



'GIVE US THE YOUNG'

by Erica Carle



"GIVE US THE YOUNG"

by

ERICA CARLE

Charlotte, 4/28/06
I think the added
appendix is just as important
as the book — perhaps more
important. I think you will find
it valuable — Love, Erica

Education Service Council

P. O. Box 271

Elm Grove, WI 53122

Give Us The Young- \$5+ P&H

Why Things Are The Way They Are

\$16+ P&H

"GIVE US THE YOUNG"

Library of Congress

**Catalogue Card Number
81-71144**

ISBN 0-942130-00-6

Copyright © 1981 by Echoes and Shadows

Printed in the United States of America. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be used or reproduced in any manner whatsoever without written permission except in case of brief quotations embodied in critical articles and reviews. For information address to Echoes and Shadows, P. O. Box 241, Elm Grove, Wisconsin, 53122.

FOREWORD

Who wrote these words?

"Oh you blind leaders who seek to convert the world by labored disputations. Step out of the way or the world must fling you aside. GIVE US THE YOUNG. GIVE US THE YOUNG and we will create a new mind and a new earth in a single generation."

Who claims the young? . . . tells the leaders of the world to step aside? . . . aims to create a new mind? . . . a new earth? Benjamin Kidd, an English sociologist who died in 1916, wrote the above lines. He was but one of the group of writers, teachers, theologians, philosophers, economists, and sociologists who believe the world is theirs. They claim the young because the young can be easily trained. The emotions of the young can be controlled and behavior managed to fit the group's desires. Other, equally bold statements of intentions are quoted throughout this book.

Are you young? They claim you as their property. Are you a parent? Your children are their booty. Grandparents, did you hear their claims and boastings many years ago? Did you understand the claim jumpers and boasters were serious? . . . that they meant to carry off the spoils and rape the future? Are you a teacher? Would you be the vassal of those who seek to overlord both you and those who come to you in trust?

This book, "*GIVE US THE YOUNG*" is an effort to explain the intentions of the self-proclaimed creators of the 'new earth,' and to show how the intentions are being transformed into education and action.

If you are young, be aware of what is being done to education to catalog your thinking. You are expected to help achieve the goals of the self-appointed overlords who claim your fidelity and your person. If you are a parent, it is up to you to inform, explain to, and protect your children. If you are a grandparent, listen now, and understand. If you are a teacher, it is you whom the overlords have hoped to use to accomplish their purpose. And then, after you have done their work, they mean to cast you aside as no longer necessary to their 'new earth.'

Young ones, parents, grandparents, teachers. . . listen all, and understand, for the call is growing stronger and louder. . . .
GIVE US THE YOUNG . . . GIVE US THE YOUNG !

“It may make a difference to all eternity whether we do right or wrong today.”

—James Freeman Clarke

Dedicated with love and appreciation to Mom and Dad, Dr. and Mrs. Harry O. Zurheide. I always knew they cared. I always knew they were ready to help if needed.

Thanks to Amber Clark for editorial assistance.

CONTENTS

Foreword	iii
Attitude Reversal	1
Lust For Power	5
Conflict of Concepts	8
Master Plan	11
Progress of Plan	16
Sociology Today	20
Techniques of Sociology	25
Sociology Closing In	30
Responsibility and Guilt	39
Alienation of Affection	43
Sociological De-Humanization	51
Training	54
Conscience and Sex Take-Over	61
Futurism	65
Conclusion	67

APPENDIX

From: Dr. Carpenter's <i>Mental Physiology</i>	71
Quoted References	87
Other References	89

ATTITUDE REVERSAL

All truth is safe and nothing else is safe: and he who keeps back the truth, or withholds it from men, from motives of expediency, is either a coward or a criminal or both.

F. Max Muller

Any parent who has raised a family or who is pretty well along the way knows his children don't love him all the time. Even respect is given on a great deal less than 100 percent basis. There is no absolute perfection. There may even be bad moments when the only thing that holds a child to his parents is his dependence on them. But basic love, respect and family loyalty usually have been strong enough to carry most people over the times of turmoil, hard training, and disagreement. Under ordinary circumstances parents can sometimes be wrong, too harsh, even unworthy of respect, and still raise fine children who are kind and loving and who lead happy and productive lives.

Years ago my father, a family physician, mentioned to me how remarkable it seemed to him that so often fine, intelligent, responsible and loving children could be found in families of drunken, shiftless and even immoral parents. Doesn't it seem remarkable to you that in recent years so many unhappy, disloyal, drunken, drug-crazed, shiftless, disillusioned and immoral children are found, not only in destructive families, but in families of fine, intelligent, productive and loving parents? Average parents, if they make an honest effort, should be able to raise children of whom they can be proud. Yet, today, even good parents are frequently failing. Why?

I would like to suggest to you that there is a cause for this unhappy reversal — for the increasing corruption and disillusionment of children — not a vague, generalized cause, but an active, persuasive force which each family can pinpoint directly to warn their children against the danger and thus help protect them from it. Parents can minimize the effects of this pernicious influence if they know of its existence, how the persuaders reach their children, and what they are trying to accomplish.

Imagine someone going into your children's school or coming into your home who does his best to demoralize your children by dampening their enthusiasm for life and respect for themselves, degrading you and any moral principles you have taught them, and attempting to alienate them from you so future guidance and admonitions will have little effect. Wouldn't you wonder what the reason might be for such an audacious intrusion? What if the intruder fills your children's minds with half-truths to mislead them, then deceives them into trying to bear intolerable burdens? Wouldn't you suspect he might be trying to use your children for his own purposes? Wouldn't you make an honest effort to discover just what he had in mind?

If you have been doing your human best to prepare your children for happy, productive, responsible lives; and he is breaking down the character you have been building, would you believe he could have their best interests at heart? If he tells your children things which fill them with doubt, despair, and with ideas of destruction, larceny and hate, could you ignore him? Or would you, despite any mistakes you may think you have made in the past with your children, rally to their defense and protect them from an influence which could possibly ruin their lives, paralyze their intelligence, destroy their enthusiasm, and rob them of any capacity for warmth and honest love?

The influence *is* there — working on your children, and not only on yours, but on the children of your friends, neighbors, relatives, and millions of other people who are strangers to you. These children are being deceived, 'treated,' and manipulated for a purpose. Not all of them will be destroyed, but many young people will be permanently damaged, and a great many more temporarily impaired.

Unless you have already had puzzling problems with your own children, or noticed undesirable changes in character and personality, you may be reluctant to believe there is a strong, highly-organized destructive influence actively at work on young minds. You may not want to believe what I am going to tell you about the influence on children, but it will not be difficult for you to check. Once you have read the entire indictment, the evidence is as available to you as it is to me. The only way you can shut out the truth is by refusing to see it.

Unless your reactions are a great deal different from mine, you will be shocked, dismayed, angered and overwhelmed; but

don't allow these emotions to paralyze your initiative. The stakes are high. The very lives and happiness of your own children may be in jeopardy. This may be the most serious threat you will ever face in opposition to your efforts to raise fine, honest, well-balanced, productive and happy children, particularly if those children are just entering their teen years. Don't under-rate or ignore the threat.

Young people are being corrupted, discouraged, deflated, frustrated, over-burdened, and deceived. If you are a parent you need to find out who is trying to alienate your children's affection and persuade them to abandon the principles you have taught them. You need to find out who is teaching the young to hate family loyalty, Christian morality and honest scientific investigation, to hate independence, self-responsibility and achievement. You need to know so you will be able to take protective measures.

Let us go to the place where the persuaders do much of their work. Let us go with the children to their sociology classroom.

While you may not be able literally to accompany your children to sociology class (although it would be a good idea to do so) you should be able without too much trouble to obtain a copy of the sociology textbook and/or materials used in your school. They are probably available in the school library or high school bookstore. To gather material for this book, I purchased copies of all the sociology textbooks used in my own area and experienced no difficulty.

It was no accident that I suspected sociology of a major role in child corruption. My study of the intent and history of sociology led me to surmise that sociology would most probably be playing a dominant role in forming the present-day mental and emotional attitudes among young people, which in too many cases lead to erratic and destructive behavior.

I hope you will find a modern high school sociology textbook and go over it as thoroughly and critically as your time permits. You don't have to be a Ph.D. or even a high school graduate to learn enough to help your children, but you should be a thorough, careful and very attentive reader.

I have been reading sociology books for quite some time, including some written more than a century ago, not because it is the world's most exciting diversion — you'll never believe how far that is from the truth until you read a few yourself — but because I have been looking for the pattern, checking to see whether sociologists throughout the history of the subject

have been consistent in their beliefs, goals, and methods. They have!

While many of the books are deadly-dull, there is a fascination to the reading. The fascination is similar to that I once experienced watching a reformed pickpocket put on a demonstration of his 'art.' He performed his work with such finesse, such charm, and such apparent interest in and concern for his victims that the 'guinea pigs' who went up to the stage to help him in the demonstration never knew their pockets had been picked. They were positive he had been unable to fleece them, that the other participants were the victims, until the pickpocket produced watches, rings, billfolds, bracelets and earrings and laid them right on the table before them. He succeeded in stealing from them while they stood smilingly confident that he would not.

Why would anyone want to steal away love? Why would anyone want to alienate a child from his parents, destroy dreams and zest for life, and downgrade the principles on which a happy, independent, and productive life can be built? He would have to have an insidious and evil purpose.

Sociology has such a purpose. For nearly a century and one-half sociologically-oriented individuals have been making steady progress toward its accomplishment. When I tell that purpose to you, please do not say it cannot be true until you personally have checked the evidence. Sociology's stated ambition and goal is to take over the minds of succeeding generations of children in order eventually to rule the world and all its people — to fleece us, and all future generations out of our individual freedom. Sociologists have used sympathy, charm, deceit, distortion, outright lies and coercion. Yet, to a surprising degree, considering the damage they have done, they have escaped detection. Let us try to learn their thoughts, reveal their purpose, discover their methods, and understand why the children are their primary target.

LUST FOR POWER

There will be discovered to be some natures who ought to study philosophy and to be leaders in the State, and others who are not born to be philosophers, and are meant to be followers rather than leaders.

Plato's REPUBLIC V. 474

Ideas of world domination are not new. It has always been a favorite pastime of brainy individuals who have no taste for physical labor, trade, natural science or mechanical innovation to play the game of human engineering: speculating on and experimenting with methods of ordering and controlling other human beings. From the Greek philosopher, Plato, who compiled the ground rules, and gave many helpful hints, through all the lesser lights, up to and including our 20th Century fireflies, the 'noble' goal has been the same: a perfectly-ordered, eternally obedient 'society.' Only the name and characters have changed with sociology. The lust is the same, and Power is the name of the game.

What kind of mind could conceive and try to carry out an ambition to rule the world? What emotional twist would cause one to want to be among those who help fulfill that ambition? It is almost impossible for one who does not possess this type of mind to understand such thinking. Don't allow the fact that you do not possess it lead you to deny its existence. Such minds *do* exist. They are already destroying, seducing or controlling many of the present generation of young people. The best description I have read of the emotional perspective of those possessed of this type of mentality was written by Edward Bellamy, a sociologically-oriented 19th Century writer. He said:

*"There is a lust of soul for soul dwarfing the lust of body for body, as the universal dwarfs the individual; a lust insatiable, a passion hopeless yet entrancing, sweeter in desire than all others in consummation."*²

There are men who lust for other men's souls!

It is difficult to understand, but perhaps the sociological power-lust is a result of inflated ego combined with a warped sense of order.

Each of us has a sense of order and a necessity for order. We try to arrange our lives and our environment to conform to our individual requirements. While manner of expression and degree differ, the necessity for order exists in all of us. For example, a child when presented a box of blocks of varying sizes, shapes, and colors can't resist the urge to form those blocks into some orderly pattern or combination. Few people are comfortable if they notice a picture on the wall is wildly askew.

Much of the training we give our children is aimed at building on and improving their sense of order. Our language, music, art, and ability to count and calculate are all dependent on the fact that we can order and organize our thinking. Careful observation shows that our sense of order and harmony is but a minute expression of the order and harmony already present in nature and throughout the universe.

We each attempt to order our lives according to our own priorities. There are individual differences — most of them can be easily resolved, but people's goals do sometimes conflict drastically. Under the best of circumstances it takes great wisdom and a strong sense of individual justice for lawmakers to establish acceptable rules which do not conflict with nature or inhibit constructive activities.

When a brilliant domineering person with excess self-esteem interferes, he can distort the entire picture and change intermittent conflict into chaos. Having no desire to satisfy his ego by his own talent, he sometimes chooses what to him is the greatest raw material of all for his 'genius' to cultivate and control: — other people. Instead of building in the material world with wood, steel and stone; or demonstrating personal skill; he trespasses, and constructs his monument to order out of human lives.

Because of the great variety of types of individuals and activities, he fails to perceive natural order. He looks upon nature's infinite variety as chaos which he must put in order. His life is devoted to finding ways to overpower other minds — to cut off their thinking so his can be the factor which controls many lives. He assigns others their places and sees that they keep to them, organizing force to intimidate them where necessary. He does not see himself as wicked. In his own eyes he is a great benefactor for allowing lesser individuals to be ruled by his 'superior mentality':

"It is indeed an ambitious conception, this idea of blueprinting the outlines of a truly worthwhile society for the future and then piloting social evolution deliberately and intelligently toward that goal. There are those who regard such an ambition as ludicrously impossible. Yet this is the supreme aspiration of social science."

Ross L. Finney¹

CONFLICT OF CONCEPTS

The normal type of Human Existence is one of complete unity. All progress therefore, whether of the individual or of the race, consists in developing and consolidating that unity.

Auguste Comte⁴

The first thing which must be done in order to succeed in the goal of world domination is to gain control of education.

None of us in our youth expects to be deceived by our teachers. We have faith in them and our parents. We are not, and we should not have to be, alert to detect intentional deception. Yet today's young people of high school and college age are members of the sixth generation who have been subjected to intentional deceit. We of the fourth and fifth generations have lost much of the truth ourselves, and as a result are often as bewildered as our sixth generation children.

A little history of thought is necessary to understand what has happened to our thinking in the past 150 years. The concept involved is one which has been argued since 500 B.C. and before. It is the concept of the 'one' versus the 'many'; of collectivism versus individualism; the state versus individuals. From a collectivist's point of view the necessary basic reality is the state. Individuals are but 'members' of the state.

Plato in his famous *REPUBLIC* wrote as a collectivist. He viewed the state as one large body, individuals existing only to serve the body. This point of view inevitably leads to slavery and violence because collectivists are forever trying to subdue individual minds and individual action which they believe will harm the unity of the state. Individuals have to be trained, not to promote their own happiness and worthwhile achievement, but to serve the needs of the state whatever the leaders of the state determine those needs to be. The collectivist's point of view is basic and necessary to tyranny.

