable in this cross-section national survey; as many as 56% thought that racial integration of Negroes in this country was going ahead too fast; and only 20% thought it was not fast enough. Only six out of every ten Americans approved of the Civil Rights Law passed in 1964. From 39% of those who were "completely liberal" to 71% of those "completely conservative" thought that most of the organizations pushing for the civil rights "have been infiltrated by Communists and are now dominated by Communist trouble-makers". p. 122.

6. We can accurately state that the Bill of Rights freedoms are in contradiction to a Constitution which approved of slavery and counted the negro as three-fifth of a human being, and that only as a result of a political compromise.

7. David O. Sears: "Black Attitudes toward the Political System in the Aftermath of the Watts Insurrection" in Midwest Journal of Political Science, Nov. 1969, pp. 515-544.

8. Albert Warner: "How the Korean Decision was Made," Harpers Magazine, June, 1951, p. 106.

9. George Gallup: "Nixon Tops 'Admired List'" in the Chicago Sun-Times, Jan., 4, 1970.

10. For the best to come about "the packaging of the President" see Joe McGinnis: The Selling of the President, Trident Press, New York, 1970.

11. What may be of interest to us here is that a recent survey of 60,000 faculty members of colleges and universities showed that in 1968, when such a narrow choice was offered between Humphrey and Nixon, only 10.5% of the faculty members did not vote; 50.1% voted for Humphrey, 29.8% for Nixon, 0.8% for Wallace, and 2.2% for others. From a Carnegie Commission on Higher Education Report, as reported in Northwestern Report, 1970.

12. Hans Morgenthau: Politics Among Nations, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1960.

13. Ibid., p. 5.

14. Ibid., p. 6.

15. Ibid., p. 9.

16. Thomas Schelling: Arms and Influence, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1966, pp. 116-125.

17. From a lecture at Frieburg in 1894, as quoted by H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills: From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, A Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press, New York, 1951, p. 35.

18. Ibid., p. 35.

19. "Structures of Power" in Ibid., 167.

20. Ibid., p. 169.

21. From a private letter to Emmy Baumgarten, as quoted by Irving M. Zeitlin: Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, op.cit., p. 157.

22. The following works are recommended to the reader on this topic: William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, A Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co, New York, 1962.

Paul M. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy: Monopoly Capital, op.cit., particularly Chapter 7: "Militarism and Imperialism" pp. 178-217.

Gabriel Kolko: The Roots of American Foreign Policy, op.cit.

Irving Howe, ed.: A Dissenter's Guide to Foreign Policy, Anchor Books, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1968.

23. As published in the Chicago Sun-Times, Oct. 5, 1969.
24. The Chicago Sun-Times, March 15, 1970.
25. As quoted by E.A. Maurer: The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948. This quote is used as a major theme for this whole book.
26. As quoted by William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, op.cit., p. 63. Perhaps the statement of the general in Vietnam: "We had to destroy it (the village) in order to save it." is an echo of this.
27. As reported by the U.P.I., The Chicago Sun-Times, May 24, 1970.
28. As published in the Chicago Sun-Times, April 26, 1970.
29. See Robert K. Murray: Red Scare, McGraw Hill, New York, 1964, pp. 82-104. For other sources on the subject, the reader is referred to: James Weinstein: The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925, Vintage Books, New York, 1967.  
Christopher Lasch: The Agony of the American Left. A Vintage Book New York, 1966, 1967, 1968.
30. Robert K. Murray: Red Scare, op.cit., p. 14.
31. On the cooperation between the CIA and the labor unions in "purifying" the unions of all Communists and Communist influence, see George Morris CIA and American Labor, International Publishers, New York, 1967.
32. Samuel Stouffer: Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, Doubleday & Co., New York, 1955.
33. Ibid., p. 26.
34. Ibid., p. 90.
35. Ibid., p. 156.
36. As reported in Anatomy of Anti-Communism, A Report Prepared for the Peace Education Division of the American Friends Service Committee, Hill & Wange, New York, 1969, p. 62.
37. Lloyd A. Free and Hadley Cantril: The Political Beliefs of Americans: A Study of Public Opinion, op.cit., p. 119, 120.
38. Roland F. Pray: "Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives" in Social Education, Feb., 1964, pp. 71-72.
39. Fred J. Sakri: "The Social Studies Teachers and the Teaching of Communism in the American High School" an unpublished First Year Paper submitted to the Political Science Department, Northwestern University, 1968, p. 17.

40. Raymond E. Platig: The United States and the Soviet Union, Laidlow Bros., 1963, p. 63.
41. The Readers' Digest, ed.: Communism, Menace to Freedom, 1962, p. 14.
42. Ibid., p. 6.
43. Zbigniew Brzezinski and Samuel P. Huntington: Political Power USA/USSR, op.cit., p. 81.
44. As quoted by David Horowitz; "Sinews of Empire" in Ramparts, Oct., 1969. This is an excellent and concise treatise on capitalist penetration and control of universities, their education and research.
45. Samuel Stouffer: Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, op.cit., p. 230.
46. J. Edgar Hoover: Masters of Deceit, A Pocket Cardinal ed., Pocket Books, New York, 1958, p. vi.
- See also Mr. Hoover's other book: On Communism, Random House, New York, 1969. This book contains interesting selected quotations from Mr. Hoover's writings and speeches over the years.
47. Ibid., p. 6.
48. Ibid., p. 8, 9.
49. Michael Parenti: The Anti-Communist Impulse, Random House, 1969.
50. For a rather comprehensive historical analysis of some of these messianic cults and their revolutionary role in the Third World, see Vittorio Lanternari: The Religions of the Oppressed, Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
51. As quoted by Seymour Martin Lipset: The First New Nation, op.cit., p. 160, 161.
52. Ibid., p. 169.'
53. Ibid., p. 169.
54. Simon Spivac: "The Vatican: Financial Superpower" in Viewpoint, The Chicago Sun-Times, May 17, 1970.
55. William Appleman Williams: Tragedy of American Diplomacy, op.cit., p. 54-55.
56. See "A Clerical Hero" in Moody Monthly, Jan., 1969, p. 68.
57. George Gallup: "Nixon Tops Admired List" The Chicago Sun-Times, Jan. 4, 1970.
58. John P. Lovell: "The Professional Socialization of the West Point Cadet" in Morris Janowitz, ed.: The New Military, The Norton Library, New York, 1964, p. 137.

59. From a study by Philip E. Jacob: Changing Values in Colleges, Harper & Bros., New York, 1957, p. 108. It must be added that percentages differed from college to another: 32% of the Harvard students did not believe in God, while at the University of Texas, the rate was the same as at West Point: 13%.

60. Quoted by Bessie Louise Pierce: Civic Attitudes in American School Textbooks, The University of Chicago Press, 1930, p. 171.

61. J. Edgar Hoover: The Masters of Deceit, op.cit., p. 311, 312.

62. As cited by Milton J. Rosenberg: "American Public Opinion on Cold War Issues" in Herbert C. Kelman, ed.: International Behavior, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, p. 313.

63. Ibid., p. 313.

64. Milton Rokeach: "Heaven, Hope, Bigotry" in Psychology Today, April, 1970, pp. 38-61.

65. Rodney Stark, Bruce D. Foster, Charles Y. Glock, and Harold Quinley: "Sounds of Silence" in Psychology Today, April, 1970, pp. 38-61.

66. George Gallup: "Churchgoing slides in U.S." in The Chicago Sun-Times.

## Chapter VI

## THE SEEDS OF REVOLUTION

Any revolution worthy of its name aims at more than exchanging one ruling elite by another. A true revolution must achieve the breakdown of some of society's most commonly held Hardened Beliefs. To be more specific, in the case of the United States, it must ultimately achieve the total eradication of the Basic Belief. The elimination of the Supportive Beliefs is useful only in so far as it can contribute to the destruction of the Basic Belief. Thus in the final analysis, revolution must take place in people's minds if it is to achieve its revolutionary purpose. If the Basic Belief remains alive and well, the outcome would mean the sellout of the revolution, a perpetuation of an old fraud in a new garb, even after the triumph of the revolutionary forces, and in spite of all the sacrifices that have been made towards that end. The tragic result may be no more than the grab of power by new individuals who have mastered the new revolutionary slogans and symbols which they can use to lure the masses into accepting tokenist reforms while leaving the basic structure intact. Such a deception is easy to achieve as long as people continue to believe in the necessity of a privileged class to rule over them. Such a revolution would be more like a slave riot whose only achievement is the exchange of one master for another.

"Revolution" has been used in many ways (the latest and perhaps most interesting of which is "The Green Revolution" which is nothing more than a new hybrid of rice that supposedly will make all the wars of national liberation unnecessary). We need not get bogged down in semantics here.

Suffice it to mention that in this context "revolution" will be restricted to mean the overthrow of the ruling class of the society. Insurrection, rebellion, riot, insurgency, coup d'etat, putsch, etc. are only some of the means to attain revolutionary ends, but they are not revolution. The tactics used to attain such an end are of secondary importance. A peaceful coup d'etat, a putsch, or even an election may achieve revolution, while the rampaging of blood-thirsty mobs, public executions, guillotines, and guerrilla wars may not.\*

Revolution must also be distinguished from counter-revolution. The latter means the restoration of a traditional ruling class after it had been overthrown. It is the frustration of revolutionary aims, a regression to a more traditional past.

Revolution in an Advanced Capitalist Society:

In the previous chapters I have tried to show how through the hardening of certain selected beliefs, the ruling class is capable of maintaining stability. With the complexity of a technological society, the average individual, in order to support a revolution, is faced not only with the problem of making such complexity intelligible, but also with seeing through the smoke screen of obfuscation that the socializing agencies have inflicted upon him. As was mentioned in Chapter Two, the Marxists were quite aware of the necessity of "class consciousness," but they underestimated the power of the ruling class of postponing indefinitely the development of such consciousness.

---

\* In this sense the Nazi take-over cannot be considered a revolution since it did not destroy the ruling class, but instead played on the traditional Hardened Beliefs of racism and chauvinism to sustain it. The Egyptian coup d'etat on the other hand, is revolutionary since it did destroy the ruling class.

In the less developed societies, the class structure is simple enough to be seen and pointed out. Though Hardened Beliefs may exist here in higher number and intensity, a Basic Belief may not be as strongly reinforced as it should be for lack of economic rewards. The poverty or non-existence of a powerful mass media, schools, or other socializing agencies also make the linkage of existing Hardened Beliefs to a Basic Belief, or the hardening of the Basic Belief itself rather unlikely. A rallying to a revolutionary cause here is relatively easy once an enlightened leadership is found, a leadership that can skillfully steer around the existing Hardened Beliefs.

But the situation is changing for the developed countries. We have reached the odd situation where the "developed" masses will be learning from the "under-developed" ones now that the communication network has transcended the nation-state, and also extended beyond the "civilized" countries of the West. Marx and Engels were able to perceive such a situation as early as the Communist Manifesto when they wrote about the bourgeoisie having given a "cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country," and "the workingmen (having) no country." The Bourgeoisie, however, has been able to frustrate the Marxist prediction about the development of an international workers' consciousness. From our perspective we can see that the Marxist perception was basically sound, but premature. What they seem to have miscalculated was the lack of communication among the workers with its availability among the capitalists. This way the capitalists were the ones who developed a class consciousness with which they were able to abort international workers' movements. With the workers engaged in daily toil for sheer survival, isolated, illiterate, and impoverished, and the capitalists, on the other hand, small



in number, educated, suave, and cosmopolitan, were able to devise a sophisticated counter-offensive. Thus while the capitalists were gaining international solidarity (solidarity in the sense of preserving capitalism and not to stop the rivalry and war inherent in the competitiveness of the capitalist system), the proletarians were fed national narrowness, parochialism, sectarianism, and ethnic rivalry.

The Awakening:

Perhaps an allegorical representation would serve as a fitting introduction:

The present capitalist system may be viewed as a monstrous octopus with numerous long fat tentacles encircling the globe. At least since World War II the main body of this octopus has been in the United States, with one of its hugest and fattest legs stretching over Western Europe itself. The octopus is powerful; its grasp of the globe is tight; attacking the main body from the outside is suicidal, but the octopus can be hurt and bled mercilessly through any of its legs; some of its legs may be cut off completely; this will not kill it, but it will certainly weaken and disturb the main body. Now those who have been crushed by the main body will begin to wake up, and feel the pain. So far many of them have been fattened and drugged off the main body, but now they discover they have to go and shed their own blood to replenish all the blood lost from the bleeding legs; they have to fight those who have been causing the bleeding. It is at this point that many of those on the list of the sacrificial lambs begin to feel an identity with those being crushed by the legs, and they begin to aim their spears at the very heart of the monster under whose weight everybody is being crushed.

