

**Lind's "The Origins of Political Correctness": Frankfurt's Attack on Religion & the West; Islam v. Judaism: No Peace in the Middle East until the 2nd Advent, Gal 4:29**

- 56. The ultimate goal of Progressivism is to transform the world away from a collection of competing cultures into one global culture by means of diversity.
- 57. Diversity today will over time amalgamate into one central culture which will be manipulated in its progress by the movers and shakers within the academic, journalistic, and political communities.
- 58a. To accomplish this there must be the removal of religious beliefs from the equation. The strategy to do this is addressed in a speech by:

**Lind, William S. "The Origins of Political Correctness." (lecture, American University, Washington, DC, 2000).**

**The Origins of Political Correctness**

**An Accuracy in Academia Address by Bill Lind**

***Variations of this speech have been delivered to various AIA conferences including the 2000 Conservative University at American University***

For the first time in our history, Americans have to be fearful of what they say, of what they write, and of what they think. They have to be afraid of using the wrong word, a word denounced as offensive or insensitive, or racist, sexist, or homophobic.

We call it "Political Correctness." It is the great disease of our century, the disease that has left tens of millions of people dead in Europe, in Russia, in China, indeed around the world. It is the disease of ideology.

Political Correctness is cultural Marxism. It is Marxism translated from economic into cultural terms. If we compare the basic tenets of Political Correctness with classical Marxism the parallels are very obvious.

First of all, both are totalitarian ideologies. The totalitarian nature of Political Correctness is revealed nowhere more clearly than on college campuses.

Indeed, all ideologies are totalitarian because the essence of an ideology is to take some philosophy and say on the basis of this philosophy certain things must be true. Since reality contradicts that, reality must be forbidden. It must become forbidden to acknowledge the reality of our history. People must be forced to live a lie, and since people are naturally reluctant to live a lie the power of the state must be put behind the demand to live a lie. That is why ideology invariably creates a totalitarian state.

Second, the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness has a single factor explanation of history. Economic Marxism says that all of history is determined by ownership of means of production. Cultural Marxism, or Political Correctness, says that all history is determined by power, by which groups defined in terms of race, sex, etc., have power over other groups. Nothing else matters. All literature, indeed, is about that. Everything in the past is about that one thing.

Third, just as in classical economic Marxism certain groups, i.e. workers and peasants, are *a priori* good, and other groups, i.e., the bourgeoisie and capital owners, are evil. In the cultural Marxism of Political Correctness certain groups are good – feminist women, blacks, Hispanics, homosexuals. These groups are determined to be "victims," and therefore automatically good regardless of what any of them do. Similarly, white males are determined automatically to be evil, thereby becoming the equivalent of the bourgeoisie in economic Marxism.

Fourth, both economic and cultural Marxism rely on expropriation. When the classical Marxists, the communists, took over a country like Russia, they expropriated the bourgeoisie, they took away their property.

Finally, both have a method of analysis that automatically gives the answers they want. For the cultural Marxist, it's deconstruction. Deconstruction essentially takes any text, removes all meaning from it and re-inserts any meaning desired. So we find that all of Shakespeare is about the suppression of women, or the Bible is really about race and gender ... which proves that "all history is about which groups have power over other groups."

Political Correctness has a history, a history that is much longer than many people are aware of outside a small group of academics who have studied this.

Marxist theory said that when the general European war came (as it did come in Europe in 1914), the working class throughout Europe would rise up and overthrow their governments – the bourgeois governments – because the workers had more in common with each other across the national boundaries than they had in common with the bourgeoisie and the ruling class in their own country. Well, 1914 came and it didn't happen. Throughout Europe, workers rallied to their flag and happily marched off to fight each other. So something was wrong.

Marxists knew by definition it couldn't be the theory. In 1917, they finally got a Marxist coup in Russia ... but it stalled again. It didn't spread.

So the Marxists' had a problem. And two Marxist theorists went to work on it: Antonio Gramsci \gräm'-shē\ in Italy and Georg Lukacs \luk'-ach\ in Hungary. **Gramsci said the workers will never see their true class interests, as defined by Marxism, until they are freed from Western culture, and particularly from the Christian religion – that they are blinded by culture and religion to their true class interests.** Lukacs theorized that the great obstacle to the creation of a Marxist paradise was the culture: Western civilization itself.