On the other hand, according to the individualistic view, the state is merely a tool used by cooperating individuals to accomplish mutual goals. The state is created by, and responsible to, individuals. It is not a god to be worshipped, but a tool to be used with justice and discretion.

Once the necessity to tyranny of the collective concept is

grasped it is easy to understand why Jesus was considered such a dangerous influence by representatives of the state. It was not that He stirred up terrible insurrections, not that He engaged in active political agitation, not that He desired control for Himself, it was because He gave people knowledge of their individual importance to God. Each Christian said to himself, "I am an individual, God-created and important. I am individually responsible for my own actions. My salvation is individual. I am more than a mere member of a huge body called the 'State.' I am an individual serving Truth, and my God is Truth. I will have no more of individuals being sacrificed. Don't tell me to place my children on the altar to appease the gods of the tribe or the state. Christ ended the necessity of human sacrifice. I am reconciled to my God through Him. Don't try to control me through collective guilt. My sins are individual, and through Christ my sins are forgiven."

Not all followers of Christ through the centuries understood their freedom or the full value of it. Many were blind worshippers. There were collectivists, however, who understood very well the danger Christianity posed to their ambitions. Some fought Christianity, others tried to adapt it and use it for their worldly purposes.

Many times throughout history the collectivist dogma has subdued entire populations and all but eliminated individual thought and action. However, in the late 18th and early 19th Centuries individual freedom was the dominant trend in the Western world: restraints on knowledge were going; new inventions and discoveries were making life fuller and more comfortable; America was offering unlimited opportunities to the courageous and enterprising; trade and travel barriers were falling, enabling individuals to seek the best of many lands; want and hunger were retreating; much was being done to alleviate human misery; science was gaining greater respect as the gifts won by careful observation and investigation were presented to the world. The trend seemed to be toward ever greater freedom, knowledge, and material abundance. People expected to rise or fall as a result of their own ability, industry, and good fortune. They no longer refrained from seeking their own answers to questions of the world around them. They no longer submitted to temporal power at variance with Christian conscience. Individuals were becoming ever more prosperous, ever more responsible. Thousands of educational institutions were being formed. Millions throughout the world were being schooled through the efforts of parents, churches, and volun-

tary groups. The children grew up in freedom under no obligation to state or ruler for their education.

To collectivists this was chaos. They hated individual thought and individuals who claimed sovereignty over their own minds. They saw the world, not as a world full of promise, challenges, and opportunities for growth and development, but as a world out of control, full of 'intellectual anarchy' — a world which frightened and dismayed them. There was no master plan, no individual or group of individuals taking charge of the lives of the masses. They yearned for a return to the slave mentality. While most were willing to admit that people had prospered greatly with the increase of individual freedom, the collectivists could not conceive of living which left so many decisions to the individuals directly affected.

They got out their *PLATO* and began to bring his schemes for controlling people up-to-date. There were many ideas and many thinkers. However, as far as putting the collective ideas in a form which was suited to the time and emotionally satisfying to great numbers of people, one man stands so far above all the rest that understanding his goals and techniques for achieving them, and following the influence of his thinking on succeeding generations can give greater understanding of all the earlier, later, lesser, and auxiliary plans and planners. Most collectivist planners for the past century and one-half have been either directly or indirectly influenced by his thinking.

MASTER PLAN

The object of our philosophy is to direct the spiritual reorganization of the civilized world . . . we may begin at once to construct that system of morality under which the final regeneration of Humanity will proceed.

Auguste Comte^s

Let us place the beginning in the year 1820. Our master planner was twenty two years old at that time, and he had already set his goal. He wanted nothing less than to reconstruct the entire religious, moral, scientific and political structure of the world. He believed his goal to be so worthy he dedicated his entire adult intellectual life to outlining his plan. His name was not God. It was Auguste Comte.

Comte was a patient master-planner. He realized, above all, that before free people could again be brought under control, their minds had to be trained to be willing to comply. He realized also, as Plato had, that such training could not be accomplished in one or two generations. He knew that a long-range plan was necessary so each new generation could be trained to accept the loss of freedom and knowledge of the preceding generation as the normal state of affairs. Many of us who are now so concerned about the trend in our country and the world are children of the fourth and fifth generations under his influence. Young people in high school and college are children of the sixth generation. Because it has been so long, all of us have been influenced by Comte's thinking in more ways that we can possibly realize or enumerate. Perhaps if properly informed, the children of the sixth generation can begin to gain release from over 150 years of his ever-hardening grip.

Comte's writings never were and never will be best sellers. He didn't want a large audience. He wrote for the intellectual elite of collectivism. He expected his ideas to be adapted by them to be given to future generations of collectivist intellectuals and through them to the young of future generations.

Comte's master plan had two vital branches. First, he turned his attention to science so his disciples and intellectual heirs could eventually claim precedence over all the sciences

and guide all further development. His early writings were an attempt to bring all scientific investigation into an orderly controllable system. He praised the sciences and arranged them according to his conception of their importance and relative development; scientific advancement being regarded by him as a matter of evolution. Those sciences which had early beginnings, he stated, were in the final stages of evolution. Their findings were governed by laws and could be considered positive knowledge. Other sciences were just coming of age, and were ripe for greater development. Above all the sciences Comte placed his new science, social science or sociology, the science of Society, highest in the hierarchy, ruler of all the sciences!

Comte based his new science on the idea of social evolution. He explained progress in terms of increasing collectivization. Beginning with individuals or small families wandering alone, humans were said to have progressed to larger and larger social groups. The final sought-after result will be when all are united into one great, well-disciplined body. The process of social evolution brings us ever closer to this goal, and it is the duty of sociologists to do everything in their power to speed the day of realization: to study and accelerate the social evolution of "Humanity."

As the theory of natural evolution gained greater acceptance, Comte's theory of social evolution attracted adherents among the uncritical; and on the basis of this theory, or as he regarded it, law of social evolution, sociology was accepted by many as a legitimate science. Proponents failed to note, however, that sociology differed from the physical sciences. Physical sciences depend above all upon observation, then collection of many observations, followed by comparison, arrangement and classification. All observations, however minute, are considered before forming an hypothesis. When conclusions are drawn from known facts, the scientific mind remains open to correction as future knowledge presents a wider view of the subject.

Sociology began, not by studying individuals and the differences between them, not by collecting actual observations, but with the conclusion itself: that all significant differences interfering with sociological control of 'Humanity' would eventually be eliminated. It demands belief that 'society' is evolving from the 'many' to the 'one' — that individual and family relationships are but the training school for larger loyalties which will eventually replace them. Sociology is the 'science'

by which this supposed evolution from individuality is to be intelligently controlled and advanced.

To bring sociology into the family of natural sciences, Comte merely redefined the word 'science' in his own fashion. Science, to Comte positivists meant the pursuit of generalities. Sociologically speaking, scientists are those who pursue generalities. Comte, himself, believed facts not in agreement with his own general doctrine should be discarded:

*"In our search for the laws of society, we shall find that the exceptional events and minute details must be discarded as essentially insignificant, while science lays hold of the most general phenomena which everybody is familiar with as constituting the basis of ordinary social life."*⁶

In unscientific fashion Comte sought not the truth of the senses, but a meeting of minds:

*"The requisite convergence of the best minds cannot be obtained without voluntary renunciation on the part of most of them, of their sovereign right to free inquiry."*⁷

So you see, the founder of the world's newest 'science' was ready to abandon all search for truth if such truth interfered with his plan for control.

Control of science and scientists was not enough. Individuals had to be controlled. A new religion was the door to many minds. In the early and mid-nineteenth century it might have seemed as impossible to conquer Christianity as it would have seemed to take over and regiment science, but Auguste Comte was undaunted. Because he believed in no God, he did not hesitate to create his own. For God he substituted the idea of collective Humanity. Humanity itself was the Great Being which must be worshipped and served. Individuals were to be taught to sacrifice themselves for the sake of Humanity, to dedicate their lives to Humanity, to give up individual benefits if leaders told them they conflicted with what was the good of Humanity. When the Religion of Humanity was originated, a word was needed to express this concept which was then foreign to Western thinking, so Comte coined his own: 'altruism,' meaning otherism, and signifying individual abandonment to the collective whole.

Gradually Humanitarian altruism began to mean the same thing to many people as Christian charity. Didn't they both involve sharing? Humanitarian giving, which had as its source

self-abnegation and guilt for personal achievement, came to be regarded as equal to, even better than, Christian charity which is inspired by self-respect and the desire to share good fortune with and elevate others.

Insofar as religious self-abnegation similar to that of Eastern religions was substituted for self-respect; collective divinity for individual integrity; and collective, unselective 'love' for devotion between individuals and families, the strength of Christianity as a force for developing self-respect, individual integrity, and personal independence was neutralized. This, of course, was Comte's goal, for then:

*"In the name of the past and of the future, the servants of humanity — both its philosophical and its practical servants come forward to claim as their due the general direction of this world. Their object is to constitute at length a real providence in all departments, — moral, intellectual, and material. Consequently they exclude once for all from political supremacy all the different servants of God — Catholic, Protestant, or Deist — as being at once behindhand, and a cause of disturbance."*¹⁰

In his plans Comte divided people into two basic types: those who did not believe in God, and those who did believe. Those who did not believe in God, he decided, would become immediate followers of the Religion of Humanity. Those who did believe in God would be subjected to a long period of training and change. As generations passed, both Christian and non-Christian religions could be brought closer and closer together until eventually all believers in God would be willing to become Catholic in a Catholic Church which had been taken over by Comte ideology. There would then be only Catholics and Humanitarians, and these two major religions, now almost alike, would eventually merge into one great world-wide, sociologically-controlled Religion of Humanity.

*"When the religion of science is inaugurated . . . man will confide in the 'sociologists' just as during the palmiest days of the Catholic Church he confided in theologians; with this great difference, that the disciples of the religion of science will be their own judges with respect to results, which are produced in this matter-of-fact world."*¹¹

If the change were carefully engineered and not pushed too fast, Christians would never miss their Christ. People would no longer suffer the yearning for a God who loved them as in-

dividuals; for a Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth to give their minds comfort, inspiration, and lead them to knowledge; for Jesus who promised forgiveness of even the most monstrous sins to free them from the slavery of guilt. Instead, 'Humanity' would provide love. 'Society' and sociologists would provide their comfort and direct their thoughts, and much of what used to be called personal guilt could be redeemed by paying the 'debt to society' — or forgotten because many sins would be attributed to faults of 'society.' There would be no need for personal forgiveness because there would be no personal guilt left to forgive.

PROGRESS OF PLAN

Towards Humanity, who is for us the only true Great Being, we, the conscious elements of whom she is composed, shall henceforth direct every aspect of our life, individual, or collective. Our thoughts will be devoted to the knowledge of Humanity, our affections to her love, our actions to her service.

Auguste Comte¹⁰

While most of Comte's mental energy was devoted to the drafting of his diabolical design for world domination; he knew, despite his feverish mental exertion, the day of realization would not be within his own lifetime. Rather than discourage his efforts, this fact had its own fascination. It gave him, he believed, a spiritual unity with the future.

During the first generation Comte's teachings were already exerting a strong influence on the thinking of scholars, certain ministers, political theorists, and even some politicians. The strongest influence was among collectivists who were ready for his new religion and science — those who shared his conviction that individual minds must be subdued and trained to fit the planned evolution of 'society,' and who were looking for a workable plan to gain control of people's minds.

Educationally, progress of Comte's design to change and eventually eliminate Christianity and take control of science, religion and world politics proceeded from the top down. During the first and second generations his ideas were much discussed by philosophers and intellectuals. Some of those who were most impressed took active steps to disseminate them. By the third generation there was much talk of religious unity. A giant World Parliament of Religions was held in 1893 at the Columbian Exposition in Chicago. It promoted sociology and the idea of religious unity and was attended by thousands of representatives of every faith from all over the world. Also, some colleges offered courses in sociology and political science.

Early in the fourth generation many more colleges opened departments of sociology, although they were not always accepted by other members of the academic community. By the end of the fourth generation the college coverage was nearly

complete and the children were beginning to receive instruction in sociology in high schools.

By the fifth generation history, geography, economics and civics had all but lost their separate identities in most elementary schools. They were considered under the blanket title, 'social studies.' This served to incorporate the prestige of all the separate fields of learning into the 'social studies' area, thus adding to the respectability of sociology or social 'science.'

Children of the sixth generation have had in their schooling a near-complete sociological education. Even such subjects as mathematics, English, and foreign languages are taught with sociological implications and for sociological purposes. There has been no escape from sociological indoctrination for members of the sixth generation. Christian or non-Christian — all have been directed toward the Religion of Humanity.

To realize how subtle the change which has brought us to this point has been, all you need is a dictionary. Look up the word 'humanitarian.' See if you do not find the same definition which I find in my dictionary.

My 1954 WEBSTER says: "*The distinctive tenet denying the divinity of Christ; also the system of doctrine based on this view of Christ. 2. The doctrine that man's obligations are limited to and dependent alone on, man and human relations. B. The doctrine of Saint-Simon* that a man's nature is perfectible through his own efforts without divine grace. 3. Regard for the interests of mankind; benevolence.*"

Now I think, whether you are a Christian or not, you will agree that being a Christian should mean more than being a good person who is nice to other people. There were nice people long before Christianity. There are nice people today who are not Christian. I think you would acknowledge that to be a Christian in the true sense of the word one would have to believe that Christ is the Son of God, that He was crucified to end for all time the necessity of human sacrifice, for sins either collective or individual, and that the Holy Spirit remains as a guide and comforter. Logically one cannot be a Christian and at the same time deny the divinity of Christ. If he denies the divinity of Christ, although he may be a nice person, he is not a Christian.

*Saint-Simon was one to Auguste Comte's early teachers.

Now think back. Can you ever recall hearing a nominal Christian object to being called Humanitarian? Yet a Humanitarian is one who denies Christianity. A Christian cannot be a Humanitarian. If thinking in six generations has become so confused that even Christian ministers allow themselves to be called Humanitarians and are willing to study sociology as a required part of their training, Comte has indeed come a long way without making too many waves. When you find individuals claiming to be both Humanitarian and Christian; collectivist and individualist; against war and in favor of coercing everyone into a collectivist 'society'; scientifically-minded, yet blind to individual differences — you must know something serious has happened to their thought processes or their means of communication. They are not talking sense. If we of the fourth and fifth generation sometimes speak so carelessly, it is small wonder those of the sixth generation are sometimes confused.

It is the children of the sixth generation who have been the most grievously wounded. They get little recognition for personal achievement, for personal responsibility, for personal virtue. The goals that are within their reach: to produce goods; to trade; to offer services to other individuals; to invent; to entertain; to discover, and profit personally from their own productive efforts — these goals have been degraded and made to appear boring by their sociological education.