So much for the allegory. For all intents and purposes, had the capitalist octopus been confined to the borders of the nation-state, parti-

cularly as in the case of a rich country such as the United States, we might speculate that a Marxist revolutionary movement could have been averted, or at least postponed into the distant future. As has been shown, the socialization process has been so perfected that almost every citizen has been transformed into a white blood corpuscle that will automatically rush to the defense of the body at the site of the least infection. But that is a hypothetical situation, for the extension of the capitalist system on a world-wide basis is the logical inevitable conclusion of its very essence. This can be explained either through the Hardened Belief concept, or through pure economics - which is nothing more than an expressing of the Basic Belief. We do not have to depend on Marxist interpretations to prove the inevitability of expansion for capitalism.

Here is Woodrow Wilson's view in 1907:

"Since trade ignores national boundaries and the manufacturer insists on having the world as a market, the flag of his nation must follow him, and the doors of the nations which are closed must be battered down.

"Concessions obtained by financiers must be safeguarded by ministers of state, even if the sovereignty of unwilling nations be outraged in the process. Colonies must be obtained or planted in order that no useful corner of the world may be overlooked or left unused."<sup>1</sup>

This is the same would-be President who was to later preach the world about self-determination.

Dwight D. Eisenhower's worries in the early fifties about Indochina were of a multiple nature:

"The loss of all Vietnam, together with Laos on the West and Cambodia in the Southwest, would have meant the surrender to Communist enslavement of millions. On the national side, it would have spelled the loss of valuable deposits of tin and prodigious supplies of rubber and rice."  
(emphasis added)<sup>2</sup>

It may be possible to envisage a form of small scale capitalism restricted to the nation-state, its trade with other nations based on exchange regulated by the governments of the nations concerned in a

rational way so as to maximize the benefits of all parties on an equivalent basis. But this is totally unrealistic picture which contradicts the Basic Belief. While such a situation is theoretically feasible had capitalism taken a different course in the past, at this point imperialistic exploitation cannot be eliminated unless capitalism itself is eliminated. For capitalistic enterprise, particularly in the technological age of mass production, has to continuously seek not only new markets for its surpluses, but also the cheapest sources possible of labor and raw material. The enterprise is forced to do that on a world-wide basis for the sake of its very survival. If it does not do that and also succeed, another one will under the competitive capitalistic game. Also in the capitalistic order, government is to protect capital, and not to regulate or limit its activity. With such "freedom" the whole world is the arena. In this kind of setup, it is not only the capitalists of the mother country that are involved, but also those capitalists of the "satellite" countries, who, in order to maximize their own profits, are willing to strike deals with the other capitalists in the best capitalistic spirit even to the detriment of their fellow countrymen. They are also willing to use their gained power and influence to boost their protective government and to defend the world capitalist system.<sup>3</sup>

In this regard, Baran and Sweezy elucidate on this very important point: It does not make any difference whether the costs of imperialism (i.e., military aid, war, counterinsurgency activities, etc.) are greater or less than the returns, simply because the costs are borne by the public at large, while the returns go to capitalist pockets with the extensive international interests.<sup>4</sup> In other words, imperialism is not only exploitation of other nationalities, but exploitation of a large portion of the population of the mother country itself through such perversion of national priorities.

Any study of revolution in our time must take into consideration this extended capitalist system. The ruling class, if it is to maintain its position of power and privilege, has to harden the Basic Belief on a world-wide basis. The difficulty to achieve this is immense. In the mother country, a large portion of the population could be rewarded. In the other countries, for obvious reasons, it is impossible to reward but a very small number of the population. The hardening of the Belief will have to depend solely on verbal messages. The lack of effective socializing agencies stand in the way of mass socialization. A more serious problem still is the increase of the challenging messages being propagated by the revolutionary forces of anti-capitalism.

Some American social scientists have been suggesting that America should change its role in the world as a counter-revolutionary force, and either acquiesce to the revolutionary movements around the world, or even help some of these revolutions.<sup>5</sup> The argument goes this way: in most of these underdeveloped countries, the ruling elite is corrupt and too traditional to induce any economic development. Therefore it may not be a bad idea that a more progressive government should carry over development through "totalitarian or national collectivistic" means, particularly since the indispensable "entrepreneurial class" who can induce development within democratic means is usually nonexistent.\*

This is very much like telling the capitalist to stop being a capitalist, while at the same time telling him that capitalism is good for him and for us

---

\* It is amazing how axiomatic it has become even to the most progressive American minds that freedom of capital means freedom of the individual and democratic rule. It seems inconceivable to these minds that a planned rational economy can open the way for a true democracy. To them "collectivism" is equivalent to Stalinist oppression and tyranny, no more no less.

all. This is the contradiction of the whole argument: capitalism is the greatest system on earth, only we should limit its practice in other countries. On the other hand, Communism is terribly bad and dangerous, but it may be good for some other people. But the fact is, and any capitalist or capitalist's agent worth his salt can see it, that for every country that "goes Communist" it would mean a loss of millions, if not billions of dollars worth of assets and profits. American overseas investments have been roughly estimated over \$50 billion. To tell the capitalist who sees the whole universe in terms of dollars and cents to forget about all these billions is almost like telling him to drop dead.

Furthermore, we must not ignore the psychological effect on the American system once it becomes encircled by regimes hostile to it. Not only would America's Basic Belief be punctured, but also its Supportive Belief, that of America being the greatest nation on earth. Long before a complete encirclement, America's socialization process would have been disrupted by the increasingly challenging messages coming from beyond its borders. The stability of its power structure would begin to totter, and its final collapse becomes inevitable.

It can thus be seen that if we take America's Basic Belief as an absolute - which it is - America's foreign policy is frightfully "rational," and we can expect to remain as long as America does not change itself from the very roots. America's Basic Belief forces it to be counter-revolutionary, and always on the side of reactionary, despotic, and corrupt regimes, and consequently the enemy of the masses all over the globe, and that is regardless of the good intentions of many of its citizens. To save America, if not the whole world, America's system must be destroyed - which is a far better cry than destroying its people. The burning question now is how to save America's

sons and daughters from dying in endless countless inevitable wars all over the world trying to defend its capitalist empire.\*

The Concept of Revolution:

To bourgeois social science, the whole notion of revolution is nothing more than a mass sickness that inflicts an unfortunate society. This should come as no surprise since, as was pointed out in Chapter Four, the mere thought of revolutionary change is considered intellectual perversion. When it comes to revolution itself, the social science doctors not only diagnose it as pathological, but describe its life cycle the same way parasitologists describe the life cycle of a deadly parasite.

In his well-known book on the subject, Crane Brinton regards revolution as "a kind of fever" for which he draws a full temperature chart. This societal disease, according to Brinton, at first shows its "prodromal signs" which show the "keen diagnostician that a disease is on its way." Then there comes a time when the "full symptoms" disclose themselves. "This works up, not regularly but with advances and retreats, to a crisis, frequently accompanied by delirium, the rule of the most violent revolutionists, the Reign of Terror." After the crisis comes a period of convalescence, usually marked by a lapse or two. Finally the fever is over, and the patient is himself again...immunized at least for a while from a similar attack..."<sup>6</sup>

What is significantly revealing about this medical description is not just the use of this particular metaphor, but the focus on the symptoms of

---

\*We must not take seriously the political gimmick propagated by the Nixon Administration, that which claims that America from now on will help other countries defend themselves against Communism with America's material aid, and without America's men (the Nixon Doctrine). Only a power supporting the masses can follow such a policy successfully. America cannot. We must remember that America is on the side of small hateful minorities against great majorities. There is a limit as to how far mercenaries would be willing to fight.

collective behavior under revolutionary situations without ever questioning the health of the status quo itself, and without ever considering the possibility that revolution could be just the required therapeutic shock for a sickly body. To Brinton, revolution is nothing more than an aberration, a fit of madness, and it is finally when the patient becomes himself again that health is restored.

Chalmers Johnson, who provides a theoretical model of revolution based on Parson's system analysis, makes violence a major criterion of revolution. The thrust of his argument is that revolution is not really a drive for drastic change, for the change occurs before the revolution through innovations, cultural borrowings, new tastes, and so on. These changes, whether in "division of labor" or "structure of values" cause "dysequilibrium" within the normally equilibrated system. What is needed then is some kind of "synchronization" between values and environment. Revolution takes place when there are enough people who suffer from "stress" and who are incapable of adapting themselves to the new "system dysequilibrium," and who, lacking the capacity of managing their tensions "through internal defense mechanisms" resort to deviant behavior, one of which is violent revolution.

Under this state of dysequilibrium, the ruling elite must know how to reequilibrate the system through manipulating either the values of the society or the environment, or both. And above all, according to Johnson, the ruling elite must know how to use its legitimate force more frequently and decisively. Otherwise, a "deflation of power" will occur, a situation which may trigger revolution if the revolutionaries begin to "believe that they have a chance of success in resorting to violence."<sup>7</sup>

Johnson's analysis, like that of Brinton, treats revolution as a sickness; only here the emphasis is on the psychological aberrations of the revolutionaries

themselves instead of a syndrome of the whole society. In Johnson's model there is more analytical consideration of the environmental factors at play, and, generally speaking, a more sophisticated sociological analysis than the Cranton model - though with less imagery and historical perspective. The remarkable achievement of the Johnson Model is that it makes revolution not only pathological but also superfluous, since, as it is stated, radical change will occur anyway, without experiencing the pains of revolution (e.g., look at the New Deal!)

The art of obfuscation is truly at its best in the literature on revolution. By making "violence" the main and essential trait of revolution, revolutionary struggle is thus degraded to criminality which should be fought mercilessly by "legitimate authority." The focus on violence in this type of analysis usually leads to a typology based on the violent tactics used,<sup>9</sup> or the "targets" of the revolutionaries.<sup>10</sup> This kind of game is intriguing, and can be endless: what is the best label we can stick on such and such a historical event? (this endeavour is usually referred to as social science theory). All kinds of odd labels can result from this: according to the typology of tactics, the Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 is really a coup d'etat. The Chinese and Algerian Revolutions are nothing but guerrilla wars, while the Hungarian uprising is a revolution, and so on.

With such an obsessive concern with strategies, tactics, and symptoms, it is assumed that the social scientists is being objective, for these are the measurable variables. This way all the injustices, oppressions, and tyrannies of the ruling class can be either ignored or encouraged, since they may be judged essential to "system maintenance." Any notion of justice can also be ignored since it cannot be "objectively conceptualized," and since "system maintenance" has often been achieved without justice.



Those same individuals who self-righteously claim that what they abhor about revolutions is their violence are more than willing to offer their "expert" advice to their ruling class as to the most effective way to conduct "counter-insurgency" tactics, and how to crush wars of national liberation whether on the home front or anywhere else in the world. The violence of war against other nations is also acceptable, for sometimes an outside enemy is needed to "stabilize" the system.

This kind of attitude can probably be best understood if we see it in the light of the Hardened Belief of nationalism. "System" and "equilibrium" are nothing more than pretentious scientism. The nation-state, being the overriding value of all values, superimposes itself as the ultimate end under the disguise of "system maintenance." Revolution, regardless of its causes, is an internal disturbance of the sacred "system" which must be protected at all costs, including the use of repression and war.

Now, of course, all these latter-day Machiavellians insist that they are for "change," and they like to use the word "dynamic" whenever they describe society. But whether the "change" is progressive or regressive seems to be of no importance. Of course, everyone is for progress ever since Burke, but progress, it is maintained, should be achieved through "evolutionary" and not "revolutionary" means - which fits in quite well with the notion that revolution is no more than the chopping off of heads. But it is made clear that within this frame of reference, "evolutionary" change does not involve any such mutation as the abolishing of capitalism and its ruling class, peaceful or otherwise, in a million years.

On the contrary, the ruling class is looked upon as the brain of the system, and its death would mean the death of that system, the ultimate tragedy. Therefore the main aim of the Machiavellian tradition is to advise

the princes of the world how they can abort revolution, and how they can preserve themselves eternally as a ruling class. For example, according to Crane Brinton (following the footsteps of Mosca and others), one of the worst signs of an impending revolution (and/or disaster) is when members of the ruling class "begin to believe that they hold power unjustly, or that all men are brothers, equal in the eyes of eternal justice, or that the beliefs they were brought up on are silly..."<sup>11</sup> The weakness of these "misguided superiors," according to Brinton, is exhibited by "the deliberate espousal by members of the ruling class of the cause of discontented or repressed classes - upper dogs voluntarily siding with underdogs. It is not altogether cynical to hazard the guess that there is about to be a reversal in the position of dogs."<sup>12</sup>

To Hannah Arendt, the American Revolution was a glorious chapter in the history of mankind because its whole aim was "political freedom," and by political freedom is meant "generally speaking the right 'to be a participator in government' or it means nothing."<sup>13</sup> What was glorious about the American Revolution was that it was a "restoration" of people's rights for "freedom." However, Arendt makes it clear, "by people these men (the American revolutionaries) did not mean the poor, and the prejudice of the nineteenth century that all revolutions are social in origin was still quite absent from eighteenth century theory or experience."<sup>14</sup> Like Locke, Arendt believes that revolution is caused by loss of authority (based on a structure of values and symbols), and to restore such an authority, violence is condoned. In other words, revolution is justified when it is counter-revolution; or when it comes to system maintenance, or the return to previous equilibrium, violence is justified. The concern with the masses of the poor, according to Miss Arendt, is not revolutionary, but a "prejudice" whose seeds were planted during the French Revolution.