In 1923 in Germany, a think-tank is established that takes on the role of translating Marxism from economic into cultural terms, that creates Political Correctness as we know it today, and essentially it has created the basis for it by the end of the 1930s. This comes about because the very wealthy young son of a millionaire German trader by the name of Felix Weil \vī'-el\ has become a Marxist and has lots of money to spend. He is disturbed by the divisions among the Marxists, so he sponsors something called the First Marxist Work Week, where he brings Lukacs and many of the key German thinkers together for a week, working on the differences of Marxism.

And he says, "What we need is a think-tank." He endows an institute, associated with Frankfurt University, established in 1923, that was originally supposed to be known as the Institute for Marxism. But the people behind it decided at the beginning that it was not to their advantage to be openly identified as Marxist. The last thing Political Correctness wants is for people to figure out it's a form of Marxism. So instead they decide to name it the Institute for Social Research.

The initial work at the Institute was rather conventional, but in 1930 it acquired a new director named Max Horkheimer, ... very much a Marxist renegade.

Horkheimer's initial heresy is that he is very interested in Freud, and the key to making the translation of Marxism from economic into cultural terms is essentially that he combined it with Freudism. In the years after 1930 the Institute's primary interests lay in its cultural superstructure.

Radical feminism, the women's studies departments, the gay studies departments, the black studies departments – all these things are branches of Critical Theory. What the Frankfurt School essentially does is draw on both Marx and Freud in the 1930s to create this theory called Critical Theory. The theory is to criticize. The theory is that the way to bring down Western culture and the capitalist order is not to lay down an alternative. They explicitly refuse to do that. They say it can't be done, that we can't imagine what a free society would look like. As long as we're living under the repression of a capitalistic economic order ... we can't even imagine it. What Critical Theory is about is simply *criticizing*. It calls for the most destructive criticism possible, in every possible way, designed to bring the current order down.

Other key members who join up around this time are Theodore Adorno \ä-dör'-nō\, and, most importantly, Erich Fromm \fröm\ and Herbert Marcuse \mär-kü'-za\. Fromm and Marcuse introduce an element which is central to Political Correctness, and that's the sexual element. And particularly Marcuse, who in his own writings calls for a society of "polymorphous perversity," that is his definition of the future of the world that they want to create. Marcuse in particular by the 1930s is writing some very extreme stuff on the need for sexual liberation, but this runs through the whole Institute. So do most of the themes we see in Political Correctness, again in the early 30s. In Fromm's view, masculinity and femininity were not reflections of 'essential' sexual differences. They were derived instead from differences in life functions.



Another example is the emphasis we now see on environmentalism. "The theme of man's domination of nature ... was to become a central concern of the Frankfurt School in subsequent years. In one of his essays, *Egoism and the Movement for Emancipation*, written in 1936, Horkheimer "discussed the hostility to personal gratification inherent in bourgeois culture." And he specifically referred to the Marquis de Sade, favorably, for his "protest...against asceticism in the name of a higher morality."

How does all of this stuff flood in here? How does it flood into our universities, and indeed into our lives today? The members of the Frankfurt School are Marxist, they are also, to a man, Jewish. In 1933 the Nazis came to power in Germany, and not surprisingly they shut down the Institute for Social Research. And its members fled. They fled to New York City, and the Institute was reestablished there in 1933 with help from Columbia University. And the members of the Institute, gradually through the 1930s, shift their focus from Critical Theory about German society, destructive criticism about every aspect of that society, to Critical Theory directed toward American society. There is another very important transition when the war comes. Some of them go to work for the government, including Herbert Marcuse, who became a key figure in the OSS (the predecessor to the CIA), and some, including Horkheimer and Adorno, move to Hollywood.

These origins of Political Correctness would probably not mean too much to us today except for two subsequent events. The first was the student rebellion in the mid-1960s, which was driven largely by resistance to the draft and the Vietnam War. But the student rebels needed theory of some sort. Classical, economic Marxism is not light, and most of the radicals of the 60s were not deep. Fortunately for them, and unfortunately for our country today, Herbert Marcuse remained in America when the Frankfurt School relocated back to Frankfurt after the war. Marcuse saw the 60s student rebellion as the great chance. He saw the opportunity to take the work of the Frankfurt School and make it the theory of the New Left in the United States.