The collectivist goals which are impossible, outside the realm of personal achievement, or only possible through coercion and violence, are thrust upon them. Before they have had an opportunity to prove their own ability, show their own worth or earn their own money, they are asked to sacrifice their lives to others, to sensitize themselves to all Humanity. They are told vaguely that they must work to 'improve society,' 'enforce equality,' 'equalize opportunity,' 'eliminate poverty,' 'serve Humanity.' The way to accomplish these ends is to engage in political coercion and submit to sociological direction. The children of the sixth generation are being trained to be blind to themselves, to their own individuality — to see themselves only as members of 'Humanity,' to accept 'Society' as their moral teacher, 'Society' as their critic, 'Society' as their disciplinarian, 'Society' as their God.

It is no accident that the sixth generation is becoming the generation of violence, of drugs, of promiscuity, of self-contempt. They have been taught that individuals are important only as members of 'Society.' Some resent 'Society' for de-

nying them their individuality. They may do violent things to punish 'Society'; behave promiscuously or cloud their minds with drugs, to show 'Society' does not rule them. Others struggle to gain 'Society's' approval by humanitarian dedication.

The only surprising and encouraging thing is that even after six generations there are still so many who retain their personal integrity. While they cannot help being confused, they are seeking something better for themselves than a drug-induced conformity, a life of protest, or a life of dedication to 'Humanity.' There are many of the sixth generation who want to learn Truth; to earn, to achieve, to produce; to help other people with their own effort and their own money; to keep their bodies and their minds clean; to love and be loved as individuals. There will be more young people of this type if we of the fourth and fifth generation, and those of the sixth generation who are able, can help lift the veil and return to true knowledge, to honest science which conforms to the evidence of our senses, to language which is precise and accurate as a means of honest communication, to history which is untainted by sociological interpretations, to an appreciation of individual differences and individual goals.

SOCIOLOGY TODAY

"Everything depends upon passing out the expert opinions of the social scientists to the masses of the people; and the schools, particularly the high schools, are the only adequate agency available for this function."

Ross L. Finney¹¹

A parent casually picking up a high school sociology text might find some cause for resentment and alarm, but it would not be easy to discern the over-all pattern and direction of teaching without knowing in advance where the sociologists are headed.

It is no secret that they are driving for power. Many books can be found in which the intent is clearly stated, or in which the necessity for sociological direction of world affairs is assumed. After reading these books, particularly those written by early sociologists who were engaged in teacher training or theological instruction, it becomes easier to understand why so many sociological humanitarian efforts to improve living conditions fail or make things worse. Improvement of the human condition was never the true goal.

The true goal has always been to increase sociological power. The schools are used to prepare children for this increased sociological dependence. If their training is effective, it will accomplish some of the following purposes:

1. To develop emotional rather than intellectual responses to what are called 'social problems.'
2. To direct emotions toward collective rather than individual or family relationships.
3. To train students toward self-sacrifice rather than self-respect.
4. To convince students that as individuals they are ineffective — that worthwhile goals must be pursued through group effort or under group control.
5. To idealize distant, long-range and even impossible achievements so people can be bound together in common effort for indefinite periods of time.

6. To alienate children from parental influence and Christian moral teaching.

The first step in an elementary sociology text, as it is with any seducer, is to build up trust and confidence. Within the first few chapters most of them will attempt to convince their readers that sociology is a science. Few children will question the claim or attempt to look behind the mask. They do not expect to be deceived. Hardly knowing what is meant by science, they accept without thinking. Once they have accepted sociology's scientific mask, they become less likely to question and more likely to accept its teachings as scientific truth.

In reality sociology is not a science, not a search for objective truth, but a way of looking at life. It is closer to a religion than a science, but it is a destructive, not a constructive religion. It is a religion of distortion, half-truth, immorality and deception — a religion which does not seek truth, but attempts to manufacture it. It is a religion which seeks to destroy, rather than perfect human nature and individuality. It has brought out the worst, rather than the best in many of the young people who have been exposed to its teachings.

Sociology or 'social science' is the religion which attempts to destroy individuals by denying their existence, by telling them they have no 'self' apart from social interaction. To a sociologist there is no such creature as an individual human being who uses his own intelligence and acts on his own initiative. We are all but members of a larger body who have no real existence outside that larger body. The intelligence of the larger body acts on us and controls us. We react and respond, but have no free will. Sociology's aim is to achieve a world which conforms to the mind-destroying ideals of the sociological religion.

"Physically we have become separate; mentally we remain but slightly differentiated participants in a common social plasm. Each person acquires a mind of his own only as he participates in the social mind. The notion of a separate and independent ego is an illusion."

Ross L. Finney¹²

I have a number of high school sociology books before me. If you will refer to yours, you will find they are all quite similar in many respects. All sociologists, for example, talk about 'social change.' The preface may begin by announcing that we live in an age of 'social change.' The statement seems so ob-

vious to most people that it is hardly worth mentioning. Change is everywhere all the time. But note that the sociologist said 'social change.' There is a difference between what the sociologist means by 'social change,' and what an uninformed, casual reader might think he means. Unless we pin down and limit the meaning of the expression, we lose the battle for our children before we begin to fight. 'Social change' is not a precise term unless its meaning is limited to changes in dealings between individuals and their relationships with one another, and changes in political demands and prohibitions. Do not include scientific advancement of technological progress in your understanding of this phrase. If you do, this allows the sociologists to gain your consent for their 'sociological change' on the basis of the fact you approve of greater knowledge and the cultural and material benefits which result from it. Because you accept changes in knowledge and the physical environment, sociologists use your acceptance as affirmation for the general idea of change — minimizing the possibility that you will question them when they begin to promote the 'social changes' which lead toward their goal of complete central control: collectivizing and centralizing authority, responsibility and power, leaving individuals without authority over their own lives — irresponsible and powerless.

"We can have an ideal society only when every person volunteers to sacrifice himself for the good of the whole."

Charles A. Ellwood¹³

There is a sociological manner of speaking which should be understood. Sociologists talk about 'mankind' and 'man' and most high school sociology books will mention at least once that 'man' knows more about regulating nature than about controlling himself. They do not mean an individual man knows little about controlling himself (although that is sometimes true), or that individual men know little about controlling themselves (also true on occasion); they are talking about group or political control. They are really saying that the few who aspire to unquestioned leadership have not yet achieved control over individual minds and actions.

"The purpose of studying sociology is that mankind may learn the rational control of social relations."

OUR CHANGING SOCIAL ORDER¹⁴

Watch out when sociologists say 'mankind' or use the singular words such as 'man' in a plural sense. If you analyze the sociological use of singular nouns for plural realities, you will frequently find that it is done to obscure the fact that individual thoughts and individual actions are involved; but the sociologist does not want you to take note of the fact. They do not like to acknowledge the existence of individual intelligence.

Truth should be our measure of merit. If sociologists were really scientists, if they spoke the truth without distortion, we could respect them. Because of their lies and attempts to deceive, we should dismiss them and their 'science.'

In the case of the particular book I am holding now, I don't have to go further than the first paragraph of the first chapter to find an example. Chapter one is the 'sell sociology as a science' chapter. One of the methods the sociologist uses to attempt to build his 'science' is to degrade the level of thinking and scientific intelligence of previous generations. The author announces that in Colonial times if a healthy man died in bed there was a 50-50 chance his widow would be tried for witchcraft. This is an outlandish distortion! Try to prove even one such case with the best historical evidence. After such a whopper he proceeds to tell students how in our enlightened age 'we' base our conclusions on study and evidence, not witchcraft.

Would your teen-aged children read carefully enough or have enough historical knowledge and interest to question a teacher on a seemingly inconsequential point? Perhaps it is unimportant in itself, but when there are many 'inconsequential' little slips of this type in high school sociology textbooks a student can be put in a state of utter confusion and complete exhaustion trying to maintain his intellectual integrity and respect for truth.

The scientific techniques on which sociology's claim to the name of 'science' is based include: questioning people, observing people, gathering statistics about people, and sometimes setting people up in a 'laboratory situation' so their reactions can be observed. This is called scientific investigation. The results of this gossip, spy, and 'what do people think?' kind of research are called scientific evidence. Sociologists' observations are supposed to be more valid than yours or mine because they count, tabulate and draw conclusions.

But sociology's credentials have been faulty from the start. Because the physical scientists in attempting to unravel nature's mysteries usually discover a pattern and organize

their material to conform with nature's patterns, sociologists believe that if they organize they are scientists. They work from exactly the opposite direction. They build up the framework of organization, and then try to get nature to conform. They classify people and their associations and strain to fit individuals into one category or another — never seeing an individual human being with individual abilities, values, and goals. They cloud, rather than increase our ability to discover cause and effect relationships.

TECHNIQUES OF SOCIOLOGY

Intellectual science can only be thoroughly appreciated when it is identified with sociology properly so called — sociology which I established on its true basis when I discarded for ever the worthless study of the individual mind pursued by metaphysicians.

Auguste Comte¹⁵

Despite the fact that from its inception sociology has had goals which negate the possibility of honest conclusions from honest evidence, many people do pay heed to advice from sociologists — the most dangerous for your children being teachers and school administrators, and the most dangerous for individual liberty being sociologically-trained and oriented politicians and governmentally-financed social researchers.

As you read your sociology book keep asking yourself questions. While you can't dwell on each of the little inconsistencies, misstatements, contradictions, assumptions, devices, distortions and untruths, you will find; be alert so you are aware of them. For example: If the sociologist makes a statement such as 'A child at birth has no self and is not aware of himself as distinct from others,' ask yourself how he could possibly learn such a thing.

Watch for devious means to plant ideas. One book in the 'promote sociology as a science' chapter mentions a playground situation saying dominance among boys is achieved by threats and arguments, leaving one with the impression that childhood dominance is violently achieved. This half-truth serves more than one sociological purpose. First, it is an effective way of degrading voluntary childhood associations because it overlooks the fact that the dominant individual in a group of boys is not necessarily the bully, but more often the one who has a happy friendly personality and a head full of ideas for having fun. The negative sociological view can have an emotional effect on students. It may even give the unpopular high school student cause to look down on his popular fellow classmates — and perhaps start him on the self-

destructive road toward hating successful people. In addition, if the student accepts the statement without question, it diminishes his ability to read critically and extract truth from his reading material.

" . . . If it were possible to control the learning of all individuals, in the way both of ideas and of emotional attitudes, as they come on to the stage of life, it would be possible to modify the whole complex of our social life, or our civilization, within the comparatively short space of one or two generations."

Charles A. Ellwood¹⁴

Another technique I noticed in several books is that of using works of fiction as sociological evidence or to draw examples of undesirable behavior. This is done to promote some type of sociological legislation or to gain approval for sociological legislation of the past. However, consulting fiction is hardly an honest way for a true scientist to get his information about people.

Sociologists are also prone to invent hypothetical situations, then interpret them in such a way as to build up resentments and desired sociological attitudes in the students. One book discusses an exuberant youngster who was frequently in trouble because of his boyhood pranks. His young adult life was filled with practical jokes, misdemeanors, and unconventional actions. Finally he took a sales job and had great success — even worked up to a position of authority. He married and had a family, worked conscientiously and rejected all reminders of his past irresponsible behavior. You and I might say he had finished with his childish fun, and had learned to assume and enjoy his adult responsibilities. In the sociologist's view, which is the one your children learn, their hypothetical person had succumbed to the unrelenting pressures of social conformity. His case was presented as if, after years of discipline and repression, his spirit had finally been broken.

Sociologist writers sometimes assert that they as sociologists and 'scientists' are concerned with 'what is,' and not 'what ought to be.' It is surprising how many of them in the very next chapter, or even the very next paragraph complain because there is great resistance to sociological or social change, and talk about sociological research and application of that research as an effective means for making over the world.

Since sociology is supposed to be the study of groups, and since the road to power is through the construction, use, consolidation and control of groups; sociologists attempt to bind students to the idea of groups. Instead of saying 'family,' they say 'primary group.' Instead of saying 'friends,' they say 'peer groups.' Instead of saying employers, associates, teachers, etc., they say either primary or secondary groups. Those who are outside are deviants or non-conformists.

Frequently sociologists have to strain to a ridiculous degree to fit people into group classifications. A pair of lovers constitute a sociological group. The whole female sex is called the 'female sub-culture.' Sociologists speak as if groups form individuals, when in fact individuals who have a common purpose form groups. But even people without a common purpose and no personal contact can be put in a sociological group — the 'out' group. A nasty child, if he becomes a real problem or delinquent, is a member of the 'delinquent sub-culture' even if he has no association with other delinquents.

It is ridiculous how sociologists strain and push to create the impression of unity and scientific integrity. Yet, it is easy to be taken in if one is not 100% alert. The writers of the books are real professional con artists, and very patient and clever. If we were to use their means of classification, we might say they belong to the same sly, delinquent sub-culture as the professional pickpockets.

After the chapter on sociology as a science you will probably find some paragraphs, or more likely, a chapter or two on heredity vs environment. Sociologists have been going around in circles on this matter for almost as long as sociology has existed. Most of us would be willing to acknowledge that both heredity and environment are of great importance in forming the personality and character of an individual and determining his course in life. When physicians, geneticists, and psychologists appear with unquestionable proof that certain characteristics are more strongly dependent on one than on the other, we are willing to listen and guide ourselves accordingly; but the endless discussion of heredity vs environment after the importance of both has been granted would seem to serve no purpose.

Don't be too sure!

The pickpocket distracts your attention by an obvious maneuver while by unnoticed subtle moves he steals away your valuables. While we are arguing for or against heredity

and for or against environment and assigning importance and debating the contributions of both, we tend to forget one equally important element in a person's makeup — his free will or his spirit — his own choice as to how he will use his gifts or overcome the obstacles heredity or environment have placed in his way.

The sociological argument of heredity vs environment distracts one from recognizing the existence of such a free will and puts human beings on an animal level as creatures who react and respond, who must be maneuvered into the 'proper' condition. It does not recognize them as thinking individuals capable of conceiving and perceiving intangible moral principles and directing their own lives.

The denial of moral principles and an individual's freedom to choose may be one reason many children fare so badly today. They are told they are under the power of groups — that morality is decreed by groups, — that their personality was formed by groups — that they are made to adhere to the standards of groups. It could make them feel helpless, caged in, pushed by 'Society.' They are left with only two choices: conform or rebel! Those who conform deny themselves and live for others, the group or Society. Those who rebel give up trying, or look for ways to destroy or break down the 'system.'