The latter failed (an inglorious chapter in man's history) because it got itself concerned with the misery of the whole people, and thus people's happiness took priority over "freedom:"<sup>15</sup>

"To Robespierre, it was obvious that the one force which could and must unite the different classes of society into one nation was the compassion of those who did not suffer with those who were malheureux (real compassion instead of just uniting symbols), of the higher classes with the low people." (parenthesis added.)<sup>16</sup>

"The transformation of the Rights of Man into the Rights of Sans-Culottes was the turning point not only of the French Revolution but of all revolutions that were to follow."<sup>17</sup>

Here agains, it is considered a sign of decay when members of the ruling class become involved with the social problems of the impoverished masses. Such a "tough-minded" callousness and cynicism prevails in bourgeois literature whether dealing with stability or revolution. That is hard to see is why social justice would contradict freedom, or why it should be impossible to regain stability when an existing ruling class is overthrown.

#### THE SALESMANSHIP CULTURE:

Among the natural by-products of the present system is a prevalent intellectual poverty which could be concomitant with the anguish of what might be called psychological emptiness. This may sound like a sweeping statement. Let me explain:

Intellectual poverty need not be an inherent part of any system. But, ironically, at the stage of maturity of monopoly capitalism, with the availability of formal education to everyone (at least in theory) that the flabbiness of intellect becomes a common feature.

When profit-making becomes the major guiding force of the social order, with a fierce competition, and a surplus production, salesmanship becomes the most essential quality of life. With the technology of mass production, the selling of the product becomes the most difficult and

critical part of the productive process. To satisfy the demands for massive scale selling, advertising and public relations become multi-billion dollar businesses.

All the available media that could have made this society intellectually the richest in the world is used for the selling of goods. The commercialization of the media means that reaching the greatest number becomes its supreme purpose. The media must compete with each other in catering to potential customers, going down to the level of the lowest common denominator, and, above all, avoiding the "controversial" subjects. Escapism becomes the safest resort: soap operas, infantile farce, disc-jockeying, hours of ball games, astrological horoscopes, etc. News, unless planted for propaganda purposes, must be selected for its sensationalistic or amusing effect, and not for its importance. Any verbal communication must be simple, curt, vulgar, and read with dramatic sing-song intonation.

Advertising agencies have discovered that the sillier is the commercial the more sales it is likely to register. Advertising schools teach their students the best way to aim at the twelve-year old female. The young person who wants to enter the advertising arena is usually advised that getting a job as a salesman is a better preparation for him than college education - which is of course a sound advice under the circumstances.

No one can escape being conditioned by the salesmanship culture. The teacher feels it is more important to exhibit showmanship and use gimmicks rather than provoke thought (otherwise they may "turn you off"). There are thousands of education schools operating in the same spirit as the business schools, teaching education salesmanship. The teacher caters to his students the same way a salesman caters to his customers. The school thus becomes another agency that induces the same mental habits and attitudes that are induced by the mass media. Commenting on the

topic of education, C. Wright Mills writes:

"But are not the people now more educated? Why not emphasize the spread of education rather than the increased effects of the mass media? The answer, in brief, is that mass education, in many respects, has become another mass medium."<sup>18</sup>

The publishing of text-books and all other educational material is a great industry whose primary aim is profit, and not education. Anything that sells will be produced regardless of its quality (if we don't produce it, somebody else will). Like all other industries, publishing houses have to aim at certain markets, and the "sensitivity" of their readership must be taken into consideration.<sup>19</sup>

The decentralized system of American education is superb for catering to parochial prejudices. Any centralization of education would put power in the hands of experts ("bureaucrats") who would take control away from local boards stacked with members of the local bourgeoisie.

Normally the professional staff runs its school, and at the surface it would look as if the school administration and faculty are completely unhampered. This is indeed the case as long as nothing threatens the Hardened Beliefs of the "community." But teachers with unorthodox ideas must always be on guard, for possible interference from the outside is always hanging over their heads. In the words of V.O. Key:

"American Legion posts and other organizations occasionally set up committees of semi-literate characters to review textbooks and raise a commotion if the authors have taken note of the fact that the era of McKinley came to an end some time ago. On occasion such groups succeed in having teachers fired who displease them. Even in some colleges and universities the unfortunate instructors who happen to utter an idea unacceptable to a member of the governing board may find himself without a job."<sup>20</sup>

With the eternal national unemployment that is part and parcel of the system, every individual must "sell" himself one way or another, not only to compete for a job, but also to preserve it, let alone to get promoted. The fear of losing one's job hangs heavy in the back of every wage-earner's

mind, and with good reason. The teachers are no exception. They must "sell" themselves continuously not only to their superiors and employers, but also to their students, the whole "community." Actually all signs show that teachers, until the present, generally speaking, have been programmed quite well to be "salable" to most "communities," and they cannot be expected to pose much threat to the system. For example, in a study by Herman Ziegler on a stratified random sample of 803 high school teachers from Oregon in 1965, it was found that speaking in favor of socialism in class was considered one of the least appropriate activities to be engaged in by a teacher (6th in rank out of eight ranks).<sup>21</sup> One of the author's conclusions is "that teachers function simply more as promulgators of societal myths than as critical examiners of the political process."<sup>22</sup>

In the mass media there is double control: that of the owners, and that of the advertising clients. Nothing hurts the art of salesmanship more than thought-provoking or Hardened Belief challenging ideas. The larger the audience of a particular medium, the more cautious it must be. With the higher electronic audience, one slip of the tongue may enrage a few million customers (poor salesmanship). This way the established Hardened Beliefs can be assured a secure and everlasting life. Politics, issues of war and peace, the future of humanity, or its very survival are all presented like the baseball game scores, only with less details, for these are topics that might bore the listener. In the best sportive spirit, the most serious subjects are presented in terms of who is winning, and who is losing, the good guys or the bad guys, our friends or our enemies, our weapons or their weapons, Republicans or Democrats, and so on.

The salesman must "sell" himself in order to sell his product. Avoidance of controversial subjects is the first lesson of salesmanship. Entertain your client, charm him, wine him, flatter him, agree with him, and you cannot

do this by talking about the "touchy" subjects.<sup>23</sup>

The politician probably has to "sell" himself more than anybody else, for he is in the peculiar position of being a public relations man, a salesman, as well as a commodity to be sold. First he must "sell" himself to his millionaire sponsors, the political bosses, and other notables. Then he must "sell" himself to the public at large. In the meantime he must sell the selected issues that sell the most, sell those on whose coattails he must ride, and then the whole system that has produced him. In politics, winning becomes the absolute end. It is the crowning success of a selling effort. Issues as well as rhetoric are selected carefully as long as they can win scores. The game may have certain rules, but these never include the avoidance of distortion, deception, or fakery. Even after victory, the publicity stunts must continue. On the national scale, the politician must deep "selling" not only issues and interests, but also the whole country, not only to its people, but also to the whole world.

The lawyers who form the great bulk of the politicians have to "sell" themselves to their clients, and must "sell" their clients to judges and juries. Under class rule, the law functions mainly as the legitimizer of the exploitation of the weak by the mighty, and lawyers write it all in the "correct" language. As in advertising, in the legal profession, what really counts is how the case is presented, and not what it represents. The law is another game in which one either loses or wins. What really counts is winning; how the game is won is hardly anybody's concern.

The ivory tower of the communities of scholars does not rise high above the salesmanship culture. Here, however, the "sensitive" issues may be less than, say, at the high school level, but normally these do not exclude the Basic Belief or its Supportive ones. Speaking about political scientists, Lasswell points out that they "have, as a rule, been too prudent or timid

to become involved in research that would arouse the ire of churchmen or moralists."<sup>24</sup> Social scientists who are expected to "sell" themselves as well as their work, in general, when they did not engage in the Cold War rhetoric, have resorted to the building of abstract models, the definition of terms, the playing of international games (with each other and with computers), and so on, most impressive and salable exercises in futility.

It is no secret to anyone that in the academic world the longer the list of titles published to one's name, the greater is his evaluation as a scholar (quality cannot be objectively measured, i.e., in dollars and cents). The "selling" of the scholar is essential to colleges and universities, for, in their turn, the latter must "sell" themselves if they want to survive. Like any other individual or organization in the salesmanship culture, colleges and universities have to conduct their own promotional campaigns, and what could be more impressive for such a purpose than the exhibiting of a long list of famous big names of athletes and scholars?

Ministers of the church, as we have seen, are under constant pressure to avoid the "touchy" social issues, for these may disturb the "true" Christians who do not want to be bothered with the "worldly" problems. How can any church or any minister survive without the generous donations of its wealthy members?

The field of religious publishing is a flourishing industry, most of which competes for the propagation of infantilism with the gossip magazines (lately the pornography and anti-pornography industries have become serious competitors). These types of material reach the tens of millions of avid readers in this country and the rest of the "Free World." Some atheist writers and editors contribute stories and articles to the religious magazines, and "laugh their heads off" exchanging some of the material they write. But



sooner or later their laughter becomes hollow, for, though they may never become believers, their thought gradually becomes as impoverished as that of their readers.

In the book publishing business, anything that sells gets printed. Here, and perhaps only here, complete freedom exists. The main reason is obvious: a book does not have to satisfy except those who buy it. It has no mass audience, and does not have to satisfy its advertising clients. The maximizing of profit will depend solely on the sale of the book itself. Perhaps Cohn-Bendit, the student radical, tells the story of the book publishing business best in a book he published about the 1968 May events in France:

"But such was the impact of the events of May and June and so wildly has the name of Cohn-Bendit been handled about that, far from my having to go down on my knees to them, the publishers now come chasing after me, begging me to write about anything I choose, good or bad, exciting or dull; all they want is something they can sell - a revolutionary gadget with marketable qualities...They do not even seem to be bothered by the fact that their cash will be used for the next round of molotove cocktails." (emphasis added)<sup>25</sup>

Needless to say, what is true in Western Europe about salesmanship can be multiplied ten-fold in America.\* Unfortunately, though such a freedom must be appreciated, it rarely leads to the enrichment of thought, or the serious challenge of the Hardened Beliefs. When salability is the major decisive factor as to what gets published, a publicized name, as in the above case, becomes much more important than the material published. A book of value, if it gets published, is usually drowned by tons of more salable trash.

---

\*Along this line we may add that in case a bloody revolution is triggered in America, the lack of weapons will not be the main problem - as long as the revolutionists have the money to pay for it.

In the salesmanship culture, school diplomas and college degrees serve as gradations of the human product to help placing it in the correct slot. Everybody must have a high school diploma to get a low-level job. So every school feels that its primary obligation is to grant diplomas to everyone patient enough to "stick it out." The diploma - as well as the degree - becomes sought for its own sake, a ticket to the job market. The primary function of the educational institutions ceases to be that of developing to the full the intellectual faculties of the individual.

From the very beginning of the Republic, the educational system was thought of as conducive to the welfare of the country, and the smooth functioning of its political institutions. The public school system certainly opened great opportunities for a larger number of people than ever before in history, and as I mentioned earlier, helped the creation of an advanced technology. However, in as far as understanding the socio-economic system, all education has tried to do has been to "sell" it. One way to do this has been through the teaching of history as hero and ancestor-worship, a long series of exploits of a "brave" and "free" people who "never lost a war." The only subject approaching what might be called social science that is given in the schools is usually the "civics" course, which is nothing more than a lengthy advertisement for the system and all its wonders.

Even in colleges and universities, there has hardly been any questioning of the common Hardened Beliefs. However, here at least in a few cases, some individuals may gather enough information which indirectly will show the contradictions between creed and reality. But even here, the great mass of college graduates may end up with more technical skills in their narrow specialties, but with hardly any greater understanding of the system within which they operate. Or, as Hutchines put it, "colleges rarely succeed in

bringing about changes in attitudes or values and...the effect of four years of college is to make students more like one another."<sup>26</sup>

(Need we talk about those, who, after high school, join the armed forces?)