One of Marcuse's books was the key book. It virtually became the bible of the SDS and the student rebels of the 60s. That book was *Eros and Civilization*. Marcuse argues that under a capitalistic order repression is the essence of that order and that gives us the person Freud describes – the person with all the hang-ups, the neuroses, because his sexual instincts are repressed. We can envision a future, if we can only destroy this existing oppressive order, in which we liberate eros, we liberate libido, in which we have a world of "polymorphous perversity," in which you can "do you own thing." What a wonderful message for the radicals of the mid-60s! They're students, they're baby-boomers, and they've grown up never having to worry about anything except eventually having to get a job. And here is a guy writing in a way they can easily follow. He doesn't require them to read a lot of heavy Marxism and tells them everything they want to hear which is essentially, "Do your own thing," "If it feels good do it," and "You never have to go to work." By the way, Marcuse is also the man who creates the phrase, "Make love, not war." Coming back to the situation people face on campus, Marcuse defines "liberating tolerance" as intolerance for anything coming from the Right and tolerance for anything coming from the Left [This may be stated, "All license to the left; all restraint to the right."].

In conclusion, America today is in the throws of the greatest and direst transformation in its history. We are becoming an ideological state, a country with an official state ideology enforced by the power of the state. In "hate crimes" we now have people serving jail sentences for political thoughts. And the Congress is now moving to expand that category ever further. Affirmative action is part of it. The terror against anyone who dissents from Political Correctness on campus is part of it. It's exactly what we have seen happen in Russia, in Germany, in Italy, in China, and now it's coming here. And we don't recognize it because we call it Political Correctness and laugh it off. It's not funny, it's here, it's growing and it will eventually destroy, as it seeks to destroy, everything that we have ever defined as our freedom and our culture.

<http://www.academia.org/lectures/lind1.html>

- 58b. But this effort falls apart since there is nothing more inflexible than established religious beliefs.
- 59. There is no area of compromise or agreement possible between Islam and Judaism or Islam and Christianity. Judaism and Christianity agree on certain issues but not on the central doctrines of Messiah and salvation.
- 60. The present conflict in the Middle East is not really a present conflict. It is the continuation of the ages-long battle between the sons of the bondwoman and the sons of the free woman: Ishmael v. Isaac; Islam v. Judaism; Arabs v. Israelis.

61. The principles of the one have no affinity with the principles of the other. They are competing absolutes that are diametrically opposed so that any mutual compromise for the sake of peace would destroy the very foundations of each belief system.
62. It is therefore a struggle to the death which will never be completely resolved until the Second Advent of Christ and His execution of the baptisms of fire.
63. This is why diversity and multiculturalism are doomed for failure. The idea behind each is that competing ideas, cultures, religions will at first tolerate and ultimately accept each other's differences.
64. Once acceptance of competing views is accomplished then amalgamation into a universal culture can then begin.
65. This is where the problem arises for Progressives. They may have no absolutes but most religions do and this is especially true of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity.
66. Progressivism has made major inroads into the belief systems of Judaism and Christianity so that both have factions that have capitulated to modernist thinking.
67. Those in each religion who stand fast are classified by Progressives as fundamentalist who blindly subscribe to a literal interpretation of their respective "religious texts."
68. This notion is even imputed to Islam, as if there is a moderate branch of Moslems and a "fundamentalist" faction that "reads the Qu'ran literally" who are terrorists.
69. The truth of the matter is that no religion is orthodox unless it is fundamentalist in the sense that it subscribes to and seeks to execute the literal intent of the writings found in its sacred texts. This true of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity.
70. Thus, there will be no peace in the Middle East. Religious wars will rage until the Lord returns prior to which there can be no cure for them. Lucifer is at war with Christ and this conflict is reflected in the perpetual disputes that erupt among men. The inevitability of it is expressed by:

Kipling, Rudyard. "The Battle of East and West." In *Complete Verse: Definitive Edition*. (New York: Doubleday, 1940), 233:

*Oh, East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,  
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great Judgment Seat;  
But there is neither East nor West, Border, nor Breed, nor Birth,  
When two strong men stand face to face, though they come from the ends of the earth!*