Life would be so much easier for them to comprehend, freer and more enjoyable if they were taught basic truths and principles rather than sociological obedience to the group. The young people who have the best chance to retain their identity and integrity are those who pay the least attention to or do not understand their sociological instruction, who somehow manage to escape indoctrination.

What a disaster, if the only students who can maintain their integrity are those who reject or ignore their training! At one time many children received good training outside the home. Even if a child had parents who were a poor example, he learned in school and in church the basic principles to apply to his own life. He learned to evaluate individuals and not to conform to the group. He learned he did not have to be immoral, dishonest, lazy or disagreeable just because some others in his family or among his associates were. He was taught to be careful in choosing friends because bad behavior is easier to learn than good. He learned he could rise above his handicaps and surroundings. He learned that whatever his situation in life he could improve it by his own effort. He was free and he knew it! He was taught to take the blame for his mistakes and

to accept without guilt the rewards of his virtues and good fortune. He had an incentive for hard work, an appreciation for the gifts he received and a spirit that gave him strength to fight against adversity and persist in the accomplishment of his goals.

He was not taught to shoulder the guilt for the misdeeds of his ancestors, although he knew he could learn from their mistakes. He learned that he, himself, not others, bore the largest share of responsibility for what he was to become. While he was urged to be charitable toward others he was not burdened with the fruits of their errors, immorality, and failures. What he did in his own life mattered. It made a difference. He was taught his character and achievements were important to himself and to God — and 'God' was not 'Society,' 'Humanity,' or the 'Group.' Material comforts for some may have been few. Work may have been difficult. Life may have been hard, but to the one who respected himself as an individual it was never futile or without meaning.

SOCIOLOGY CLOSING IN

Man indeed, as an individual, cannot properly be said to exist, except in the too abstract brain of modern metaphysicians. Existence in the true sense can only be predicated of Humanity.

Auguste Comte¹⁷

Recently while visiting a young cousin in college my husband became involved in one of the rap sessions at the fraternity house. The subject of drugs was brought up. One young man listened for a while and then said, "I'll tell you one thing, LSD showed me who I really am."

"You stupid idiot!" my husband joked, "there never was a time when I didn't know who I was. If you're having such a hard time, bring me all your coats and shirts. I'll have little labels with your name sewn inside. Then every time you wonder who you are you can unbutton and take a look."

Everybody laughed, and the discussion continued. It wasn't until I began to read modern high school sociology books that the real tragedy of this little drama hit me with its full impact. The statement about LSD did not indicate a smart aleck trying to show off. It was not an affectation, nor was it a rationalization to justify stupid behavior. That poor boy actually did not know who he was. In his own eyes he had no real identity. He was literally trying to find his 'self' in drugs.

Hundreds of thousands of young people today are in more or less the same situation. Their problem is a great deal more serious than their parents realize, have ever experienced, or possibly could even understand. These lost souls are wandering around seeking, but never finding, that elusive something called 'self.' They seek it in their relationships with other people. They seek it in travel. They seek it in outlandish dress and hair styles. They seek it in sexual activity. They seek it in drugs or debauchery. They seek it in service and self-sacrifice. They seek it in crime — perhaps hoping that someone somewhere will make it clear to them who they really are.

How could it be? How could so many be similarly afflicted? Is there some common cause to which all of them have

been exposed? How could anyone doubt his own identity? We all have minds. We have bodies. What is it we perceive when we look in the mirror? It is a reflection of something! Do we not see ourselves?

According to sociologists — No! The 'self' to a serious student of sociology is the opinion of other people — or what one imagines other people's opinion of him to be. A newly born child, according to sociological thinking has no 'self' because he has not interacted with the groups that make up his social environment. High school young people are told they were born without a 'self.' They have no identity, no soul. It must be given to them by 'Society.'

Do you know any high-school-aged individual intellectually equipped to battle that one out with the sociologists? They parrot the sociological phrases. Many of them believe. Why not? One does not expect to be deceived by his teachers. They believe, but they cannot accept. Without knowing where to look, which way to turn, or even what they are looking for, they begin the pitiful, heartbreaking search for identity. They have to find themselves and they don't know where to look.

What would you tell somebody who is actually looking for his 'self'? Where would you tell a youth to look for his own identity? How do you talk to a youth who believes he has no 'self'? Can you talk to him about self-respect? He has no self. Can you talk to him about self-confidence? He has no self. Can he have self-control? He has no self. Self-reliance? He has no self.

If your child contracted no other mind-corrupting concept from sociology, the loss of 'self' could be enough to destroy him. He can be blinded to his own individuality. He can find identity only as a member of a group.

The sociological child is born into a group — the family. He is molded by the group. There is nothing but groups. There is the kinship group, the religious group, the play group, the common interest group, the neighborhood group, the trade group, the fraternal group, the army group, the medical group, the political group, the nationality group, the racial group, the 'in' group, the 'out' group — everything is groups. Any time he meets another person the sociology student is told he is interacting in a 'group situation.' A young person with such training loses his ability to recognize his own unique personality. If parents are not aware of how he is being trained, they are not even alerted to the fact that he needs help. The sociologists can train him their way.

"The young mind is as absorbent as blotting paper. The ideas of other people exert an insistent pressure even upon adults unless we are already possessed of ideas with which they seem to conflict. As a young child's mind is so meagerly equipped as yet with knowledge, it can offer no such resistance. Accordingly it absorbs whatever cognitive material happens to be extant in its social environment."

Ross L. Finney¹⁸

What about churches? Don't they help young people recognize their own value? Many do, of course. However, one of the major goals of Auguste Comte, the sociologists, and sociologically oriented people who followed Comte's intellectual pattern was to take over or destroy Christianity. Then, as generations passed, the Christian religion which spoke to and cared for individual souls could be replaced by the sociological religion which deals only with groups and social issues. Many priests and ministers today have been sociologically trained and no longer speak of individual identity, individual concern, individual guilt, and individual salvation. They preach on social issues, abhor talk of a personal relationship with God, and refuse to acknowledge individual souls. They augment rather than counteract the sociological destruction of 'self.'

"The nation is not a mass of independent individuals, but of related individuals, who, moreover are so closely related that they make together an indivisible organism; this organism develops according to orderly laws; this organism has perpetuity, never disjoining itself either from its past or future; and the organism has also self-consciousness and moral personality. This is the nation in which we live and move and have our being."

Rev. Francis Bellamy¹⁹

In some cases this may be due more to ignorance than malice. There are ministers and priests who have had ample training in sociology, but their knowledge of history, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, the natural sciences and the Bible frequently does not compare with that of an ordinary 19th Century schoolboy. They are better trained in urban sociology than the New Testament.

A lost child looking for 'identity' does not need a lecture on self-sacrifice, the troubles of 'Humanity', and urban sociology. He needs to be told that he has a *self* — that whatever may

happen to him, *he* is important, and his response to the challenges which are given him is important. He needs to be told the opinion of the world is not the directing force; but that he should be guided by Truth and personal integrity. He needs to be shown how to discover, use, and multiply his talents. He needs to be warned against trespassing and uninvited interference in the lives of others. He needs assurance that he is not bound by unbreakable chains to every other individual no matter how evil or depraved. He needs to be freed from the sociologist's destructive concept of the group as an organic entity.

No one can know exactly how another person feels, but when I see young people of the sociological generation (the generation that has had a complete sociological education), I wonder whether they might be experiencing the same trapped feeling I used to get from certain movies and in geography class.

If we kids didn't go to the movies on Saturday, we had to go on Sunday, because the hero of the adventure serial was suspended from a cliff or surrounded by Indians, about to be tortured by the mad scientist, or dropped into a vat of bubbling acid. We knew he would escape, but were quivering with anticipation to discover how. Sometimes the escapes were ingenious and exciting. Other times simple and obvious, but we never tired of the suspense.

Strangely, there was only one sequence which gave me bad dreams. In it the hero and his sweetheart had been deceived by a half-crazed inventor into entering a long narrow room. Within minutes they were horrified to discover that the walls were moving. Bit by bit, inch by inch, the walls were coming closer and closer together. I used to dream myself in that room with them. There were no doors and only one small circular window at the long end of the room through which we could see the wild-eyed inventor as he turned the crank bringing us closer and closer to our doom. I don't know how we escaped if we ever did. All I could remember were the walls moving slowly, relentlessly closer and closer. We couldn't help ourselves. I would wake up gasping for air and pushing against the wall.

Perhaps the comparison seems farfetched logically, but I used to get the same suffocating, hemmed-in emotion in geography class when we studied India. We learned how poor Indians were and how they suffered from famine and disease. It wasn't the poverty and illness which made me feel the walls were closing in. I was sure that if I were poor or sick I could do

something to overcome my problems or find someone to help me. The oppressed squeezed-in feeling came from the fact that religious beliefs, customs and government restrictions tied men's hands and restrained their minds, bound them together in misery. Individuals were not allowed to think or do for themselves. Even if they were capable of independent thought to try to better their condition, they were confined to their caste or group. They were restricted and hemmed in by others. The walls had closed in on them and there was no way out.

If a sacred cow trampled their garden and ate their grain, they could do nothing. If a rat were eating precious grain and spreading disease, they could do nothing. Millions and millions of people existed cramped and crowded, regulated and restricted. Many believed they were sacrificing their present lives for a better one in the next reincarnation, so did not complain. Intelligent individual action was all but impossible because individual lives were of no significance. To be poor is by no means pleasant; but to be poor and completely walled-in by religious and government restrictions and by other people who refused to release you, seemed unbearable.

Without knowing of my emotional and frightened reaction to the study of India, one of my teachers took away my fear and made it possible for me to concentrate on the facts of geography. Miss Berg explained that such a way of living couldn't happen to us because there is a difference in the way people think in our country.

"India is a country," she told us, "where a large majority of the people do not see themselves as individuals. Their ancient religions are used to instill a spirit of self-sacrifice. In this country," she went on, "most of us believe that each person is different and each important to himself and God. We are all free to work at any job we can do. We can earn and save, or spend our money. This gives us personal power so we don't have to submit to political power. Instead of being born into a class and dying in the same condition, while good fortune does play some part, we are not dependent on birth or wealth or the government to do well.

"One man in his lifetime can live many lives. He can do many things. He can go from poor to rich; or if he is unlucky, lazy or foolish, from rich to poor. One who begins dependent on the charity of others may some day be able to return the gifts and kindnesses he has received by passing them on to another. We have an inheritance of freedom. We are not limited to one trade or to our father's trade if we do not choose to be. A per-

son who is interested and willing to work can learn many things and have a marvelous personal security if he has many talents. "I teach," she said, "but if I didn't teach I wouldn't starve. I can clerk in a store, I can type letters and take shorthand, I can work in an office, I can see when a job needs to be done and do it without being told. I can organize my work. I have always learned as much as I could because by being well-trained and versatile I am free. That's why I ask you to work so hard. When you grow up I want you to be able to do at least one thing very well, and many things better than most people. Then you will never be enslaved by your ignorance or lack of ability. If you are well prepared for life you will never be fenced in. You will never have to sell your soul to buy your bread."

I wish today's children could learn from a Miss Berg. She might arm them against sociological teaching which robs them of 'self' and soul before they are old enough to know they have been cheated. She might warn them against turning vital economic and social functions over to political and therefore sociological central control. She might warn them against building up government as the one source of wealth, service, supply and power. She might warn them against selling their birthright of freedom and self responsibility to walk into the long narrow room where there is no choice, no freedom to think constructively about one's own welfare, and no escape.

Consciously or by unconscious intuition she understood the dangers and oppression of the sociologist's 'organic society.' She would never have believed it possible that we could be in danger of giving up individuality to become no more than members of the Great Being — Humanity.

I once knew an exceptionally talented young singer. Glen had an outstanding voice, could write songs, had an excellent stage personality, and could put on an effective and entertaining one-man TV show. His talent won him jobs, but he couldn't follow through. Most of those who were impressed with his singing and lively personality cooled off on him after a short time. The failing, I believe, which cost him his career in that city was his busy-body mode of operation. He was never content to do his own job and do it well. He was openly critical of the camera men, the director, the announcer, the musicians, the stage manager, and most stupid of all — the sponsor and the way he wanted his product presented. The point is not whether or not Glen was possessed of sufficient genius to be wiser at all these jobs than the professionals, the point is there were many areas of his own performance and of his own per-

sonality which could have been sharpened up and polished. By paying so much attention to others, he was ignoring his own self-improvement. The other people involved in his show were all doing a better than adequate job. They didn't need his nagging. While it would not have been out of line for him to ask for a change now and then, or a better angle for a more effective presentation; his criticisms were constant and done with no tact. He had none of the responsibility for the others' work, yet wanted his way to be followed by all of them.

It was so unpleasant to listen constantly to his nagging critical complaining, no one could stand to have him around for very long. He remained in town for about a year and then left in search of recognition and appreciation in other towns. I hope he has become successful somewhere; but unless he changed his method of operation, I doubt it could be in the field of television entertainment.

Sociological teaching is filling the country with young people like Glen, but most of them can't even sing. They believe they are making a wonderful contribution when they sit on the sidelines and parrot sociological gripes. Most often they are not even directly involved in and have no responsibility for the work they criticize. Because they have been taught that 'Humanity' is their responsibility, they are wasting their precious youth pushing and coercing other people, trying to force them to act as a group to solve problems. The only results they can boast are political. They help politicians grasp more power; which means ever greater power for the sociologists who are always behind the scenes whispering in the politicians' ears, and drawing up plans for new laws, restrictions, and intrusions. Always the plans are sociologically engineered to turn the crank which brings the walls closer and closer. The destructive young critics help sociologists apply the squeeze binding individuals to the group for easier control of the universal tribe.

"It is the business of teachers to run not merely the school, but the world; and the world will never be truly civilized until they assume that responsibility."

Ross L. Finney²⁰

Teenagers enter sociology classrooms completely unarmed and vulnerable. They have limited experience, a minimal knowledge of history, a subordinate position in which they are not free to probe or contradict, a dependence on the good will

of the teacher because passing grades are necessary for graduation, and no reason to be suspicious either of what is presented as knowledge or the intent of the instruction. Few, if any, parents look at their children's books. It is a beautiful set-up, and sociologists use it to full advantage.

"The school is the germ plasm of the higher civilization. Teachers are, therefore, in charge of social selection at the source of origins for each new generation; they can even introduce at will mutations of their own invention."

Ross L. Finney²¹

No child takes sociology for his own benefit or profit. He may take it to satisfy his curiosity, because it is required (not needed) for some field of work which interests him, or because he needs the credits for graduation; but there is no way personal benefit can be derived from a sociology class as it might be from an English, mathematics, foreign language or natural science course. Except for the material sociology appropriates from other academic areas, there is nothing to be learned that can be of value to an individual student. The real learning which might be credited to sociology courses is that which is pirated from biology, zoology, history, economics, civics, geography, anatomy, physiology, psychology, etc. A good general science course could easily convey all the scientific knowledge sociology fences. Stripped of all its stolen treasures, sociology is left with nothing more than a point of view — the self-denying, de-humanizing, group-worshipping, unscientific, hate-inducing, collective point of view.