Perhaps no other person is more revealing on American education than James B. Conant, the ex-Harvard President whose work on the subject has probably been the most influential. After his long search, Conant decided that from 80-85% of the children in this country are not academically talented. According to him, about 6% of an age group possess such superior talents, and it is upon this elite that all attention should be intensified. It is this group that should provide the country with the professionals, scientists, and scholars that it needs. As to the lower grade 80-85% of human beings, Conant suggests that the schools should concentrate on providing them with sequences of courses that would produce "marketable skills." (emphasis added) The courses are to be designed by advisory committees representing both management and labor (fair balance!). While such subjects as English and social studies should be taught (how else would they read the instructions on the labels, and also be "good citizens?"), not much stress is to be placed on academic achievement. In plain English, the schools are there simply to mold the human being to make him fit the available empty slots, to shape and polish him to make him a salable commodity. This does not even exclude the elect few who only differ from the rest in that their "marketable skills" require more refined chiseling.

The main thing that seems to concern Conant about this mass of uneducated youth is whether the skills they learn will continue to be salable by the time they are given their ticket to the job market. What seems most frightening to Conant is not the unemployment, the misery, the intellectual and psycholog-

ical emptiness, the alienation of the individual, the cramming of great numbers in urban ghettos, but how they are likely to respond to Communist agitation.<sup>27</sup>

Thus the educational system, instead of developing the human mind, reduces it to a functional robot to fulfill the demands of capitalist production. The success of the socializing agencies here lies not only in the hardening of certain beliefs, but in the paralyzing of the critical intellectual faculties that can detect the incongruencies between myths and realities. With most jobs, having become routinized in the age of technological maturity, the wage-earner's little free time hardly offering him intellectual stimulation, he finds himself leading a mechanized and empty life which seems to go in endless monotonous circles. He struggles all his life trying to get ahead in "this great land of opportunity," and yet he remains in the same spot. His tragedy is that he is not equipped to detect the source of his misery. He hates his routinized life at work, his routinized life at home, and yet he is enslaved to his routine, and he is disturbed deeply if something or somebody disturbs it for him. Now he may own certain things (mostly on credit) which he might have considered unattainable a few years ago, and yet the dryness of life keeps harassing him, and the possession of things is not as satisfactory as he used to imagine. When others begin to agitate for changes, however, he is disturbed deeply, for any of those changes are likely to threaten his Hardened Beliefs. The agitators become the scapegoat of his frustrations. Deep inside, he knows there is something seriously wrong in his social environment, but his Hardened Beliefs, being his main guide, prevent him from detecting the falsehoods. The only falsehoods he can see are the agitators for change. They become his villains, for they are the ones who are disturbing his Hardened Beliefs. He is a prisoner who hates his prison life, and yet he is too scared and unequipped

to face a life of freedom outside the prison gates. Instead of attacking his oppressive guards, he attacks those who are trying to get him out of his imprisonment.

#### Who Is Revolutionary?

In the salesmanship culture, the vast majority of wage-earners can be ruled out as potential forces of a revolutionary movement, at least in its first stages. Only a small minority of those who have had the opportunity for an advanced free-enquiry type of education would be the first ones to discover the fraudulence of the agencies that socialize them. The universities are the most natural milieu for the first layers of scales to start falling off some people's eyes. This is when the peers become an important anti-socialization agency, and the falling off of scales becomes a rather "infectious disease." The individual awakening is slow, painful, and gradual at first, but is accelerated later on, and, with the bitterness of shock, there comes later the excitement of an intellectual liberation, the thrill of repeated discovery, the gaining of a new sight after the distortion and fogginess of semi-blindness. But all this is frustrated by the discovery that the great numbers with whom he comes in contact cannot see what has become so obvious to him. Nobody is anxious to catch the magician's hocus pocus; it seems preferable to remain under the magician's spell, painful as this may be.

Sometimes the revolt of youth creates the painful situation where the older professors who are still chanting the incantations of liberal democracy are disrupted by their own students who, for the first time, challenge the old authorities and the old tunes. This is a pitiful sight what has always been the holiest of all holies is thrown into the garbage. How do the hurt elders respond? Among other things, they write countless books and articles psychoanalyzing their hateful attackers. Psychology and psychoanalysis have

ever served as good weapons to the social scientist as well as a good tonic for his own illusions. What these angry old men end up doing does not rise above the art of name-calling. Here is an assortment of the "diagnostic" labels given the young radicals: anti-intellectual, paranoiacs, romantic, fascists, dictatorial power-seekers, barbarians, deranged power-hungry intellectuals, alienated intellectuals, spoiled brats, juvenile delinquents, perpetual adolescents, and so on, ad nauseum.<sup>28</sup> That some of these epithets may fit certain individuals among the radicals there can be no doubt. But what kind of virus is this, we may ask, that inflicts so many millions of younger individuals within the same society at the same time so as to make them all paranoiacs? Here again the cats are the crazy ones, and not the psychologists who drive the cats to madness. The response of the older professors only shows the impasse in which they find themselves. Unable to see or admit the contradictions of the system they have been praising all their lives, they find no other recourse but to describe the symptoms manifested by the young, and labeling them as pathological. From this they can conclude that what is wrong is really something within the personalities of the actors, and not within the conditions that produced them. It is not nice to scream, to use dirty words, to write on walls, or to break windows. This is barbarous. The educator who calls his own students barbarians feels relieved, for their "barbarism" can somehow be attributed to their evil nature, and he, or his system, apparently had nothing to do with it.

But then the new radicals find new allies: the impoverished, the uneducated, the lumpenproletariat, those that the system has failed to socialize, the Negro, the Mexican, and the Red Indian. It is a strange, but natural alliance between the supereducated and the undereducated. In a way we can

say that the supereducated has gone a full circle to finally liberate his mind from the shackles that the power structure has tried to impose on him, while the undereducated has escaped through his underprivileged circumstances at least the particular shackle of the Basic Belief. The undereducated has always lived on the margin of society, and the main stream of its beliefs has escaped him, and so did its rewards. Speaking about such an alliance, Herbert Marcuse writes:

"This new consciousness and the instinctual rebellion isolate such opposition from the masses and from the majority of organized labor, the integrated majority, and make for the concentration of radical politics in active minorities, mainly among the young middle-class intelligentsia, and among the ghetto populations. Here, prior to all political strategy and organization, liberation becomes a vital, "biological" need."<sup>29</sup>

To the poor and undereducated the need for liberation, as Marcuse says, is "biological." But they cannot by themselves detect and comprehend the contradictions of the system. Let us not build any mystique about "the wretched of the earth," or any other specific group. The difference between the undereducated and the integrated semi-educated majority is that they will not, like the latter, automatically reject the messages of the Anti-Belief, especially when it can promise them a relief from their present misery. Their lack of the stabilizing Hardened Beliefs makes them responsive, but the revolutionary initiative must come from the liberated intelligentsia.\*

---

\* This group does not necessarily have to be limited to the formally educated. The ghetto can also produce its own breed of outstanding intelligentsia. Malcolm X and Eldridge Cleaver, among others, had most of their education in jail, and yet they gradually developed a more enlightened understanding of the social structure than thousands of supereducated from the world of academe.

Perhaps Thomas S. Kuhn's theoretical model of revolutions in scientific concepts<sup>30</sup> may be applicable to our case. Kuhn proposes that every scientific community develops its own "paradigm" which he defines as "universally recognized scientific achievements that for a time provide model problems and solutions to a community of practitioners."<sup>31</sup> While the paradigm and the Hardened Belief may not be precisely the same, the paradigm in the scientific enterprise achieves some of the same functions the Hardened Beliefs achieve in society. Besides, a paradigm, being taught repeatedly to generations of students in approximately the same way, is likely to harden the same way other beliefs harden in the society at large.<sup>32</sup> The paradigm serves to determine and limit the type of puzzles to be solved, and the type of solutions to be found the same way the common Hardened Beliefs limit the questioning of the legitimacy of the power structure.

Scientific revolutions, according to Kuhn, are "those non-cumulative developmental episodes in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole or in part by an incompatible new one." Scientific revolutions "are inaugurated by a growing sense...often restricted to a narrow subdivision of the scientific community, that an existing paradigm has ceased to function adequately in the exploration of an aspect of nature to which that paradigm itself had previously led the way."<sup>33</sup> Kuhn draws his model from political revolutions in which a growing number of people begin to realize that existing institutions have ceased to adequately meet some new burning problems. Kuhn calls the new unsolvable problems within the old paradigm "anomalies." Only a very small minority at first is prepared to go as far as face the new anomalies, and try to solve them even if it means the destruction of the old paradigm and the creation of a new one. The vast majority would rather ignore the anomalies. This is when a crisis arises within the scientific community,



a crisis which begins with the blurring of the paradigm and ends "with the emergence of a new candidate for paradigm and with the subsequent battle over its acceptance." This is far from a cumulative process. It is rather a "reconstruction that changes some of the field's most elementary theoretical generalizations..."<sup>34</sup>

When dealing with the society at large, the picture of revolutionary movement that emerges may be more complex, but in its basic elements, it is similar to Kuhn's model. Anomalies (i.e., poverty, ghettos, counter-revolutionary wars, racism, unemployment, injustice, etc.) may exist for a long time, but, as we have seen, they are either ignored, or rationalized in hundreds of ways within the confines of the paradigm. Finally a few individuals whose beliefs have not had time to harden enough are capable of relating the "anomalies" to the system as a whole. Contrary to the scientific case, the "anomalies" here are known all along; the revolutionary step is realizing that these are not anomalies at all, contrary to what the paradigm was trying to make out of them, but they are the normal by-products of the system itself. Understanding the system can explain the "anomalies," but what is desirable in this case is not simply explanation, but elimination. A revolutionary jump involves the unfolding of fraud, bluff, and stupefaction that have become part of the paradigm. What ensues is the total rejection of the ruling paradigm not because it does not explain the "anomalies," but because it explains them in a fraudulent way, and in that respect the paradigm itself becomes the anomaly. Its explanations do not differ much from the fraudulent advertising that tries to sell a faulty or useless product. Therefore the first revolutionary steps have to be intellectual. It is quite true that poverty and oppression do not produce revolution in our sense of the word. They may produce insurrection and rioting. They may

induce such tactics as "The Poor People's March on Washington." But in a true revolutionary act, the poor will not beg the rich to have mercy on them, but will tell the rich that what they have been calling their property is everybody's property, and that the rule of property has got to come to an end.

A recent survey of university faculty members may shed some light on our subject. This survey was conducted by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in the fall of 1969, and the sample included 60,447 faculty members.<sup>35</sup>

If we consider as potential revolutionaries those faculty members who approve of radical student activism, who consider themselves "Left," and who do not presently believe in any religion, we find a definite correlation between those fields which deal with social questions and potential revolutionism. Such fields as sociology and anthropology head the list, followed by philosophy, political science, history, English, and social work. For example, 9.2% of the sociologists, 7% of the anthropologists, 7.9% of the philosophers "unreservedly support student activism; 19.4% of the sociologists, 15.3% of the anthropologists, 13.8% of the political scientists, 17.6% of philosophers, 14% of the historians consider themselves "Leftists;" 56.1% of the anthropologists, 41.7% of the sociologists, 40.8% of the philosophers consider themselves without religion at the present (on this item psychologists score high with 44.1% without religion, though their scores on the other two items are not very high). On the other hand, the lower scores on the same items lie in such fields as medicine, chemistry, physics, business, agriculture, home economics, nursing, etc. What is worth noting is that those in physical education have some of the lowest scores on all three items: only 0.6% of these "unreservedly approve of student activism," 0.5% of them consider themselves "Left," (those in nursing, home economics, and agriculture score still lower on this item);

also the phys. eds. contribute most to the cause of conservatism, with about 46% of them considering themselves "conservatives" (in contrast, only 5% of the sociologists are conservative); only 10.3% of the physical. ed. group do not have any religion (7.8% of the nurses, 4.7% of the home economists) In short, the further we go from what we may call intellectualistic subjects the less the likelihood of potential revolutionism; the more technological is the field the more are the members likely to be anti-revolutionary, gripped by the socialization of the ruling agencies. There lies the "danger" of social science and the humanities. One way to overcome such a "danger" is discourage the humanities, and reduce social science to techniques and formalities, which is precisely what has happened. The avoidance of the "controversial" in academia parallels its avoidance in the rest of the salesmanship culture; only here the avoidance is mystified by false pretenses of neutrality, scholarship, and a scientific stance.<sup>36</sup> But in spite of this lack of what C. Wright Mills called "the sociological imagination," the first revolutionary steps - at least within academia - are taking place in those fields where intellectualism - as opposed to technologism - is more or less unavoidable.

#### Violence and Revolutionary Strategy:

It is unfortunate that the revolution is still thought of as little more than a violent bloody upheaval whether on the part of the regime defenders, or on the part of those who call themselves revolutionaries. That violence may not be completely avoidable at a certain stage of a revolutionary movement cannot be denied, but that, if it has to occur, should be but a minor part of a revolutionary process. The primary aims of a revolutionary movement that can have the least hope of success in a technologically advanced society should be above all to soften the Basic and Supportive Beliefs, and

eventually to neutralize them completely. The alternative beliefs in a more humane, cooperative, rational, and a truly free society should be disseminated. Needless to say, this is easier said than done under the circumstances, for such a disruption of the socialization process would require either a massive scale penetration of the socializing agencies by the revolutionary elements, or the creation of new agencies that can compete with the established ones. A combination of both tactics would probably be the most preferable.