Sociologists live in and seek to transport your children to an empty world of make believe. Even their language reveals the artificiality of their approach to life. They talk about 'status' which is one's position in a particular group. They talk about 'role' which is one's manner of performing in the group. It is as if we are all merely actors. These concepts may provide effective phrases in Shakespearean drama, but it is not good to give youngsters the idea that their worth is dependent on artificial 'status' with various groups. It is not good to give children the impression that moral values are merely emotionalized attitudes which are transmitted from parent to child. It is not good to give youngsters the idea that the only reason we refrain from moral wrong is because the group would disapprove if we did not comply with the 'norms.' It is not good to sweep away all that has been discovered or reveal-

ed about principles, morality, and personal integrity, and ask children to begin with no greater knowledge than is available to the most backward savage tribes.

How can inexperienced children judge for themselves as sociologists pretend to ask? What child has the knowledge or mature intellect to understand and appreciate the intellectual perfection of the New Testament? How can children feel its emotional satisfaction and appreciate its morally uplifting effect when they have so little experience with life? How can children understand the intellectual exertion, physical suffering, moral turmoil, and resolute conviction which have gone into formulating, understanding, and upholding the principles which enable people to live together in justice and freedom?

Instead of teaching children to seek strength, purpose, truth and independence; sociological training leads to indecision, dependence, artificiality, distortion and moral cowardice. Sociologists have little or no individual moral sense. Morality is forever changing for them because it is whatever 'Society' accepts — whatever appeals to the emotions of the group.

They don't see that what they wish to discard is a great deal more valuable than the 'mores' of a primitive, savage tribe. They reject strong, proven foundations to build on spongy bog. While they talk in hypocritical, pseudo-scientific fashion about social heritage, cultural heritage, and intellectual heritage, they cast away all with no greater consideration than they would give an empty tube of toothpaste. They are willing to forget the moral lessons of past ages. They are willing to forget knowledge, truth, intelligence and reason, for they have been told by their predecessors that:

"The great secret of the coming age of the world is that civilization rests not on reason but on emotion."

Benjamin Kidd"

RESPONSIBILITY AND GUILT

The whole effect of Positivist worship will be to make men feel clearly how far superior in every respect is the synthesis founded on the Love of Humanity to that founded on the Love of God.

Auguste Comte²⁸

High school students have a great deal to think about, learn and do. They have to think about growing up and planning their futures. They have to think about getting along with their teachers and parents and trying to measure up. They have to think about developing their talents. They have to think about developing their social skills so they can make friends and a proper impression when the opinion of others is important to them. They have to think about their high school sports and high school clubs. They have to learn self-discipline and how to get along with and enjoy the company of the opposite sex. Some have to think about work as they have jobs and special chores. Some have parents who are hard on them — or not hard enough.

The high school years are a time of great activity, personal change and strong emotional pressures, but they should also be a time for fun and a time to build up happy memories.

While some teenagers can find special areas to be helpful to other people, and while most are warm, outgoing and willing to help when asked or when they recognize a need, it is enough. At this very emotional, very difficult, very special and golden time of their lives, young people do not need additional mental burdens. They do not need backbiting, gossip, nasty innuendoes, carping criticism. They do not need to be taught to be complainers, critics, grippers, busybodies, trespassers, know-it-alls. They do not need to be shown the unpleasant, negative, failure ridden, spiteful, bitter, depraved, dirty side of life. Most especially they do not need to have the burden for all of the world's failures placed on their shoulders. No one can bear such burdens. If they were older and more experienced they might realize it; but being young, many will accept their 'guilt' and 'responsibility' and begin a frantic effort to make things

right. Too many instead of choosing an area where they can do constructive work decide that the answer lies in becoming sideline critics and agitators who coerce other people. Instead of building for their own constructive futures, many begin to tear down what others have built. Much of this hysterical destructive attitude is a result of sociological teaching and training.

It is good that one should give voluntarily from his abundance to elevate others, admirable to share daily bread with those who have none. It is heroic to sacrifice or risk oneself to help another in dire distress. It is constructive to call attention to problems as a challenge to personal excellence giving examples of individuals who have overcome them and made great discoveries, done fine work, developed new and better methods to perform services or produce wanted goods. It is constructive to point out the many areas where young people can do useful, satisfying, productive work, and to inspire a zest for life. It is constructive to give examples of individuals who have sacrificed for a purpose or dedicated their lives to a search for truth, but it is an abomination to teach children they, themselves, have no personal value — that the only way they can prove their worth is to sacrifice themselves to Humanity for the sake of the Universal Tribe — to accept responsibility for all the world's hunger, all the world's poverty, all the world's disease and misery, all the world's ignorance, cares, headaches and battles.

Sociologists place these intolerable and impossible burdens on young people, but give them no avenue of personal achievement which has any hope of accomplishing useful goals. They close doors to productive activity by degrading work for personal gain. They close doors to personal achievement by demanding equality. They clamp the lid on personal happiness by demanding all share everyone's misery. They fill minds with guilt for other people's errors and misdeeds. They offer only collective solutions to personal problems — collective solutions to bind everyone to the group — immobilizing them so individual efforts will be more and more impossible and unproductive.

As the walls are closing in, sociologists use the students to help crank them closer and closer. Each new generation has less room to move toward personal goals. They are told their salvation is in the group and in appealing to politicians for group benefits. The students scream and push, march and throw stones in the hope of getting political action. All the

while sociologists whisper in the politicians' ears, "Take more power. Take more control. We will tell you what to do. We are the scientists. We will rule through you." The politicians listen, obey, and the walls move closer.

Those things which free minds and promote individual development and self-control are most frequently degraded by sociologists. Those things which blind the senses, close one's mind, increase dependence, and promote submission are elevated by sociological teaching.

Sociologists have a word which may have done more to break down family loyalty, patriotism, Christian morality, school spirit, fraternal devotion, national and racial pride, artistic appreciation, and scientific honesty than any other term ever invented. The word: ethnocentric. To sociologists (since they don't like to acknowledge individuals) it means judging other groups in terms of our group's standards. To the students they teach it means, 'Don't accept the values your Christian or Jewish parents may have taught you. If one is proud of and speaks well of his country, family, friends, race, nationality, religion, associations; if he has values and ethical yardsticks for judging others, he is 'ethnocentric.' Ethnocentric groups according to sociologists do not understand other groups and cultures because they judge in terms of their own values and not in terms of the other group's values.

We would understand other cultures better if we judged them from their point of view rather than our own. For example: the eskimo who kills for revenge is not a criminal, but is admired by his group. The kindly New Guinean head-hunter should be understood. Our values do not apply to his culture. He should not be condemned. He believes he needs other men's heads so his children can have names and identities. Premarital pregnancy is not necessarily bad. It is expected of the Bantoc women in the Philippines. It proves them fertile and makes them better marriage prospects. In some cultures it is a friendly gesture for a man to offer the use of his wife to a visiting stranger. We must not look down on these people merely because they have a different set of customs. Many of the practices which seem repugnant to us are necessary to the integration of their society. Morality is only a matter of what is expedient in a given situation or society.

If you have wondered why many young people have abandoned moral principles, consider the possibility it might be because sociologists and sociologically oriented teachers tell them morality is just a matter of cultural orientation. They are

also told 'society' is changing its orientation and now no longer condemns many practices which were once considered immoral.

"Traditionally there was little question that the schools should promote such values as the following:

- 1. Respect Property.*
- 2. Be respectful of adults.*
- 3. Say please and thank you at appropriate times.*
- 4. Do not use profane language or bad grammar.*
- 5. Be neat and clean.*
- 6. Do not lie or cheat.*

Now, however, in some situations these are quite controversial. Many lawsuits and community controversies have focused on the meaning of 'neat and clean,' for example. Several recent surveys indicate that cheating in school, rather than being unacceptable, has become the norm, and most students feel no guilt about cheating. Standards of profanity are constantly changing and words that one rarely heard used in public a few years ago are now heard a great deal. While many may not like these developments, it is very necessary for teachers to recognize that they are taking place.

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction²⁴

Don't expect sociologists to explain to your children that the primitive 'cultures' which they seek to emulate value only the 'tribe' and the 'group,' that individual lives are not considered. Don't expect the sociologists to worry about the eskimo who lost his life, the tribesman who lost his head, the baby who never knew his father and a father's personal protection, and the wife who must accept violation from every male who comes to visit. And don't expect the sociologists to worry about what their teaching does to your children! The sociologists are trying to build a world tribal society. They must attend to their work!

ALIENATION OF AFFECTION

We must get rid of personality in every shape, even of the personality of an imaginary being, if we would found a powerful and enduring discipline, in the name of Humanity.

Auguste Comte²⁶

It is becoming ever more painful to read the daily paper. Nearly every day in most cities — large or small — there are stories of youths and girls who have lost their search for 'identity.' Some have died from drug overdoses, some in drug-crazed stupor have taken their own lives, some have turned to crime and prostitution, others look for 'status' and identity in mob action and destructive agitation. There are parents who don't need newspapers to come close to the pain because their own children or those of close friends and relatives are lost and confused.

The deluded children say they hate life, hate 'society,' hate all the pretense and hypocrisy, hate their teachers, their parents, their country. These poor unhappy ones do not know it, but it is not life they hate, not pride of achievement, not their families, nor their country, but the barren futility of the sociologist's way of looking at life, — the negative, unkind, uncharitable, distorted sociological view of life.

Family life because it develops individual personality and because a family is a strong economic unit, is a prime target of sociologists. It is not difficult to drive a wedge between a child and his parents by pointing out parental defects to the child. We all have faults. Some parents are selfish; some lack self-control; others are tactless, domineering and have unattractive vices; some parents are not so loving or interested as they might be; but children are robust and resilient. They forget and forgive and learn. Most of them would be O.K. if they had only their parents' human imperfections to contend with. Even bad television and x-rated books, magazines, and movies need not destroy them if their schools inspired them, reinforced their virtues, taught them their individual worth and respected the parent-child relationship. If the warm, loving side of the parental picture were pointed out it might help children be happy, honest, conscientious, appreciative and productive.

Even if some homes are not the best, or especially because some homes are not the best, the school should never cut down a child's parents, never say destructive things about them in the child's presence. The only one harmed by such malicious talk is the child. No child should be put in the position of having to defend his parents' imperfections to his teacher. He should never be put on the defensive in this manner. There is no way a child can benefit.

When a person is older and a parent himself, he may seek information on how to raise his own children; but none of the destructive type talk which goes on in a sociology classroom, or in a sociologically-oriented primary school is appropriate for little children or high school students — nor is it appropriate at the college level where parents should be able to expect a little more than a stab in the back. Even a psychology teacher can discuss good and bad influences without making blanket accusations against parents.

There may be a great deal of truth in the statement that delinquent children frequently come from undesirable homes, but there is no excuse for making such a statement to children who are in the process of developing their own characters and personalities. Such broad statements and even discussion of juvenile delinquency to juveniles in the manner sociologists adopt can only serve to call attention to the fact that such types of behavior are open to them. This talk also serves to justify wrong behavior. Youngsters feel they can escape responsibility for their own acts by blaming family influences.

Children are extremely impressionable. If one were to make a statement to a large class that some children take poison because they are curious or that some children take poison because they are angry with their parents, sure as day follows night some kids would try poison.

If there is one thing I know after teaching and living with teen-aged boys and girls, it is that they are not yet objective about themselves. All teenagers have some problems and most of them during unhappy times believe they are being treated unfairly. While they have a marvelous sense of humor, few are ready to laugh at themselves or adopt a philosophical attitude about their own faults and errors. They tend to take everything personally, and most certainly are *not* ready for objective classroom discussions about teen-aged behavior and parent-child relationships.

Imagine a young person who is going through a difficult time emotionally. How do you think he might react upon find-

ing statements similar to the following in his sociology textbook?

Most children's problems have their roots in the family.

Sociologists talk about problem parents rather than problem children.

The child attacks other children when his needs are not met by parents.

It is not surprising that many children spend little time at home or run away from home.

All young people must break away from the family.

Conflict in the family is not always the parents' fault.

Parents of the 'ordering and forbidding' school are likely to have real conflict.

Truancy indicates the home lacks authority.

A parents' lack of understanding may be responsible for a child's juvenile delinquency.

Just because you were reared in an unhappy home is no reason your children should be.

Low family social standing and income block some children's opportunities.

Parents pass on their own feelings of prejudice to their children.

The child has no chance to judge for himself.

No one is fully victimized by his family.

The rejected boy may turn to stealing, speeding or dare-devil activities.

A girl who has been denied affection at home sometimes seeks satisfaction through sex delinquency.

Do you want your children upset by such vindictive criticism and influenced by such destructive suggestions? Why would sociologists want to call attention to and blame so many troubles on parents, and then suggest running away or delinquent behavior as a solution? What is the purpose of risk-

ing creating new difficulties by such intemperate discussions with impressionable youngsters?

If you want to discover the answers to these questions you can't be too polite or too charitable. Read your sociology book very carefully. You will learn who wants to be there to solve all the problems created: the sociologically trained and oriented workers. In behalf of 'Society' they are ready to pick up the pieces and take control. Child-destruction and alienating children from parents and parents' opinions are just other ways of weakening family bonds and gaining sociological power. Whether your children are destroyed physically, morally, or intellectually is of little consequence to the child-corrupters. It is only important that new generations be cleansed of the 'insanity of individualism' which might interfere with their socialization.

If a youngster leaves his sociology course with no other impression, the course will have been successful from a sociological point of view if he believes parents are inadequate, sociologists are needed to understand and solve the problems of the world, and that all personal problems have collective solutions.

"If customs or institutions are to be reformed it is first necessary to dig for them new channels of popular belief. Secure the prevalence of new beliefs and new programs of collective behavior will result; indeed, not otherwise can social changes be originated — except by sheer coercion."

Ross L. Finney²⁶

There are direct ways and indirect ways to damage a child's respect for his parents. Sociologists, as you have seen, do not scorn the direct methods, but indirect methods are also useful to them. When they enter into discussions of status they can damage a child's regard for his parents and also narrow his own field of choice when considering future careers. Some books go to the outrageous extreme of listing anywhere from fifty to one hundred occupations. The occupations are rated on the basis of prestige and status. If Dad is a Supreme Court Justice, a physician, state governor, cabinet member, diplomat, scientist, banker or professor, he has extremely high social prestige and status. If he is a bookkeeper, insurance agent or undertaker, that's about average. If he is a barber, milkman, or truck driver, his status in society is below

average. If he is a dock worker, night watchman, janitor, garbage collector or shoe shiner his status couldn't be much lower.

Imagine the effect on children of such nonsensical unscientific games! A very small percentage of the children will have fathers in the 'upper-status' groups. They are encouraged to feel superior, perhaps a little guilty, and possibly isolated to some degree from their classmates. Those whose fathers are said to have average prestige may not be damaged too much by the revelation other than to begin to develop a resentment against a 'society' that values people on such shallow grounds. Now consider the children who are told their fathers have the lowest status. Can they whose fathers' occupations have been insulted in front of the classmates fail to feel humiliation and resentment? The resentment is not likely to be directed against the teacher, book, or sociologist who dreamed up the malignant little exercise, but against their fathers or against 'society' for so insulting the dearly-beloved, hard-working dads.

There are also children who may hear in sociology class that their fathers are similar to helpless senseless robots because they work in factories. If a child sits in class and allows his father's occupation to be discussed in such a manner, he is damaged. If he makes a protest he has to risk admitting before his classmates that his father is like a helpless senseless robot. What a nasty, cruel, unnecessary choice to force on a child. Where is the respect that every hard-working responsible worker deserves?

A moment's thought would make immediately apparent the ridiculousness of the sociological idea that machines enslave people and turn them into robots. If men use shovels to dig a ditch, are they slaves to the shovels because they are not clawing the dirt with their hands?

The resentment built up by discussion of status and by the degrading of occupations can be used by sociologists. In later life those who have been wounded or have guilty feelings may be more responsive to sociological prodding for laws to restrict opportunities. They may be more willing to help crank the sociologists' restrictive walls even closer.

One sociological lie has been used with stunning effectiveness to discredit parents in the eyes of their children and also to build up hate between people of different races so they can be played one against another. Guilt for this vicious distortion can be laid directly at the door of sociologists who represent it to students as truth. They know better, yet they lie. The

lie is so widespread and socially acceptable I risk losing some readers by discussing it; but because parents are treated with contempt because of it by the sociological trainers of their children, I think the risk is worth taking.

Perhaps I am more aware of the sociological distortion because it is related to one of my earliest and at the time most frightening childhood memories. I was just three. I was walking up the back stairway of the building where my parents had rented an apartment when I heard footsteps. Suddenly a person appeared on the landing above me — big and black with large white eyes and flashing white teeth. I was petrified with fright. As she came closer she began to speak and I panicked. Terror stricken and screaming hysterically, I shot back down the stairs straight to my mother's arms. I knew she wouldn't let that big woman eat me.

Of course the poor lady was hurt by my action and sorry she had frightened me. She loved children and had only smiled and started to say 'Good morning' when I commenced my screaming session. But I had never seen a negro person before. Not only did she appear suddenly, but there was an obvious difference between her and all the other people I had seen up to that time. Nobody had told me to *notice* this difference. Nobody *told* me to be frightened of her. Meeting her was a new experience and I was afraid.

My mother spent much time explaining to me that this was a kind woman who loved little girls — that she would never hurt me and was only being friendly. She told me I would see many more black people during our stay in Philadelphia, and I was not to be frightened.

I didn't come around right away. There was another incident in a cafeteria because I was alone when the colored bus boy came to clear the table. But by the time we left Philadelphia six weeks later I was a much better-behaved little girl.

From my own experience I know that it is not true that racial differences would be unnoticed if parents didn't teach their children to fear, hate or avoid other races. Quite the opposite is true. We are wary of one another until we are reassured. It is natural to feel safer and more comfortable with those who are like ourselves. The ancient Greek poets said, "Birds of a feather flock together." Sociologists, despite their lies, recognize this truth and among themselves call it 'consciousness of kind.'

"The original and elementary subject fact in society is the consciousness of kind. By this term I mean a state of consciousness in which any being, whether low or high in the scale of life, recognizes another conscious being as of like kind with itself."

Franklin Henry Giddings²⁷

More than any others, it is the sociologists and sociologically oriented who are offended by the fact that people come in different colors. It is they who tell us we should be 'color blind.' Color blind — indeed! Hypocritical is the word! How can we be friends when we begin our friendship with a lie and a refusal to recognize one another's attributes? Are racial differences so offensive we have to close our eyes and not look at each other? Are we to be so blind to our own identity we cannot recognize or must be offended by our own color?

Sociologists can't tolerate differences. Racial differences particularly, are offensive because they interfere with sociological 'solidarity.' It would be easier for sociologists to take control if the black people would just disappear. Then we would be more alike and more willing to be integrated and treated as indistinguishable members of the great body.

"The blinding vision of which the west has caught sight has been that there is but one class, and but one color, and but one soul in humanity."

Benjamin Kidd²⁸

To a sociologically-oriented individual, the preceding thought is beautiful and inspiring. Hundreds of millions of bodies and one soul for all! All they need do if this concept be accepted is put themselves in control of the master soul.

The sociological advance is occurring more easily in countries such as China and Sweden in which the differences between people are less pronounced than they are in our country. Thank the Lord for variety! The fact that our country is composed of people of such diversity may have helped retard the sociological domination.

While there are wide differences we are not isolated. Emotional, intellectual and spiritual likenesses draw us to other people. A mother who loves her children and wants to protect them sympathizes with and wants to help other mothers and their children. Admiration for talent, intelligence, character, courage and congeniality draws people together. The desire to

trade goods and services draws people together. The mental and spiritual likenesses are often a great deal more significant than the physical differences.

But the differences are there. They exist. Noticing them — even talking about them is not a sign of hate. However, consider those who reject the very idea of variety and individual souls — do they not hate us all? Do they not strive to turn us all into mindless, soulless, assembly-line robot slaves?

“The purpose of this chapter is to emphasize the responsibility of education for making us all alike.”

Ross L. Finney²⁹

SOCIOLOGICAL DE-HUMANIZATION

It is in domestic life that the fundamental maxim: 'Live for Others' begins to take practical complement: 'Live without concealment. '... They who refuse to live openly will be justly liable to the suspicion of not really wishing to live for others.

Auguste Comte³⁰

Sociological de-humanization begins with the child in the womb. In the sociological point of view, the new life which is developing is not human — nor is the child human when it is born. It must *become* human through socialization. This is the function of the Group or Society.

Perhaps the sociology text you have acquired is one which will continue the explanation of this concept with examples of 'wild' children who were more like animals because they had been deprived of group interaction. Sociologists would have one believe that because these poor young 'creatures' had been unable to acquire the talents and self-control which we learn from our parents and from others, they are on a level with beasts.

What if a child's arms and legs were bound at birth so he could never exercise his muscles? What if he managed to survive, but because his muscles were never exercised they atrophied and became useless? Would that mean his body was not a human body? Of course not. The human attributes were there. This does not mean they cannot be destroyed or deprived of the opportunity to develop.

The fact that an infant needs adult help to survive does not deprive that infant of his human identity. The fact that he learns from his parents and others does not deprive him of his independent mind. The fact that he is taught self-control does not deprive him of his individual freedom. The fact that he learns from past and present generations does not place him in eternal bondage and cement him to all of 'Humanity.' Individuals of each generation reap what previous generations have sown — to their profit if they harvest wisely as in the case

of many discoveries which have made our lives more comfortable and productive, or to their degradation if they accept untruth and corruption which ignorant or cunning predecessors bequeath. There is no profit for us or our children in the cannibalistic sociological religion. Would we could decline that part of our heritage!

Plain stupidity may be forgivable; but teaching stupidity with full knowledge of the fact that it is stupidity and teaching it for the purpose of corrupting and enslaving the innocent and unsuspecting students, is a deed monstrous beyond description.

While I suspect most of the teachers of sociology are as much victims of the sociological religion as their students, the top intellectuals in the field know what they are doing and why. They know they are training future adults with a slave mentality — adults who will be little more than obedient zombies, who have no self-esteem, who can easily be used as pawns to help bring about complete sociological submission. Here are some of the ways sociologists teach children they are unimportant and ineffective as individuals:

1. By telling them moral maturity means to become less ego-centered and more Society-centered.
2. By telling them they are not human until Society makes them so.
3. By telling them they have no 'self' until Society gives it to them.
4. By telling them there is little chance that young people of average intelligence will ever make an impressive contribution to Man's store of knowledge and skill.
5. By leaving out or downgrading the important motivations for personal achievement: the satisfaction of a scientific curiosity, the desire to learn about the wonders of nature, the desire to acquire something of value and to have a surplus to exchange with other individuals, the desire to bring gifts to family and loved ones, the desire to be useful to other people, and the feeling of personal satisfaction for a job well done. No, the main sociological motivation for personal achievement is to gain 'status' in Society.

My God! Can they then pretend to wonder why young people have lost ambition and the spark of life which drives them to higher achievement?

Status in Society! — Such a prize! The young victims surely sense there must be something more to life than 'status in Society.' But who is to tell them if their teachers do not, and if in addition they interpret the motives of parents in the same shallow terms and downgrade their accomplishments?

Where can a child go for inspiration? — for a sense of wonder? — for training in personal moral conduct? — for an appreciation of his heritage? — for lessons in courage? — Where is teaching of truth and real values? Where can a child go for uncorrupted knowledge?

TRAINING

Human institutions, sociology shows, are in every case learned adjustments. As such, they can be modified provided we can obtain control of the learning process.

Charles A. Ellwood²¹

Sometime ago my husband and I made an emotional decision which we regretted many times since. The children came home from their cousin's with the most appealing, beautifully-marked, perky-looking German shepherd puppy any of us had ever seen. We all knew what raising a puppy meant for the appearance of our beautiful garden, how the house would probably suffer from the puppy's bad habits, the trials that would be ahead, the cold and rainy mornings when someone would have to attend to the dog's needs; but we pushed all this from our minds. The puppy got to us, and that was it.

He chewed the woodwork, tore the wallpaper off the wall, destroyed a portable radio, turned a sweater into shredded yarn; but the habit that infuriated me and made me feel helpless, stupid and frustrated was his refusal to come when I called. He never went far so long as I was present, but he would duck and dodge and run around the bushes, then cut out across the neighbor's yard. He'd drink out of her birdbath until I got within two feet of him, and then take off the instant I reached out. Whenever I was in no mood for games he kept it up longer. He drove me wild. But that wasn't the only reason we decided we needed a trainer. When Baron was about eight months old, the gas man came to read the meter. I learned then that our *weak moment* was going to be more than just a family pet. His protective instincts took over completely. He lunged at the poor man with all the ferocity of a killer wolf. Luckily he had not quite entered the house and was able to close the screen door before Baron sampled his flesh; but the encounter convinced us that if we couldn't master the dog, he would have to go.

Our trainer, who was familiar with our dog's family tree, informed us Baron's reaction to intrusion was good and to be expected since he came from three generations of trained guard dogs. Knowing that fact did nothing to dispel my ap-

prehension about the dog's future disposition, but we were assured he could be trained to give immediate obedience and to stay on our property.

We all participated, and Baron learned to heel, to sit and lie down on command, to jump over barriers and return immediately to his trainer. He learned that every human in the family outranked him and that he would have to conform to our rules. The training made him a great deal easier to live with.

In the early training he began to be somewhat better outside. He would respond quickly to a man's voice, but I still had difficulty. That is, I had difficulty until I learned to use the throwing chain. The throwing chain is a moderately heavy circular chain of about twelve or fourteen links. When Baron decides to run off, the chain is thrown at him. He has no idea where it comes from, and doesn't understand the hit, but he is immediately subdued. He stops dead. The next command is obeyed instantly. Two or three hits were all it took, and now it is seldom necessary to throw the chain. All that is needed is to rattle it and he obeys. If Baron shows the least doubt about being willing to obey, the chain is thrown at his back just as he starts to take off. There is instant obedience and the power a mere rattle of the chain is reinforced.

Such training is wonderful for dogs. Baron knows his place and keeps to it. He is not a danger to visitors to our house, and he is obedient both inside and out. We can live with our 'mistake' and even begin to admit it might not have been so terrible an error after all. He is a superb watchdog and a good friend to everyone in the family. He is happy and we are much relieved.

Children need training too. They need training in personal habits, self-control, cleanliness and proper care of their surroundings, and they need training to teach them the type of behavior which has been proven over many generations to be good moral behavior. But their training should be of the type that can be rationally explained when they are able to understand. Children are not animals and should not be trained for a lifetime of instant irrational obedience. Unthinking submission and follow-the-group morality are not worthy goals for humans. Self-respecting parents will train their children for future freedom and independence. As each year passes the children are permitted to be more and more responsible for themselves.

Few, if any, parents are perfect, but children have a better

chance for free and happy lives under natural parental control than any artificial arrangements sociologists can concoct, because parents let go. Parents recognize their children's lives are their own. Sociologists train for lifetime submission and obedience. Individuals exist only for the good of the greater whole — collective Humanity. To sociologists, individuals are 'human resources' to be exploited for collective purposes.

If intelligent people are to become tools of slavemasters, the power and protection of children's natural trainers (their parents and legitimate agents of their parents) has to be broken. Then means have to be found to make new generations submissive to trainers who teach them blind obedience.

The slave trainers have been working in our country for well over 100 years. It has taken a long time and a great deal of work and planning for them to reach the present stage of control over education. Each new generation has produced more individuals of a slave mentality. Many converts have been made at the top intellectual levels because those who fancied themselves brilliant and above the 'masses' saw themselves as leaders; and made converts at the lower intellectual levels because it is difficult to understand bondage without visible chains, and seduction by the bearers of gifts.

Intelligent, hard-working, self-respecting, productive individuals who envision themselves as neither master nor slave are becoming more and more aware of the squeeze as their choices are limited. Yet they have appeared to accept encroachments on personal liberty. This has not been due to a lack of courage or unwillingness to sacrifice for principle, but to an honest bewilderment about the moral principles involved and how to meet the issue. True principles have been obscured by political oratory and counterfeit 'values' have been substituted. The values of sociological thinkers have been used by them in the same manner I use the throwing chain on Baron. Every time they want to restrict individual range of action, or if there is an opportunity for some to break free, the sociological trainers hurl one of their chains. Sometimes they only need rattle it and we heel.

Unless we are able to render the sociological trainer's values or throwing chains powerless to affect our behavior, and unless we can prevent them from training our children to respond to these false religious values, our lives and our children's lives will increasingly become lives of turmoil and suppression.

The trick, then, is to stop cringing when one of the chains

is thrown, to become impassive when it hits, deaf when we hear it rattle. One who is aware of what to expect is not nearly so likely to be intimidated.

The most effective, most frequently used, hardest to combat sociological throwing chain is the dogma of equality. Equality is taught to children as a supreme value. It is an hallucination, an ideal that can never be realized — only emotionalized and held before the eyes to blind the vision.