How can this be achieved when the ruling class interests control all the agencies, and when new agencies would have to compete with the huge resources in the hands of the ruling class (this is not to mention possible repression which we shall deal with briefly below)? There are certain facts which could lead to some realistic optimism on the matter:

1. Disrupting the hardening process is much easier than the hardening itself. A few negative messages at the right time can pull out the steel from the very foundation of the structure.
2. The ruling class paradigm is very fragile in spite of its intensity because it is incongruous with the real world - that is once the real world becomes understood.
3. The Basic Belief puts the ruling class and its agents in a world situation where their words and deeds cannot be but absurd and self-defeating, themselves thus disrupting the hardening process (the Bay of Pigs, Vietnam, the Dominican Republic, Cambodia, domestic problems, etc. are but a few symptoms of a long series of events that can be expected to be continuously on the scene).

The positive aspects of the revolutionary process (the instilling of alternative beliefs) would become easier the more the Basic and its Supportive Beliefs weaken.

A major aim of the revolutionary movement is to gain the massive support of the millions. It must gain their confidence through a sincere effort at accuracy, honesty, and the complete avoidance of any trace of deception. It must, in one word, free itself from the salesmanship culture from which it springs.

The Hardened Belief conceptualization makes it clear that it would be futile to try to reach those whose beliefs are likely to have completely hardened (i.e., the older people, and those that the system has already reduced into functional robots to fight its wars, run its machines, and consume its products). However, this does not mean that these great numbers should be completely ignored in designing the approaches to revolutionary activism. If this "silent majority" at this point in history, cannot be radicalized, it can probably be neutralized, enough not to become active in a massive counter-revolutionary offensive. If it cannot be won, it does not have to be antagonized.

Any social analysis should take seriously the Greek philosopher's famous saying: "You cannot step into the same river twice." What is true about this "silent majority" at this time may not be true of their children.

It has become common knowledge that the younger people are the ones that can be radicalized. This is true. However, this should not lead us to consider revolution as a war between the generations. The young is not a class, and revolution is a class struggle. Its primary aim is to destroy the capitalist-imperialist system, and not to act as psychotherapy for the Oedipus Complex (if there is such a thing). It is a struggle of all actual or potential wage-earners, and not of one or another stratum among them. Much of Marxist activism has dissipated itself in futile arguments

in trying to pinpoint the revolutionary proletariat.<sup>37</sup> Radical students, for example, have been trying very hard to convince themselves that they are workers in order to justify their revolutionary activism. The mystique created around the proletariat as the industrial workers since "The Communist Manifesto" is no longer justified. The working class is almost everyone in an advanced capitalist society, excluding only those who earn a living by the sheer investment of capital (see Chapter Two).

Though exploitation of certain ethnic groups is still as crude as it ever was in the days of Marx,<sup>38</sup> the exploitation of the upper strata has become much more subtle, and applied with a lot of psychological anesthesia. Consciousness means the overcoming of the induced illusions, and the identification of one's interests with those of the whole working class (regardless of the color of one's collar), and not with those of the bourgeois minority. Consciousness to the petty bourgeois means the valid realization that his disappropriation has been carried out by big capital, and not by the impoverished oppressed groups. It also means his realization that he is also a worker whose interest would be served best by identifying with the workers, and not with the capitalists (see Chapter Two). Consciousness of all workers means the overcoming of all the artificial barriers set up by the ruling class to divide and subdivide them in order to make their domination possible (men vs. women, blacks vs. whites, white collar vs. blue collar, middle-class vs. lower-class, college-educated vs. non-college educated, professional vs. non-professional, manual vs. intellectual, plus myriads of gradations, labels, and euphemistic titles). Consciousness in short means the isolation of the owning class as a first step toward its disappropriation by the people, a first step towards replacing money power by a

true democracy of people's power.

How about the capitalists themselves? It should have become clear by now that as far as the hardening of the Basic and Supporting Beliefs, the capitalist's socialization in an advanced capitalist society does not differ much from that of the population at large. What has been said about the integrated workers applies to capitalists. If the old capitalists will never give up their Hardened Beliefs, these same Beliefs do not have to harden in their sons or daughters. It is neither naive nor far-fetched to expect many capitalists becoming part of the vanguard of the revolutionary movement. Marx and Engels were well aware of this possibility when they wrote:

"...a small section of the ruling class cuts itself adrift and joins the revolutionary class, the class that holds the future in its hands. Just as..., at an earlier period, a section of the nobility went over to the bourgeoisie, so now a portion of the bourgeoisie goes over to the proletariat, and, in particular, a portion of the bourgeoisie ideologists who have raised themselves to the level of comprehending theoretically the historical movement as a whole."39

The capitalist's son - or daughter - is in the best position to discover (perhaps with a little help from outside eye-openers) the disparity between myth and reality. He is close enough to discover how much of his father's image is a fabrication of the hired image-makers. He can easily discover the fraudulence and artificiality of his father's corporate world. Furthermore he can see and feel the emptiness of life, the mental sickness, the anxieties and tensions that the obsession with wealth brings about. To him, all the glittering gadgets, comforts, and luxuries in which he was born are not rewards as they are to the upstart, but no more than old toys. When he is reminded, and sees with his own eyes, the poverty and misery that co-exist with his gluttonous life, he begins to despise the life of

luxury and position of power which he knows he never earned. Many sons and daughters of the wealthy have already deserted the sick and oppressive atmosphere of their parents' home, and voluntarily joined a life style of honesty, poverty, and freedom. These individuals and many others who will follow their path can become an important contributing force to the revolutionary movement.

In Marxist revolutions in the past, such as in Russia and China, those coming from a bourgeois background were often discriminated against after the victory of the revolution. There is no reason for such policies in the case of the more developed countries. A revolution is not to be aimed at revenge, but at the establishment of a new order. A person's family background in a more developed society contributes but a fraction of one's socialization. A rich man's son, due to the opportunities available to him may have a better chance than the poor man's son to obtain an individualization rather than a socialization. In a revolutionary era, when new beliefs are being generated and propagated among the intellectuals and the young, the individualization of the young rich man makes him more open to the new messages than the socialized poor. It would be foolish on the part of the revolutionary movement to ignore or discourage such a great potential force. What has been said about the capitalist's son is also true of the politician's son, and the sons of many others who consider themselves in the upper echelons of bourgeois society. The strongest counter-revolutionary offensive should be expected from the upstarts, and ironically enough, from the older industrial workers, and not from the established capitalists. But eventually (when the revolutionary movement matures), whosoever will try to join a counter-revolutionary oppression will have to consider the possibility that he might



be shooting at his own children.

It is to be regretted that some of those who have joined the revolutionary movement suffer from the same anti-intellectual stance of the predominant salesmanship culture. They show a repulsion towards theory, and they pride themselves as believers in action. They are convinced the system must be destroyed, and their battlecry is simple; so let us destroy it. Some of them decide that the educational system serves to socialize them, so instead of challenging it, they drop out of it. Quite often the success of the system lies in not giving its rebels the necessary intellectual weapons they need for fighting it. Some of its revolutionists become public relations men in reverse, using some of the gimmicks and slick salesmanship in which they were raised. Imaginative and unconventional methods for transmitting revolutionary messages should be encouraged, provided that they are honest, but such methods should not become ends in their own right.<sup>40</sup> To gain the necessary overwhelming support of the masses, the movement must be capable of showing the falsehoods of the status quo, and showing clearly the benefits to be gained by liberation from it. New imaginative minds are needed to engage in exchanging views, and in propagating to the masses various possible models of a socialist, democratic, and rational society. (Much can be learned from the successes and failures of the socialist countries, but none of these countries can be taken as a model for America.) This should be the exciting new frontier of all available knowledge. It should engage numerous revolutionaries from the social and physical sciences, the humanities, and the arts. All talents and specialties are needed to work together for the creation of the New Society. This is not to say that a fully detailed blue-print has to be agreed upon before the destruction of the present order.

A lot of experimentation and learning must take place in the building process, but when dealing with a complex socio-economic order, it would be foolish to leave everything to be played by ear. Besides, nothing could help win the masses to the revolutionary cause than the vision of an attractive alternative. The perception of a revolutionary process must be drastically changed from that of sheer irresponsible destructiveness to that of a creative constructiveness.

It should be obvious that this is a lengthy educational process which cannot be accomplished by clever gimmicks or desperate acts of violence. Because the softening of the Hardened Beliefs cannot but start with the younger people, patience is required until such liberated individuals become a majority in the population at large.\* A great deal of radical political activism is required in the meantime, but any attempt at using violence for the overthrow of the ruling class and its government before the required revolutionary maturity would be an insane suicidal act. Even in the most unlikely event of a successful coup, America's Hardened Beliefs are still so powerful that a takeover of governmental power would be short-lived indeed.

Many young American revolutionaries have been much influenced by the leaders of the Cuban Revolution (none of whom can be accused of not being an intellectual). Those leaders have all emphasized action, and showed certain contempt for theorizing about revolution or the kind of society that follows

---

\* It can be validly argued that in the meantime the ruling class could destroy the world in its desperate commitment to preserve its power and its imperialist system. Horrifying as it may sound, this is a calculated risk we have to take for the simple reason that in the short run we have no other choice.

it. Regis Debray, for example, who wrote a kind of revolutionary manual for Latin America,<sup>41</sup> has based his guerrilla tactics solely on the Cuban experience. Though he thinks it is essential for any revolution to win over the masses, he recommends the bloody blows against the enemy as the best propaganda in its own right. While such daring acts against the established authorities may be most admired by an impoverished population lacking a Hardened Basic Belief, and where acts of bravado still have their respectable place in the culture, such may not be the case in the well-socialized United States society - at least not until the Basic Belief has been significantly weakened.

This is not to imply that the revolutionary movement has to confine itself to work "within the system." All kinds of imaginative political activism should be applied from within as well as from without. Marcuse puts this succinctly when he writes:

"An opposition which is directed against a given social system as a whole cannot remain legal and lawful because it is the established loyalty and the established law which it opposes. The fact that the democratic process provides for the redress of grievances and for legal and lawful changes does not alter the illegality inherent in an opposition to an institutionalized democracy which halts the process of change at the stage where it would destroy the existing system."<sup>42</sup>

A Note on the "Youth Culture:"

Many radicals have put much hope in the "youth culture," and the drastic changes of attitudes that have been taking place in regard to sexuality. Some of the developments, such as the spreading use of drugs, the "copping-out," etc. should be taken as no more than symptomatic manifestations of the poverty of life under monopoly capital. A rebellion against the style of life and some of the conventions of the society that is not linked to its Basic Belief can have no hope of changing its power structure. Unless such behavior

is channeled into fruitful revolutionary action, it may be leading to a dead-end street. The system is so flexible, as I have shown, that it can easily not only link the new cultural changes to its Basic Belief, but also its capitalists can invest most profitably in the pornographic industry, and in providing the knick-knacks demanded by the "youth culture" - as indeed they are already doing. Thus the new cultural ramifications can be regarded as no more than the natural consequences, as well as the reinforcers of the impoverished salesmanship culture. The cultural rebels, instead of liberating themselves from a hateful system, their helpless poverty makes them victims of a merciless exploitation by the various sharks of capital. Their bodies can become cheap commodities to be bought and sold in the best traditions of the laws of supply and demand.

The liberation from sexual inhibitions, since it does not threaten the Basic Belief, can easily be tolerated, and it should come as no surprise if, in the future, capitalism adds open sexuality as another item in its cherished list of "freedoms." Actually, sexual inhibition, as a Hardened Belief, has been softening gradually for a long time, and its value as a Supportive Belief has been practically nil.

This is not to say that a cultural rebellion is without any revolutionary value. The revolt against the established institutions can distort the socialization process, desanctify established authority, and open the mind for revolutionary messages. But unless the revolutionary messages can link the society's ills to its Basic Belief, the whole "youth culture" may end up as no more than another big market for the sale of mass anesthesia.

#### THE ESTABLISHMENT'S DILEMMAS:

At this point in history, and in the context of the world arena, the established order is facing some inescapable dilemmas. Every counter-

revolutionary act is likely to boomerang and hit back at the system itself. Here, in brief are some of those boomerangs:

1. The ruling class can reduce its support to higher education (which is where most of the "trouble" seems to be coming from ) as indeed it has already started doing. Such an action cannot be truly effective unless it becomes suicidal, i.e., unless it pushes back the society into a Medieval ignorance. Any partial weakening of higher education, to be of any significance, will have to weaken the system of monopoly capital, particularly in relation to the socialist countries who are attempting to develop all their human potential ("the Russians will beat us"). Besides, those who will be deprived of their educational opportunities will be frustrated individuals who will be easily radicalized by the revolutionary forces that already exist outside the colleges and universities.