"The science of the emotion of the ideal is the science of power in civilization. . . ."

Benjamin Kidd²²

"Once the influence of the ideal is imposed upon the individual by social heredity, . . . he can never escape from it. It is this creation of the ideal, and the organization of the minds upon which it is imposed into the collective will, that constitute the first objective in the science of power in the future of the world."

Benjamin Kidd²³

The dogma of equality is the most powerful throwing chain of those used to train children to act according to sociological bidding. Unless they are freed from this dogma, your children, their children, and their children's children could be sociologically enslaved. The word has achieved a near-religious acceptance to the point where its truth is taken on faith and seldom questioned. Yet, nowhere in nature does it exist.

The closest thing I have ever seen to human 'equality' is in the case of identical twins. Yet, among all the identical twins I have known, I could by careful observation easily distinguish one from the other. Each wanted to be treated as an individual, not as half of a pair.

Dictators can keep most subjects on a more equal economic level than can be accomplished if government powers are limited, but still there are at least two classes: those who are supposed to be equal, and the equalizers.

People who wish to use and act on their individual intelligence and to seek their own destiny, cannot keep their integrity if they make equality their goal. In the name of equality they would be sacrificing the right of each to govern his own life.

Freedom and enforced equality are irreconcilable opposites. Efforts to force economic and social equality only

restrict freedom, thought, intelligence and productive capacity. Equality as a goal or dogma is a crippler and a killer.

EQUALITY is the ceiling above which one dare not rise; the mental block which holds one back from superior accomplishment.

EQUALITY is hate for your superiors and contempt for your inferiors.

EQUALITY is the yoke which binds us to the failures, degenerates and primitives of the world, and the wedge which separates us from the inspiration of the hard-working, successful, and morally pure.

EQUALITY, the sociologists' supreme value, is the source of guilt for material abundance; the excuse for oppression; the promise, which because it cannot be kept, enslaves its believers.

EQUALITY is the denial of nature, the rallying cry of the willfully blind, the source of poetic inspiration for men without dreams; the ever-gushing source of tear-stained rhetoric for hypocritical politicians who seek power.

EQUALITY is morality for the morally bankrupt.

EQUALITY is the carrot and the stick — the sociologists' goal for all who are not sociologists; and the sociologists' justification for the whip to punish those who dare achieve beyond sociologically-prescribed limits.

EQUALITY is the narrow room where sociologists cast all the world's people, then crank the walls closer.

EQUALITY is death of spirit, choice denied.

EQUALITY is never saying, "Look where I came from. See where I am!"

EQUALITY is waking up every day of your life with no place to go.

EQUALITY is thinking always about other people — about whether they have more than you, or you have more than they.

EQUALITY is judging everyone the same, loving everyone the same, HATING everyone the same.

EQUALITY is no mountains to climb, no barriers to leap, no dreams to make real.

EQUALITY is spying on other people to be sure they have not become unequal.

EQUALITY is dragging down the ones who climb too high.

EQUALITY is taking away from those who have too much.

EQUALITY is seeing yourself no better than the most corrupt and no less than the most virtuous.

EQUALITY is wanting no more and no less than anyone on earth, achieving no more no less than anyone, giving no more no less than anyone, hoping no more no less than anyone.

EQUALITY is having no more joy than anyone and as much sorrow as everyone.

EQUALITY as an ideal shuts out reason, closes doors, denies nature and reality.

EQUALITY as a demand can turn potentially kind considerate charitable people into aggressive snarling beasts.

EQUALITY as a value replaces individual virtues of love, kindness, honesty, industry, truth, freedom, morality, faith, hope and charity.

EQUALITY is a zombie, head lowered, never daring to look up, ahead, or to the side — marching at measured pace with all who deny individuality and self.

EQUALITY, if the sociologists have their way, is what we will bequeath to our children.

Politically the word 'EQUALITY' has worked like a voodoo charm. All a politician needs to do is shout 'EQUALITY' and the opposition crumbles away to whatever new plan for the consolidation of sociological power is being pushed.

Why must we accept sociological control over medical care?

EQUALITY

Why must we suffer sociological economic manipulation?

EQUALITY

Why have sociologists been granted control over education?

EQUALITY

Why should our possessions and hard-earned income be given away to primitives and strangers all over the world without our consent?

EQUALITY

Why should tiny tots be taken away from their mothers for sociological training before they are five?

EQUALITY

Why should youngsters be forcibly transported to school many miles from home against their parents' wishes and away from their supervision?

EQUALITY

Why should academic standards be lowered?

EQUALITY

Why should entrants to the professions no longer be chosen on the basis of intellectual achievement, good character and willingness to invest in their own futures?

EQUALITY

Why should productive people be compelled to do more for the unproductive than they are willing to do for themselves?

EQUALITY

Who supervises all this equality and determines what laws should be passed to punish inequality?

By now, I believe you know.

CONSCIENCE AND SEX TAKE-OVER

Eugenics demands that we control marriage in the interests of the race, but this in turn implies the control of all sex relations.

Charles A. Ellwood³⁴

Sociologists have discovered that there are two types of conscience. The old-style conscience which they believe is obsolete and unfitted to present day life is the authoritarian conscience. The new up-to-date 'practical' conscience which they are now trying to convince teachers to develop in your children is the rational conscience.

"A child generally comes to school with what R. J. Havighurst calls an authoritarian conscience acquired from his parents through a progression of punishments and rewards. He soon learns that he is not equipped to deal with all the new situations which confront him. Peers and teachers join and sometimes supplant parents in helping him to find solutions which are often in conflict with those offered by his parents. His task, then is to change from this early authoritarian conscience to a rational one."

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction³⁵

The old-style authoritarian conscience was certain, knew what was right and what was wrong. The rational conscience expresses doubt and looks for reasons to justify whatever behavior is chosen. One must think about his behavior and explain to himself why he acted as he did, or why he intends to act in a certain way.

Since the rational conscience responds to reason, it is a great deal easier to deal with. To change a decision of one who has a rational conscience, all you have to do is provide justification strong enough to break his resistance. It doesn't require very strong arguments to collapse the conscience of a young person if it is built only on his own meager experience, education and reasoning power. Once cut off from historical and religious morality, a youngster with a rational conscience is hopelessly adrift. There are always good reasons for doing wrong.

If it is true that young girls are more easily seduced today, the new rational conscience provided through the courtesy of their sociological education could be largely to blame. There are always lots of good reasons to submit, but a young woman with an authoritarian conscience never listened or took them seriously. She didn't have to provide reasonable excuses for saying no. She just said no. While she may have enjoyed and been amused by the intellectual sparring, she never took it seriously.

An authoritarian conscience may be, as the sociologists suggest, the result of parental and religious influences; but it is not as they claim the result of blind obedience. It is the result of centuries of experience, knowledge and intuition passed on with love from parent to child. It is based on a confident belief that one's moral behavior and his own self-respect are among the most important of life's values — more important than material goods or the opinion of others.

While a person with an authoritarian conscience does not always listen to that conscience, and may make many mistakes in his lifetime; he knows they are mistakes. He knows when he has done wrong. The conscience is not deceived. He will ask that his errors and faults be forgiven, but he would never expect or want them to be justified.

The rational conscience thinks about the possibilities and chooses the most useful course at any particular moment based only on his own reason and emotions. The most important thing to a rational conscience is not what decision is made, but that the decision was arrived at by conscious thought. It is a flexible conscience which can be made to justify any type behavior which appears reasonable. It responds to public opinion and the needs of Society. And herein lies its usefulness to sociologists who see themselves as Society's guardians.

Recent controversy over the issue of sex education in schools has been the result of sociology's need to bring about a complete change in family relationships, sexual attitudes, and parental responsibilities. The lifetime devotion of one man to one woman and their joint acceptance of responsibility for the children they conceive are not in accord with sociology's goals. Universal, rather than selective 'love,' and collective, rather than private, responsibility for children are projected. Sexual relationships and parenthood are intended to become public rather than private functions. In 1923 sociology professor, Charles A. Ellwood wrote the following concerning the changes:

*"But most of all, must social religion demand a complete change in our 'mores' with reference to marriage and the family. Instead of regarding these as matters of individual convenience, social religion must teach that they are social responsibilities and also opportunities for human service. The whole family life must be put upon an ethical instead of a selfish basis. Marriage itself should come to symbolize, both in the minds of the contracting parties and of the community, full consecration of life to the service of the race."*¹⁹⁶

If reproduction could be accomplished without sexual contact Auguste Comte considered that goal to be desired. He hoped also to do away with the sexual instinct. He believed the best method might be by overexposure to sexual suggestion, stimulation and activity until people were so revolted by the idea they would have nothing to do with sex. Comte said:

*"Useless for the preservation of the individual, in the propagation of the species the sexual instinct contributes but in an accessory degree, and even that degree is open to question . . . It is possible to effect, if not the atrophy, at any rate the inaction of this instinct . . . Not merely will the Positive education make all feel the defects of the instinct and raise a hope of its entire desuetude, but the whole tendency will be to institute a revulsive treatment of greater efficacy than the austerities of Catholicism."*¹⁹⁷

The changes desired are now being brought about through sex education, values clarification and various channels of public communication. Behavior technology is being used to gain the unwitting cooperation of the young. The technology is based on knowledge of the human mind which has been available to high level sociologists and behavior technologists for more than 100 years,* but which has NOT been shared with the general public: — those whose behavior is being altered and managed.

To understand how sociologically-planned changes are being brought about it is important to know some of the important facts that are being used to control behavior.

(1) Unless a mind is already in possession of conflicting ideas, it *cannot resist* new ideas which are brought to the attention. (See quote P. 32)

(2) If children have not been taught the difference between

*See appendix

right and wrong, and have not gained knowledge of, and love for the authority on whose word the distinctions are made, they have no mental or moral armor. They cannot help responding affirmatively to whatever suggestion promises pleasure, or negatively to whatever seems to bring immediate pain or discomfort.

(3) If the mind has been cleared of all values by the process of values clarification, the one who has experienced it has no more moral intelligence than an infant.

When children's minds are *cleared of values* through values clarification, they are ready to receive whatever suggestions are presented to them. The behavior desired by behavior technologists does not have to be advocated, merely suggested. Values clarification can *clear the mind of values*. If it is followed by sex education, the minds of the young accept whatever types of sexual behavior technologists decide they wish to promote or suggest.

Sex education courses in schools are sought by sociologists so instruction in this whole sensitive area can be transferred from natural science departments to "social science" where sex instruction can be given with emotional overtones and in combination with values clarification and behavior technology.

For years "Marriage and the Family" courses have been a part of the college curriculum offered by the sociology departments at universities. It is therefore logical to assume that in the majority of grade and high schools which adopt sex education courses, the teaching will be in the hands of 'social science' teachers or sociologically-trained and oriented teachers rather than teachers of natural science. As years pass it will become the exclusive prerogative of sociologists to do the training in sexual facts and morality. They have wanted this power for a long time, and are now beginning to realize it.

FUTURISM

The future of Humanity offers the best field for the intellect as for the activity of man. To determine the future, and to inaugurate it . . . will at no distant period ensure the universal triumph of the Positive religion . . .

Auguste Comte²⁸

Sociological and behavioral technology are used as means to gain control of the behavior of those subjected to them. Sociologists also use other names to gain access to a wider range of people both in school and in the adult community. Among the other names are: human relations specialists, team builders, management consultants, community leaders, futurists, etc. . . . Many sociologists, humanists, and sociologically-indoctrinated teachers and curriculum planners now call themselves 'futurists'. Sociology classes are more and more being called 'future education', 'futuristics', or studies in 'alternative futures'. These classes are heavily financed by corporate foundations and by the federal government, which is being changed from a constitutional unity of 50 sovereign states into a sociologically-managed world regional government.

Pretending to study the future is a devilishly clever way to present sociological ideas in an exciting new format. Students are fascinated by science-fiction and by all the attention paid to their own predictions about the future. Futurism is a devious way to destroy character, principles and moral standards. Immorality is presented as the morality of the future. International collectivism is palmed off as the social order of the future. Students are also told technology is changing the world so fast that the governments must take steps to slow it down. The students become frightened and willing to give the governments more power over their lives so they will be safe from the frightening new sociologically-invented disease called 'future shock'.

Students of all ages are being changed and corrupted in courses on the future. I cannot overemphasize the necessity for avoiding such courses and for keeping your children out of them. Even innocent-appearing science-fiction is now being used on a massive scale to indoctrinate and corrupt the reader.

In fact, much science fiction is intended to shock, horrify, and change the emotions of the reader. This emotional impact, especially on young minds, can be catastrophic. Our emotions are *not* intelligent. They *cannot separate* truth from fiction. Have you ever cried at a movie or while reading a book? Have you ever been genuinely excited or frightened by a TV mystery? If so, why? Your intellect knew the situations were fiction and not real, but your emotions did not. Emotionally you responded to the fiction *as if it were fact*.

Subjecting children to science fiction horror, fright, and brutality can be like an emotional whipping, and the results may be tragic. Early in 1975 an incident occurred which should have suggested an investigation into the use of science fiction in classrooms. At the time we discussed the incident in our "Truth In Education" column as follows:

"NOW IT BEGINS! Tony Barbaro, a 17-year-old honor student, school rifle team sharp shooter from Olean, N. Y., left home at 2:30 on a recent afternoon, saying he was going target shooting. He drove to his school which was closed for the holidays and entered through a side door. Less than two hours later he was led away by the police. Tony had shot and killed both the school custodian, a 25-year-old mother of four who had been riding past the school in a car, and a gas meter reader whose truck had been passing by. In addition 12 people were wounded by shots from Tony's gun or by shattered glass.

"Why do I say: NOW IT BEGINS!'"? Because in all likelihood there will be more — many more unhappy youngsters like Tony. There will be more good kids whose minds give way under the terrible artificial and contrived burdens they are forced to bear and the terrible strain they are under."

The CHICAGO TRIBUNE reported: "*Tony's English teacher . . . said the youth was brilliant and considerate. She told of a paper Tony wrote about Fahrenheit 451. It contained the following passage: 'The society of bookburners depicted in the film isn't the landscape of a thousand years from now. The director shapes it frighteningly close to your own time. It could be in a few short years.'*"

The TRIBUNE then asked: "*Is that a subtle clue to Tony's behavior?*"

In December, 1975, before trial, but almost a year after the shootings, Tony was found hanging in his jail cell, a bed sheet knotted tightly around his neck.

CONCLUSION

Men will adopt notions upon trust, and carry them out with the same zeal and confidence as if they were thoroughly acquainted with all the grounds for their belief. All that is necessary is that they should feel satisfied that their confidence is well bestowed . . .