2. A more sophisticated approach to education would be to cut funds to the humanities and the social sciences, and concentrate on the production of the needed technocrats - which is of course what the educational system has been concentrating upon anyway. But the danger here lies in the fact that these disciplines, though they have occasionally produced a few radicals, have far more acted as the sinews of the system. To weaken them would mean cutting the life blood of the very Hardened Beliefs that have sustained the power structure. But here again, the social knowledge that is available already can be easily propagated with more vigor outside the confines of formal education.

3. An intensified repression of ideas may be the next step. A blunt and open repression on top of the subtle repression that already exists would probably be the gravest mistake. So far the Supportive Belief of anti-Communism has been mainly nourished by the repressive feature of the

Soviet system. To apply repression would mean pulling the rug from under the regime's feet. Millions of Americans have been socialized to believe in the sanctity of freedom of expression - at least in its formal form. To blunt such a freedom may mean the loss of millions of liberals who have been the major pillars of the system. Besides, an efficient scheme of repression would be impossible to implement in a technologically advanced society, and in a well-developed world communication system. An underground revolutionary movement may become far more potent and dangerous than one carried out in the open.

4. A revolutionary uprising is a continuous potential threat to the imperialistic octopus in almost every land where its tentacles stretch. With every attempt to crush such revolutions, the regime will be faced with the intensification of the revolutionary movement at home. With every failure to crush such revolutions there comes a new weakening of the octopus. The octopus can thus select its best way to die: a slow and painful bleeding from the limbs, a repeated stabbing of the main body, or a combination of both.

5. Of course the worst and most obvious boomerang would be a war that would attempt to destroy the socialist countries without whose help the Third World revolutions could easily be crushed. Not only would this be foolishly suicidal, but also, even with the one-millionth possibility of partial survival, the United States would become so hated by the rest of the world and its own population that might have survived, while the socialist "cancer" would not be removed. The octopus' death in this case would result from blows at the main body from within, and blows at the fattest limbs even in those countries now considered allies.

In an advanced capitalist society, the revolution can no longer be viewed as a brute clash of arms between two distinct antagonistic classes, but as an attack on the Hardened Belief produced by the class structure. It is an evolutionary process with a major mutation at the end. How painlessly this can be accomplished will depend on how skillfully the revolutionaries can soften the Basic Belief and its Supportive ones. The final degeneration of these Hardened Beliefs will mean that when the ruling class or their agents push what has always been the "right buttons" no response will come from the masses. The system's battery will be dead. The programming of the masses has been disrupted.

It is at this point that the revolutionaries should give the final blow to the octopus' head, with the full support of the people. The members of the ruling class will be liberated the same as everybody else, for the chains that will be broken will also be their own.

Footnotes

Chapter VI: The Seeds of Revolution

1. Quoted by William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, op.cit., p. 66.
2. Dwight D. Eisenhower: The White House Years: Mandate for Change, A Signet Book, The New American Library, New York, p. 404.
3. For more on this (other than Lenin's famous work, Imperialism the Highest Stage of Capitalism), see David Horowitz: Empire and Revolution, Vintage Books, New York, 1969, esp. Section V: "The New Revolutionary Epoch" Baran & Sweezy: Monopoly Capital, op.cit., esp. Chapter 7: "Militarism and Imperialism".  
William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, op.cit., passim. For the views of a Soviet economist on the subject, see A. Frumkin: Modern Theories of International Economic Relations, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969.
4. From "Notes on the Theory of Imperialism" as cited by David Horowitz: Empire and Revolution, op.cit., f.n. p. 235.
5. e.g., Robert L. Heilbroner: "Counter-Revolutionary America" in Irving Howe and Lewis Coser, ed.: A Dissenter Guide to American Foreign Policy, Anchor Book, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1968, pp. 241-259.  
See also the Conclusion to William Appleman Williams: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, op.cit.
6. Crange Brinton: The Anatomy of Revolution, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1965, p. 16, 17.  
The author goes on to claim that he has "no feelings of dislike for revolutions in general," but he dislikes cruelty in the author's mind (more than any of all its other facets) only shows to what extent he truly feels it is pathological.
7. Chalmers Johnson: Revolutionary Change, Little Brown & Co., Boston, 1966, particularly see Chapter 4 & 5, pp. 59-118.  
See also Antony F. C. Wallace: Culture and Personality, Random House, New York, 1961, a work which is cited approvingly by Johnson.
8. Ibid., p. 59, 60.
9. e.g., Ibid., Chapters 7 and 8.
10. James Rosenau, ed.: International Aspects of Civil Strife, Princeton University Press, 1964, pp. 63-64.



11. Crane Brinton: The Anatomy of Revolution, op.cit., p. 51, 52.
  12. Ibid., p. 53.
  13. Hannah Arendt: On Revolution, A Viking Compass Book, The Viking Press, New York, 1963, 1965, p. 221.
  14. Ibid., p. 61.
  15. Ibid., p. 61.
  16. Ibid., p. 74.
  17. Ibid., p. 55.
  18. C. Wright Mills: The Power Elite, op.cit., p. 317.
  19. Some publishing houses, long years after the "Monkey Trial," still publish two different texts on certain subjects, one designed for certain parts of the South (avoiding the theory of Evolution), and another version for the rest of the country.  
(This information was obtained from a staff editor from a well-known publishing house in Chicago. The editor - and the House - prefer to remain anonymous.)
  20. V.O. Key: Public Opinion and American Democracy, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963, p. 323.
  21. Herman Ziegler: The Political Life of American Teachers, A Spectrum Book, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., p. 97.
  22. Ibid., p. 96.
  23. William H. Whyte, Jr. tells of an "Effective Presentation Course" given to salesmen at a big corporation. One of the major principles of the course: "Never say anything controversial."  
The Organization Man, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1956, p. 122.
- Discussing the famous personality tests prepared for new employees and used by most corporations in America, the same author advises the applicant who wants to get a high scores to follow these rules:
1. When asked for word associations or comments about the world, give the most conventio al, run-of-the-mill, pedestrian answer possible.
  2. When in doubt about the most beneficial answer to any question, repeat to yourself: I loved my father and my mother, but my father a little bit more. I like things pretty much the way they are. I never worry about anything. I don't care for books or music much. I love my wife and children. I don't let them get in the way of company work.
- Ibid., p. 196, 197.
24. Harold Lasswell: The Future of Political Science, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1963, p. 184.

25. Daniel and Gabriel Cohn-Bendit: Obsolete Communism: The Left-Wing Alternative, trans., by Arnold Pomerans, McGraw Hill, New York, 1968.

26. As quoted by Baran & Sweezy: Monopoly Capital, op.cit., p. 330.

27. See James B. Conant: The American High School Today, New York, 1959. See Also, by the same author: Slums and Suburbs: A Commentary on Schools in Metropolitan Areas, New York, 1961, passim.

I owe some of the ideas expressed on Conant's work to Baran & Sweezy: Monopoly Capital, op.cit., pp. 333-335.

28. For samples of such rich invective, see Russell Kirk: "The University and Revolution: An Insane Conjunction" and Edmund S. Glenn: "The University and the Revolution: New Left or New Right?" both in Gary R. Weaver and James H. Weaver: The University and Revolution, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969.

Norman F. Cantor: The Age of Protest: Dissent and Rebellion in the Twentieth Century, Hawthorn, 1969.

Sidney Hook: Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy, Cowles, 1969.

29. Herbert Marcuse: An Essay on Liberation, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969, p. 51.

30. Thomas S. Kuhn: The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

31. Ibid., p. x.

32. Contrary to commonly held opinion, it must be stated that beliefs in natural science can become just as hardened as any others, and differences of opinion can sometimes lead to the same amount of conflict and bitterness as they do in social discussions of any kind.

33. Thomas S. Kuhn: The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, op.cit., p. 91

34. Ibid., p. 84.

35. "The Profession: Faculty Opinion Survey" in PS (The American Political Science Association), Summer, 1970, pp. 382-386.

36. Spiro Adnew, who may be considered the embodiment of the upstart who suddenly found himself in a high position of power, and who is expected to be the most zealous defender of the system, published an article recently in the newspapers. In this article he advises the academic community as to which subjects they should teach, and which they should not.

After informing us about the higher value of "the traditional history course" where the student is able "to make independent judgements one way or the other (!)," he adds: "That is not so in the 'relevant' courses. The material is controversial; the student is more often than not a partisan

an advocate...he will hardly be in the best position to learn accurate observation and disinterested analysis." From "Is College Relevant?" in Viewpoint, The Chicago Sun-Times, Sept. 27, 1970, p. 3.

What is interesting about this article is the striking similarity between the Agnew version of "scholarship" and that of many academicians. Agnew and the scholars would show much more honesty if they would only say that what they are really worried about is not "partisanship" or "advocacy," but a certain kind of "partisanship" or "advocacy" that does not agree with theirs. But then if they say that, they will not be able to claim that they themselves are "disinterested observers."

37. Even Marcuse falls into the trap of insisting that the industrial working class "which constitutes the human base of the process of production" is the only revolutionary class. He goes further by identifying the radical students as "middle-class" and the radicalized ghetto population as "Lumpen-proletariat."

To limit the working class to a certain strata of workers is dogmatic Marxism, and an uncalled for technicality. To call intellectual workers a middle class, as if it is a class in itself, loses sight of the Marxian class concept.

See particularly Chapter III in Essay on Liberation, op.cit., pp. 49-78.

38. e.g., see "Law and the Grievances of the Poor" in The Rule of Law: An Alternative to Violence, A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence, Aurora Publishers, Nashville, 1970, pp. 27-51.

39. "The Communist Manifesto" in Lewis S. Feuer, ed.,: Marx & Engels, op.cit., p. 17.

40. e.g., There can be no doubt that such acts as Yippies distributing money bills in the Stock Market, or encircling the Pentagon to "exorcise the evil spirits" are imaginative, humorous, and can be effective in many ways. However, such acts may lose their effectiveness if they end up with only the theatrical performance.

For more on revolutionary theatre and a wealth of humorous - sometimes tragic - incidents, see Abbie Hoffman's book: Revolution for the Hell of It, The Dial Press, New York, 1968.

41. Regis Debray: Revolution in the Revolution, Grove Press Inc., New York, 1967.

42. Herbert Marcuse: An Essay on Liberation, op.cit., p. 66.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Only those works directly used, or which have directly influenced (either positively or negatively) the writing of this thesis are included below. Many other works and individuals must have influenced by thinking on the subject, but of course, it would be impossible to include all these here.

2. Almost 75% of the works listed below have been cited in the footnotes, or directly quoted in the text.

3. Because of the nature of the thesis, works from various disciplines were used. However, the classification below does not follow the traditional divisions of the social science disciplines. One big category is listed under "Social Science." The other smaller categories are mostly determined by the specific purposes for which they were used in the text.

4. No reference is mentioned more than once, though many could easily belong to more than one category.

5. Articles cited in the text are listed under the name of the author. But once the main volume containing the article is mentioned with the article, it is not listed separately again under the editor's name.

6. Articles, reports, polls, etc. adopted from newspapers are not listed.

### I. Socialization, Psychology, and Belief Formation

Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney: The Civic Culture, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1963.

Asch, Solomon E.: Social Psychology, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1952.

Benedict, Ruth: Patterns of Culture, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, 1934.

Berkowitz, Leonard, ed.: Advances in Experimental Psychology, Academic Press, New York, 1969.

Boas, Franz: The Mind of the Primitive Man, MacMillan, 1938.

Boulding, Kenneth: The Image, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1956.

Bradburn, Norman: "The Cultural Content of Personality Theory" in Joseph Weyman and Ralph W. Heine, ed.: Concepts of Personality, Aldine Publishing Co., 1963, pp. 333-335.

Brian, Orville G., Jr. and Stanton Wheeler: Socialization After Childhood, Two Essays, John Wiley & Son, New York, 1956.

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education: "Faculty Opinion Survey" in PS, Summer, 1970, pp. 382-386.

- Commager, Henry Steele: The American Mind, Bantam Books, Toronto, New York, London, 1950.
- Dawson, Richard E. and Prewitt: Political Socialization, Little Brown, Boston, 1969.
- Edelman, Murray: The Symbolic Uses of Politics, The University Press, 1964.
- Erikson, Erik H.: Childhood and Society, 2nd. ed., W.W. Norton, New York, 1963.
- Festinger, L.: A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance, Row, Peterson, Evanston, Ill., 1957.
- Free, Lloyd A. and Hadley Cantril: The Political Beliefs of Americans, A Study of Public Opinion, A Clarion Book, Simon and Schuster, 1968.
- Greenberg, Edward S.: "Children and Government: A Comparison Across Racial Lines," Midwest Journal of Political Science, May, 1970.
- Greenstein, Fred: Children and Politics, Yale University Press, New Haven 1965.
- Hess, Robert D. and Judith V. Torney: The Development of Political Attitudes in Children, Anchor Books ed., Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1967.
- Hyman, Herbert: Political Socialization, A Study in the Psychology of Political Behavior, A Free Press Paperback, Macmillan, New York, 1959.
- Jennings, Kent M. and Langton, Kenneth P.: "Mothers versus Fathers: The Formation of Political Orientations among Young Americans" The Journal of Politics, May, 1969.
- Key, V.O., Jr.: Public Opinion and American Democracy, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1961.
- Klapper, Joseph T.: "Mass Media and the Engineering of Consent" American Scholar, XVII, 1948, pp. 419-429.
- Lane, Robert E.: "Fathers and Sons: Foundations of Political Beliefs" The American Sociological Review, Aug., 1959.
- Lane, Robert E.: Public Opinion, Foundations of Modern Political Science Series, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1964.
- Linton, Ralph: "The Concept of National Character" in Alfred H. Stanton and Stewart E. Perry, ed.: Personality and Political Crisis, The Free Press, New York, 1951.
- Lovell, John P.: "The Professional Socialization of the West Point Cadet" in Janowitz, Morris, ed.: The New Military, The Norton Library, 1964.

- Lanternari, Vittorio: The Religions of the Oppressed, Alfred A. Knopf, 1963.
- Mead, George H.: Mind, Self, and Society, The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Muller, Edward N.: "Correlates and Consequences of Beliefs in the Legitimacy of Regime Structures" Midwest Journal of Political Science, Aug., 1970.
- Lippman, Walter: Public Opinion, Penguin Books, New York, 1922.
- Mannheim, Karl: Ideology and Utopia, Harvest Book, Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, 1936.
- McClelland, David: The Achieving Society, Free Press Paperbacks, MacMillan, 1961.
- McNeill, W.H.: The Rise of the West, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963.
- McLuhan, Marshall: Understanding Media: The Extension of Man, Signet, The New American Library, New York, 1964.
- Miller, Neal E. and Dollard, John: Social Learning and Imitation, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1941.
- Pierce, Bessie Louise: Civic Attitudes in American School Text-books, The University of Chicago Press, 1930.
- Remmers, H.H. and Richard D. Franklin: Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools, Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Ill., 1962.
- Rivers, William L.: The Opinion-Makers, Beacon Press, Boston, 1965, 1967.
- Rokeach, Milton: "Heaven, Hope, Bigotry" in Psychology Today, April, 1970.
- Rokeach, Milton: The Open and Closed Mind, Basic Books, New York, 1960.
- Rosenberg, Milton J.: "American Public Opinion on Cold War Issues" in Kelman, Herbert C.: International Behavior, Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.
- Sears, David O.: "Black Attitudes Toward the Political System in the Aftermath of the Watts Insurrection" in Midwest Journal of Political Science, Nov., 1969.
- Segal, Ronald: The Americans: A Conflict of Creed and Reality, Bantam Books, New York, 1968, 1969.

- Skinner, B.F.: "Freedom and the Control of Men" in The American Scholar, Winter, 1955-56.
- Skinner, B.F.: Science and Human Behavior, MacMillan, New York, 1953.
- Skinner, B.F.: Walden II, MacMillan, New York, 1948.
- Stagner, Ross: Psychology of Personality, 3rd ed., McGraw Hill, New York, 1961.
- Stark, Rodney, Foster, Bruce D., Glock, Chalres Y., Quinley, Harold: "Sounds of Silence" in Psychology Today, April, 1970.
- Verba, Sidney: "Conclusion" to Pye, Lucian and Verba, Sidney, ed.: Political Culture and Political Development, The Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1965.
- Wallace, Anthony F.C.: Culture and Personality, Random House, New York, 1961.
- Wasley, Stephen W.: "The Impact of the Family on Politics" in The Family Coorindater, Jan., 1966.
- White, Elliot: "Intelligence and Sense of Political Efficacy in Children" in The Journal of Politics, Aug., 1968.
- Wright, Charles R.: Mass Communication, A Sociological Perspective, Random House, New York, 1959.
- II. Social Science (Political Science, Political Sociology, Political Philosophy, history, etc.)
- Ake, Claude: A Theory of Political Integration, The Dorsey Press, Homewood, Ill., 1967.
- Aristotle: The Politics, trans. by T.A. Sinclair, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1962.
- Aron, Raymond: "Social Structure and the Ruling Class" in The British Journal of Sociology, Part I, March, 1950, Part II, June, 1950.
- Banfield, Edward C. and Wilson, James Q.: City Politics, A Vintage Book, Random, New York, 1963.
- Baratz, Morton S.: "Corporate Giants and the Power Structure" in The Western Political Quarterly, June, 1956.
- Baritz, Loren: The Servants of Power, Weseleyan University Press, Middletown, Conn., 1960.

- Bay, Christian: "The Cheerful Science of Dismal Politics" in Roszak, Theodore, ed.: The Dissenting Academy, A Vintage Book, Random House, 1967, 1968.
- Beard, Charles A.: An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States, MacMillan, New York, 1913.
- Bell, Daniel: The End of Ideology, A Free Press Paperback, Rev. ed., The Free Press, New York, 1962.
- Bendix, Reinhard and Lipset, Seymour Martin: "The Field of Political Sociology" in Coser, Louis A.: Political Sociology, Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, New York, 1967.
- Bendix, Reinhard: Max Weber, An Intellectual Portrait, Doubleday, New York, 1960.
- Benoit-Smullyan: History of Political Theory, Student Outline Co., Boston, 1938.
- Birnbaum, N.: "Conflicting Interpretations of the Rise of Capitalism: Marx and Weber" in The British Journal of Sociology, June, 1953.
- Bluhm, William T.: Theories of the Political System, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.
- Brace, Richard M.: The Making of the Modern World, 2nd. ed., Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, New York, 1961.
- Bunzel, John H.: Anti-Politics in America, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1967.
- Campbell, Angus, et al.: The American Voter, An Abridgement, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964.
- Chase, Stuart: "American Values: A Generation of Change" in Public Opinion Quarterly, Fall, 1965.
- Cleaver, Eldridge: Soul on Ice, A Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co., 1968.
- Cornford, Frances Macdonald, trans., ed.: The Republic of Plato, Oxford University Press, New York, 1966.
- Cox, Edward F. et al: Nader's Raiders, Report on the Federal Trade Commission, Grove Press, New York, 1969.
- Dahrendorf, Ralf: Class and Class Conflict in Industrial Society, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Cal., 1959.
- Dahl, Robert A.: Who Governs?, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn. 1961.
- Darwin, Charles: "Recapitulation and Conclusion" (of the Origin of Species)



- in Cummins, Saxe and Linscott, Robert N., ed.: The Philosophers of Science, Pocket Book, Inc., New York, 1954, pp. 245-275.
- Deutsch, Karl W.: Nationalism and Social Communication, 2nd. ed., The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.
- Deutsch, Karl W.: "Recent Trends in Research Methods in Political Science" in Charlesworth, James C., ed.: A Design for Political Science, The American Academy of Political and Social Science, Philadelphia, 1966.
- Djilas, Milovan: The New Class: An Analysis of the Communist System, New York, 1957.
- Domhoff, William G.: Who Rules America?, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967.
- Durkheim, Emile: The Division of Labor in Society, The Free Press, New York, 1965.
- Easton, David: A Framework for Political Analysis, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1965.
- Finn, David: The Corporate Oligarch, Simon & Schuster, New York, 1969.
- Feuer, Louis S.: "Introduction" to Feuer, Louis S., ed.: Marx and Engels, Anchor Books, Doubleday, New York, 1959.
- Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright: From Max Weber, A Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press, New York, 1958.
- Hansen, Eric G.: "Intellect and Power: Some Notes on the Intellectual as a Political Type" in The Journal of Politics, May, 1969.
- Harrington, Michael: The Other America, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1962.
- Hoffer, Eric: The True Believer, Harper and Row, New York, 1951.
- Hofstadter, Richard: Anti-Intellectualism in American Life, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1963.
- Horowitz, Louis Irving, ed.: The Rise and Fall of Project Camelot, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1967.
- Howe, Irving, ed.: The Radical Papers, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1966.
- Hughes, Stuart: Consciousness and Society, A Vintage Book, New York, 1958.

- Hunter, Floyd: Community Power Structure, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1953.
- Hunter, Floyd: Top Leadership, U.S.A., University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1959.
- Irish, Marian D. and Prothro, James W.: The Politics of American Democracy, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.Y., 1962.
- Jacob, Herbert and Vines, Kenneth, ed.: Politics in the American States, Little Brown, 1965.
- Jacob, Philip E. and Teune, Henry: "The Integrative Process: Guidelines for Analysis of the Bases of Political Community" in Jacob, Philip E. and Toscano, James V.: The Integration of Political Communities, J.B. Lippincott, New York, 1965, pp. 1-45.
- Josephson, Mathew: The Politicos, Harcourt Brace and World, New York, 1938.
- Josephson, Mathew: The Robber Barons, Harcourt, Brace and World, New York, 1934.
- Kefauver, Estes: In a Few Hands: Monopoly Power in America, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1965.
- Kohn, Hans: The Idea of Nationalism, Collier Books, MacMillan, New York, 1944.
- Krutch, Joseph Wood: The Measure of Man, Grosset & Dunlap, 1953.
- Lasch, Christopher: The New Radicalism in America (1889-1963): The Intellectual as a Social Type, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1965.
- Lasswell, Harold: The Future of Political Science, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1963.
- Lasswell, Harold: Politics, Who Gets What, When, How, Meridian Books, The World Publishing Co., New York, 1936, 1958.
- Lerner, Max, ed.: The Portable Veblen, The Viking Press, New York, 1948.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, ed.: Politics and the Social Sciences, Oxford University Press, New York, 1969.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin and Bendix, Reinhart: Social Mobility in Industrial Society, The University of California Press, Berkeley, 1959.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin: The First New Nation, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1967.

- Lipsits, Lewis: "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Reevaluation" in American Sociological Review, Feb., 1965.
- Locke, John: "Of Property" in Barker, Ernest, ed.: Social Contract, A Galaxy Book, Oxford University Press, New York, 1962.
- Lundberg, Ferdinand: America's Sixty Families, Vanguard, New York, 1937.
- Lundberg, Ferdinand: The Rich and the Super-Rich, A Bantam Book, Lyle Stuart, 1968.
- Lynd, Robert S. and Lynd, Helen Merrill: Middletown in Transition, Harcourt Brace, New York, 1937.
- Matson, Floyd W.: The Broken Image, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1964.
- Newsweek: "The Troubled American: A Special Report on the White Majority" in Newsweek, Oct. 6, 1969.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo: The Prince and the Discourses, Modern Library ed., Random House, New York, 150.
- Marcuse, Herbert: One-Dimensional Man, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964.
- Mathews, Donald E.: U.S. Senators and Their World, Vintage Books, Random House, New York, 1960.
- McGinnis, Joe: The Selling of the President, Trident Press, New York, 1970.
- Miller, S.M. and Riesman, Frank: "Working Class Authoritarianism: A Critique of Lipset" in British Journal of Sociology, Sept., 1961.
- Mills, C. Wright: "Marx for the Managers" in Horowitz, Irving Louis, ed.: Power, Politics, and People, The Collected Essays of C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963.
- Mills, C. Wright: "The American Political Elite: A Collective Portrait" in Horowitz, Irving Louis, ed.: Power, Politics, and People, The Collected Works of C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963.
- Mills, C. Wright: "The Political Gargoyles: Business as Power" in Horowitz, Irving Louis, ed.: Power, Politics, and People, the Collected Works of C. Wright Mills, Oxford University Press, New York, 1963.
- Mills, C. Wright: The Power Elite, Oxford University Press, New York, 1956.
- Mills, C. Wright: The Sociological Imagination, Grove Press, New York 1959.

Moore, Barrington, Jr.: Political Power and Social Theory, Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, New York, 1958, 1962.

Morris, George: CIA and American Labor, International Publishers, New York, 1967.

Moskos, Charles C. and Bell, Wendell: "Emerging Nations and Ideologies of American Social Scientists" in The American Sociologist, May, 1967.

Parsons, Talcott: Structure and Process in Modern Societies, The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1960.

Wise, David and Ross, Thomas B.: CIA: The Invisible Government, Random House, 1964.

Zeitlin, Irving M.: Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory, Prentice-Hall, Englewood, N.J., 1968.

### III. Social Science of the Underdeveloped Areas

Apter, David E.: The Politics of Modernization, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1965.

Coleman, James S.: "Sub-Saharan Africa" in Almond, Gabriel and Coleman, James S., ed.: Politics of the Developing Areas, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960.

Finkle, Jason L. and Gable, Richard W., ed.: Political Development and Social Change, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1966.

Kautsky, John H.: Political Change in Underdeveloped Countries: Nationalism and Communism, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962.

Lande, Carl H.: "The Philippines" in Coleman, James S., ed.: Education and Political Development, Princeton University Press, 1965.

La Palombara, Joseph: "Notes, Querries, and Dilemmas" in La Palombara, Joseph, ed.: Bureaucracy and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1963.

Myrdal, Gunnar: Asian Drama: An Inquiry Into the Poverty of Nations, Pantheon, A Division of Random House, New York, 1968.

Pye, Lucian W.: Politics, Personality, and Nation-Building, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1962.

Pye, Lucian W.: "The Politics of Southeast Asia" in Almond and Coleman: The Politics of the Developing Area, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1960.

Spengler, Joseph J.: "Bureaucracy and Economic Development" in La Palombara Joseph, ed.: Bureaucracy and Political Development, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. 1963.

Sigmund, Paul E.: The Ideologies of the Developing Nations, Rev. ed., Praeger, New York, 1967.

Weiner, Myron: "The Politics of South Asia" in Almond and Coleman: The Politics of the Developing Areas, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1960.

#### IV. Primary Sources of Marxism-Leninism

Avineri, Shlomo, ed.: Karl Marx on Colonialism and Modernization, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1969.

Bottomore, T.B., ed. and trans.: Karl Marx, Early Writings, McGraw Hill, New York, 1963.

Chai, Winberg, ed.: Essential Works of Chinese Communism, Bantam Books, New York, 1968.

Feuer, Louis S., ed.: Marx & Engels, Anchor Books, Doubleday, New York, 1959.

Jacobs, Dan N., ed.: The New Communist Manifesto and Related Documents, Harper Torchbooks, Harper and Row, New York, 1962.

Kuusinen, et al: Fundamentals of Marxism-Leninism, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, 1963.

Lenin, V.I.: Imperialism, The Highest Stage of Capitalism, in Lenin's Selected Works, (3 Vol.), Volume I, International Publishers, New York, 1967.

Marx, Karl: Capital (3 Vol.), International Publishers, New York, 1967.

Mendel, Arthur P.: Essential Works of Marxism, Bantam Books, New York 1963.

Selsam, Howard and Martel, Harry: Reader in Marxist Philosophy, International Publishers, New York, 1963.

#### V. Primary Sources on Americanism

Boorstin, Daniel J., ed.: An American Primer, The University of Chicago Press, 1966.

Eisenhower, Dwight D.: The White House Years: Mandate for Change, Doubleday, New York, 1963.

Heffner, Richard D., ed.: Documentary History of the United States, A Mentor Book, The New American Library, New York, 1952.

Randall, Nelson H. and Wuest, John J., ed.: The Primary Sources of American Government, G.P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1962

Sobel, Robert: The Federalist Papers, Monarch Press, New York, 1965.

Truman, Harry S.: 1945, Year of Decisions, Memoirs, Vol. I, A Signet Book, The New American Library, New York, 1955.

Truman, Harry S.: 1946-1952, Years of Trial and Hope, Memoirs, Vol. II, A Signet Book, The New American Library, New York, 1956.

#### VI. Marxism, Communism, Anti-Communism, and Anti-anti-Communism

Barghoorn, Frederick C.: Politics in the U.S.S.R., Little Brown, New York, 1966.

Brzezinski, Zbigniew and Huntington, Samuel P.: Political Power, USA/USSR, The Viking Press, New York, 1963, 1964

Drachkovitch, Milorad M., ed.: Marxism in the Modern World, Stanford University Press, Stanford, Cal., 1965.

Feuer, Louis S.: Marx and the Intellectuals, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1969.

Gray, Roland: "Teaching About Communism: A Survey of Objectives" in Social Education, Feb., 1964.

Hoover, J. Edgar: Masters of Deceit, A Pocket Cardinal ed., Pocket Books, New York, 1958.

Hoover, J. Edgar: On Communism, Random House, New York, 1969.

Koestler, Arthur: "The Initiates" in Grossman, Richard: The God that Failed, Harper Colophon Books, Harper and Row, New York, 1949.

Lasch, Christopher: The Agony of the American Left, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1966, 67, 68.

Mills, C. Wright: The Marxists, A Laurel Ed., Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1962.

Milosz, Czelaw: The Captive Mind, New York, 1955.

Murray, Robert K.: Red Scare, McGraw Hill, New York, 1964.

Oakes, Clarence Perry, ed.: Education and Freedom in a World Conflict, (Guidelines for Teaching About Communism), Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1963.

Parenti, Michael: The Anti-Communist Impulse, Random House, New York, 1969.

The Peace Education Division of the American Friends Service Committee:  
Anatomy of Anti-Communism, Hill and Wang, New York, 1969.

Platig, Raymond E.: The United States and the Soviet Union, Laidlow Bros., 1963.

Sakri, Fred J.: "The Social Studies Teachers and the Teaching of Communism in the American High School" Unpublished First Year Paper submitted to the Political Science Department, Northwestern University, 1968.

Simirenko, Alex, ed.: Soviet Sociology, Chicago Quadrangle Books, Chicago, 1966.

Skilling, Gordon M.: The Governments of Communist East Europe, Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York, 1966.

Stouffer Samuel: Communism, Conformity, and Civil Liberties, Doubleday, New York, 1955.

The Readers' Digest: Communism, Menace to Freedom, 1962.

Weinstein, James: The Decline of Socialism in America, 1912-1925, Vintage Books, New York, 1967.

#### VII. Education and Politics

Aptheker, Bettina: Big Business and the American University, New Outlook Publishers, New York, 1966.

Barzun, Jacques: The American University, Harper & Row, New York, 1968.

Conant, James B.: Slums and Suburbs, New York, 1961.

Conant, James B.: The American High School Today, New York, 1959.

Goodman, Paul: Compulsory Mis-education and the Community of Scholars, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1962, 1964.

Goodman, Paul: Growing up Absurd, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1956.

Horowitz, David: "Sinews of Empire" in Rampart, Oct. 1969.

Hook, Sidney: Academic Freedom and Academic Anarchy, Cowles, 1969.

Jacob, Philip E.: Changing Values in Colleges, Harper & Bros., New York, 1957.

Laqueur, Walter and Mosse, George L., ed.: Education and Social Structure in the Twentieth Century, Harper and Row, New York, 1967.

Massialas, Byron G. and Cox, Benjamin: Social Studies in the United States, Harcourt, Brace, and World, New York, 1967.

Ridgeway, James: The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis, Ballantine Books, New York, 1968.

Rosenthal, Alan, ed.: Governing Education, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, New York, 1969.

Wolfe, Alan: "Myth of the Free Scholar" in Center Magazine, July, 1969.

Ziegler, Herman: The Political Life of American Teachers, A Spectrum Book, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1967.

#### VIII. Foreign Policy and International Relations

Fulbright, Senator William J.: The Arrogance of Power, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1966.

Howe, Irving, ed.: A Dissenter's Guide to Foreign Policy, Anchor Books, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1968.

Kennan, George F.: American Diplomacy, 1900-1950, A Mentor Book, The New American Library, New York, 1951.

Kolko, Gabriel: The Roots of American Foreign Policy, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.

Liska, George: Imperial America, The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1967.

Maurer, E.A.: The Nightmare of American Foreign Policy, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1948.

Morgenthau, Hans: Politics Among Nations, 3rd. ed., Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1960.

Schelling, Thomas: Arms and Influence, Yale University Press, New Haven, Conn., 1966.

Williams, William Appleman: The Tragedy of American Diplomacy, A Delta Book, Dell Publishing Co., New York, 1962.

#### IX. Economics, Political Economy, and the Distribution of Wealth

Baran, Paul A. and Sweezy, Paul: Monopoly Capital, Modern Reader Paperbacks, New York, London 1966.

Frumkin, A.: Theories of International Economic Relations, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1969.

Galbraith, Kenneth: The New Industrial State, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Mass., 1967.



- Heilbroner, Robert L.: The Limits of American Capitalism, Harper Torchbooks, Harper & Row, New York, 1965, 1966.
- Keynes, John Maynard: The General Theory of Unemployment, Interest, and Money, London, 1936.
- Kolko, Gabriel: Wealth and Power in America, Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1962.
- Lampman, Robert J.: "Changes in the Share of Wealth Holders, 1922-1956" in Review of Economics and Statistics, Nov., 1959, pp. 379-392.
- Lampman, Robert J.: "The Distribution of Wealth According to Estate Tax Returns" 39th Annual Report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1959.
- Leontyev, L.: A Short Course of Political Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968.
- Mason, Edward S.: "The Apologetics of Managerialism" in The Journal of Business, Jan., 1958.
- Neye, Richard: The Wall Street Jungle, Grove Press, New York, 1970.
- Nossiter, Bernard D.: The Myth-Makers, Beacon Press, Boston, 1964.
- Rostow, W.E.: The Stages of Economic Growth, A Non-Communist Manifesto, The University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1960.
- Samuelson, Paul A.: Economics, seventh ed., McGraw Hill, New York, 1967.
- Survey Research Center: 1960 Survey of Consumer Finances, Ann Arbor, Mich., 1961.
- Vygodsky, S.: Capitalist Economy, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1966.
- Wallich, Henry: "On Peoples' Capitalism" in Newsweek, July 20, 1970, p. 70.

#### X. Radical Movements and Revolution

- Ali, Tariq, ed.: The New Revolutionaries, William Morrow & Co., New York, 1969.
- Arendt, Hannah: On Revolution, The Viking Press, New York, 1963, 1965.
- Berger, Peter L. and Neuhaus, Richard J.: Movement and Revolution, Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1970.
- Blackburn, Robin: "A Brief Guide to Bourgeois Ideology" in Cockburn, Alexander and Blackburn, Robin, ed.: Student Power, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1969.

- Brinton, Crane: The Anatomy of Revolution, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1965.
- Camus, Albert: The Rebel, A Vintage Book, Random House, 1956.
- Cantor, Norman: The Age of Protest: Dissent and Rebellion in Twentieth Century, Hawthorn, 1969.
- Cohn-Bendit, Daniel and Gabriel: Obsolete Communism: The Left Wing Alternative, trans. by Pomerans, Arnold, McGraw Hill, New York, 1968.
- Debray, Regis: Revolution in the Revolution, Grove Press, New York, 1967.
- Fanon, Frantz: The Wretched of the Earth, Grove Press, New York, 1963.
- Glenn, Edmund S.: "The University and the Revolution: New Left or New Right?" in Weaver, Gary R. and James H.: The University and Revolution, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969.
- Gough, Kathleen: "World Revolution and the Science of Man" in Roszak, Theodore, ed.: The Dissenting Academy, A Vintage Book, Random House, New York, 1968.
- Hoffman, Abbie: Revolution for the Hell of It, The Dial Press, New York, 1968.
- Horowitz, David: Empire and Revolution, Vintage Books, New York, 1969.
- Jacobs, Paul and Landau, Saul: The New Radicals, A Vintage Book, Random House, 1966.
- Johnson, Chalmers: Revolutionary Change, Little Brown, Boston, 1966.
- Kirk, Russell: "The University and Revolution, An Insane Conjunction" in Weaver and Weaver, ed.: The University and Revolution, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1969
- Kuhn, Thomas S.: The Structure of Scientific Revolutions, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.
- Leiden, Carl and Schmitt, Karl M.: The Politics of Violence: Revolution in the Modern World, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968.
- Lenin, V.I.: State and Revolution, in Lenin's Selected Works, (3 vol.), Vol. 2, International Publishers, New York, 1967.
- Libarle, Marc, and Seligson, Tom, ed.: The High School Revolutionaries, Random House, 1970.
- Malcolm X: Malcolm X Speaks, Grover Press, New York, 1965.
- Marcuse, Herbert: An Essay on Liberation, Beacon Press, Boston, 1969.

- Memmi, Albert: The Colonizer and the Colonized, Beacon Press, Boston, 1965.
- Oglesby, Carl, ed.: The New Left Reader, Grove Press, New York, 1969.
- Marek, Franz: Philosophy of World Revolution, International Publishers, New York, 1969.
- Ponomaryov, B.N., et al: World Revolutionary Movement of the Working Class, Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1967.
- Rosenau, James, ed.: International Aspects of Civil Strife, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1964.
- Skolnick, Jerome, ed. The Politics of Protest, (A Report to the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence), Ballantine Books, 1969.
- Wallace, Anthony: "Revitalization Movements" American Anthropologist, April, 1956.
- Zeitlin, Maurice: Revolutionary Politics and the Cuban Working Class, Princeton, 1967.

VITA

NAME: Fred J. Sakri

PLACE AND DATE OF BIRTH: Sidon, Lebanon, October 20, 1924

(US citizen since 1963)

DEGREES: B.S., 1967, Northwestern University

M.A., 1968, Northwestern University

Ph.D., 1971, Northwestern University

PUBLICATIONS: None