Auguste Comte⁹⁹

It is a mistake to give uncritical trust in any educational situation. Now, even more than in 1975, the intent to manage the emotions of children is having its effect. Parents, teachers, and elected officials in the various states and in local communities have not been informed, and have neglected their responsibilities. They have given away or sold control of their schools in exchange for outside funds. They have allowed their schools to be smothered under the demands of sociological blanket organizations, and have allowed their curriculum and policies to be dictated by university-based behavior technicians. As a result, learning is no longer stressed. It has been replaced by techniques to manage behavior and emotions and by information-gathering on relationships, feelings and opinions. This is called, 'affective education.' It is intended to destroy the will, self control and individuality of all students so they will adapt to a computer-controlled, sociologically-managed world regional government.

Blind trust in the educational system is not only no longer possible, it is dangerous. Sociological behavior technology is used everywhere and in all types of courses. Constant attention is necessary. We and our children need to be alert and watchful at all times, and firm in our demand for honest, uncorrupted education. The following list of 'Don'ts' may alert parents, teachers, and students to some of the dangerous areas.

DON'TS FOR STUDENTS:

- DON'T** get into science-fiction values discussions or trust a teacher who dwells on science-fiction in his 'teaching'.
- DON'T** discuss the future or future social arrangements or governments in class.

- DON'T** discuss values.
- DON'T** write a family history as a class assignment.
- DON'T** answer personal questions or questions about members of your family.
- DON'T** play blindfolded games in class.
- DON'T** exchange 'opinions' on political or social issues.
- DON'T** write an autobiography in school.
- DON'T** keep a journal of your opinions, activities and feelings.
- DON'T** take intelligence tests. Write tests only on your lessons. Force others to judge you on personal achievement.
- DON'T** discuss boy-girl or parent-child relationships in class.
- DON'T** confide in teachers, particularly sociology or social studies and English teachers.
- DON'T** judge a teacher by his appearance or personality, but on his competence as a teacher of solid knowledge.
- DON'T** think a teacher is doing you a favor if he gives you a good grade for poor work or in useless subjects.
- DON'T** join any social action or social work groups.
- DON'T** take 'social studies' or 'future studies'. Demand course definition: history, geography, civics, French, English, etc..
- DON'T** role play or participate in socio-dramas.
- DON'T** worry about the race or color of your classmates. Education is of the mind, not the body.
- DON'T** get involved in school-sponsored or government-sponsored exchange or camping programs which place you in the homes of strangers.
- DON'T** be afraid to say 'no' to morally corrupting literature games and activities in class.
- DON'T** submit to psychological testing.
- DON'T** fall for books like *Future Shock* which are intended to put readers in a state of panic about 'change' so they will be willing to accept slavery. Advances in science and technology don't drive people into shock. It is government and vain-brain intrusions in private lives which cause much of the unbalance in nature and in people.
- DON'T** get into classroom discussions which begin:
WHAT WOULD YOU DO IF . . . ?

WHAT IF ?
 SHOULD WE ?
 DO YOU SUPPOSE ?
 DO YOU THINK ?
 WHAT IS YOUR OPINION OF ?
 WHO SHOULD ?
 WHAT MIGHT HAPPEN IF ?
 DO YOU VALUE ?
 IS IT MORAL TO ?

- DON'T** sell out important principles for money, a scholarship, a diploma, popularity, or a feeling of importance.
- DON'T** think you have to associate with morally corrupt people or sanction their corruption just because 'society' now accepts such behavior.
- DON'T** get discouraged. If you stick to firm principles, others will respect you for it, and perhaps gain courage from your example.

. . . . And now some DO'S for parents, teachers and students:

- DO** insist on quality in education.
- DO** have the courage to back up your convictions.
- DO** explain any objections you might have to textbooks, materials or instruction.
- DO** complain in writing (keep copy) to the highest level about courses that have no substance, which teach falsehood, force unsubstantiated theories and opinions, or indoctrinate in the Humanist and Humanitarian religions.
 (College level — To trustees, or to board of regents and legislators if tax-supported.)
 (High school & grade school — To school boards, administrators and legislators.)
- DO** send copies of important letters with documented complaints to the news media.
- DO** give specific examples of the most offensive sections of offensive materials to officials, school boards, etc. when you complain.
- DO** explain as clearly as possible how you want the situation to be corrected.
- DO** suggest better materials if you know of any, but do not take the burden of finding better materials on

yourself. It is the duty of the educational institution to have good Constitutionally-acceptable materials on hand.

- DO** stand up publicly for the teachers or administrators who insist on firm, fair discipline and quality education.
- DO** make your complaints as widely known as possible among other parents, teachers and students who are affected.
- DO** expect efforts to put you down, to distract you, and to discourage you by inaction.
- DO** persevere.

It is enough. IT IS TIME TO CALL A HALT! Too many children have already been corrupted and damaged. If we do not begin now to rescue our children from the sociological corruptors and reclaim our parental rights, they may be lost to parents for centuries to come.

Remember, whatever your race or religion; no matter what sins you have committed in the past; regardless of whether you are sometimes too harsh, too lenient, too distracted, too lazy, too uneducated, too overeducated, too prejudiced, too nervous, too unhappy, too poor, too rich, too sick, or even too drunk to be an ideal parent — if you love your children and are aware that there is a difference between right and wrong, and are trying to teach that difference to your children; you are most certainly a better guardian and are better equipped to guide your children than any cynical, sociologically-dominated educator whose good judgment is blinded by his messianic illusions.

It is time to be a jealous parent: — to do everything in your power to keep your children's education and moral training in your own hands; — to refuse to allow change agents to teach or speak to your children in such a manner as to alienate their affection; — to forbid the moral corruption of your children by sociological religion and sociology's rational conscience; — to insure that your children gain a respect for truth and intellectual integrity.

Rescuing young people from sociology and sociologically-oriented classes is more important than a high school or college diploma, more important than 'status' in society, more important than 'group solidarity.' To reject sociology and its behavior technology is the first step toward regaining and/or maintaining individual worth, integrity, self-respect, and responsibility.

APPENDIX

It was my good fortune to come across a book published in 1878 titled, *PRINCIPLES OF MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY With Their Applications to the Training and Discipline of the Mind and the Study of its Morbid Conditions*, by William B. Carpenter, M.D., LL.D. of the University of London. It was to my amazement to discover that the information therein was not only up-to-date in its scientific understanding and explanation of the human mind and how it functions; but that it also covered many of the issues, such as the doctrine of human automatism and the effects of alcohol and narcotics, which are being discussed by sociologists and behavioral psychologists to this day. While many modern discussions seem to be confusing, Dr. Carpenter's explanations of the anatomy and physiology of the brain and nervous system and the relationship to thought and behavior were both informative and interesting. It was Dr. Carpenter's contention that while much of human behavior can be accounted for by explaining the automatic reactions of the nervous system, there is something within us beyond that, which can be referred to as the Will.

After reading Carpenter, it is difficult to understand how some, who claim to be professionals, can express such ignorance of the ways in which alcohol and narcotics affect the brain and its functions and destroy the Will or power to control one's own emotions, thoughts, and actions.

I wish it were possible to share the entire book with you, but it is more than 700 pages of detailed information and explanation. I can, however, share some thoughts as expressed in the Preface to the Fourth Edition. Dr. Carpenter wrote:

I find nothing in the results of recent researches to shake the conviction at which I arrived nearly forty years ago, of the existence of a fundamental distinction, not only between the rational action of sentient beings guided by experience and the automatic movements of creatures whose whole life is obviously but the working of a mechanism, but also between those actions (common to Man and intelligent brutes) which are determined by a preponderating attraction towards an object present to the consciousness, and those (peculiar, as I believe to Man) in which there is, at one stage or another, that distinct purposive intervention of the self conscious Ego which we designate Will, whereby the direction of activity is modified.

In external Nature there is nothing that can truly be termed 'choice.' If a piece of iron be brought within the sphere of attraction of two magnets placed on opposite sides of it, one near but feeble, the other strong but remote, we feel assured it will be drawn towards the one which makes the stronger pull upon it. To use the word "choice" in such a case — to say that the iron Chooses towards which of the magnets it shall move, — would be felt by everyone to be a misapplication of the term. The same would be the case as regards any other action determined by Physical causation. And yet on the Determinist doctrine, if I am attracted by the temptation of an immediate but immoral pleasure, and am deterred from it either by a sense of duty or by the fear of the remote consequences of the sin, I have no more "choice" as to the course I take, than has the piece of iron that is attracted in opposite directions by two magnets. Now my contention is, not merely that I Have a choice, but that the very existence of an idea which can be derived from no other source than Human experience, confirms the testimony of my own consciousness to that effect. And like confirmation is afforded by the familiar reply "I have No Choice," in cases in which we feel it to be a Necessity (whether physical or moral) that we should take a particular line of action.

That in making our Choice, and acting upon it, we are determined by the "preponderance of motives," I do not call into question; the Self-determining power of the Will seeming to me to be exerted in modifying the preponderance which the motives Per Se would determine.

Now, all experience shows that Motives which may exert a preponderating influence at one moment are comparatively powerless at another; on the other hand, Motives whose influence at one moment is scarcely felt, may come to acquire a force that makes them far outweigh those which at first over-balanced them. This is especially apparent when we exert our Volitional power of 'self-control' to check the immediate action which is prompted by some Automatic impulse; time being thus gained for the excited feeling to subside, and for the 'second thoughts' of the higher Reason to make themselves heard. And a further reflection on our own mental experience will satisfy us, that these variations in the relative strength of Motives mainly arise from the degree of Attention that we give to each respectively. An excited Feeling which would soon die out if let to itself, will retain its potency, or even gain augmented force, if we allow ourselves to brood over it; whilst, on the other hand, the power of those remoter considerations which deliberation suggests, increases in proportion as they are dwelt on. And just as, in the case of the two magnets, we may

reverse their relative attractions by changing their respective distances from the iron between them, so can each Ego who has acquired the power of directing his own course of Thought and Feeling, alter the relative potency of different motives or sets of motives, by Determinately Directing His Attention to those which would draw him in one direction, and by partially or completely Excluding those of an opposite tendency from his mental view.

If it be urged by the Automatist that this fixation of the Ego's attention on one set of motives to the exclusion of the other, is really due to the superior strength of the motive (supplied by his previously-formed character) which leads him to Desire so to fix it, I reply that no experience of which I am conscious is more real to me, than that if I did not Make An Effort to keep my attention fixed, the Desire alone would fail to do it. I am further conscious that a great deal more is 'taken out of me' by the prolongation of such a struggle, than by a far larger measure of undistracted mental action. And I ask, 'Why, on the Automatist theory, should this 'be?' — To myself it seems clear that it is in the control he thus acquires over the Automatism of his nature, that Man's Freedom Of Choice essentially consists; whilst, on the other hand, it is in virtue of his want of power to gain a complete control, that his Freedom Is Limited.

This view seems to me to find its strongest support in the experience of those who have been most largely and most successfully engaged in the Education of the young. For, as I have had abundant opportunities of learning, they watch for the dawn of this power of reflection and deliberation in the child, endeavour to strengthen his feeble resolution by judicious encouragement, lead him to reflect upon the consequences of his misdoing to himself or to others, and give additional force to his sense of Duty by earnest appeals to it, so as to sustain him in a conflict to which he is as yet unequal if left to himself; but at the same time they make him feel that he must not always expect such help, and that it rests with himself, by habitually fixing his attention upon what his Reason and his Moral Sense tell him he Ought to do, to be able to Will to do it against his inclination.

No experience is so remarkable in its bearing on this question, as that of the Philanthropic men and women who have taken the largest and most efficient share in the work of Juvenile Reformation. For they have to deal with a class of boys and girls, who have grown up to a most unmanageable age, in habits of entire unrestrainedness of Thought and Feeling, and in no more restrainedness of Action than has been imposed by external coercion or by fear of punishment. These young "reprobates" have not

the least idea of self-control, or of doing anything else than that which their inclinations prompt; their notions of "right" are all based upon limited self-interest; and they hold everything to be "wrong" which interferes with what they conceive to be their own "rights." Now the first lesson that has to be taught them is that of obedience to discipline, for which punishment has often to be used as a motive. But in proportion as the habit of Self-control is acquired, appeals to the better nature come to have a force superior to that of mere coercion; and the greatest success is attained when that controlling power is Spontaneously exerted under the direction of Ought or Ought Not. So, in the cultivation of the dormant Moral Sense, the first teaching goes to show that what the pupil considers his (or her) "rights" are some one else's "wrongs"; and the Golden Rule is enforced by the practical applications which are found most suitable to impress it on each individual nature. Thus a foundation is laid for the development of that higher Moral sense, on which the principle of Religious obligation is most securely based. But the result of the most successful effort in this direction is only considered to have been attained, when the subject of it has been awakened to a full consciousness of possessing a power Within Himself to resist temptation and to act as duty directs; which power it rests with himself to exert, and for the non-exercise of which he is responsible.

Of course it will be replied by the Automatist, that all such "training" is part of the external influences which go to the formation of the Character; and that its efficacy depends upon the degree in which the sense of Duty can be thus developed by judicious culture into efficient predominance. But I affirm it to be a matter of notorious experience, that it is the reiteration of the assurance that the Child or Juvenile offender Can govern his temper, if he will try hard enough; that he Can overcome a difficulty, if he will summon courage to make a vigorous effort; that he Can choose and act upon the right, in spite of strong temptation to do wrong, by Determinately Keeping Before His Mind the motives and sanctions of duty, — which constitutes the most effectual means of calling forth that power of "Self-control," which the most enlightened Writers of antiquity, and the most successful of modern Educators, concur in regarding as the most valuable result alike of Moral and of Intellectual discipline. — To the consistent Automatist, who denies the existence in the Ego of any self-determining power, and who puts his whole trust in the Motives brought to bear from without, it seems to me that the word Try can really have no more meaning than the word Choice.

The sense in which the terms Right and Wrong are universally

accepted is based on the idea of a Self-determining capability to Do the right and to Avoid the wrong. This seems to me perfectly clear, when we compare this acceptation with the sense we attach to the very same words when applied (figuratively) to a piece of pure Mechanism. If I say that my watch goes "right," I do not assign to it any moral credit, but merely mean that it keeps time well. And if I say that it goes "wrong," I do not speak of it as an object of blame, but merely mean that it wants regulating.

So, again, I am unable to see any meaning in the ancient proverb that "he that is slow to anger is better than the mighty, and he that ruleth his spirit than he that taketh a city," — or to feel any admiration for the hero who "has gained the greatest of all victories; "the victory over himself," if the course of action results from no other agency than either physical or mental Automatism, and no independent power be put forth by the Ego in determining it. And if I felt obliged to accept that doctrine as scientific truth, I should look to its honest and consistent application to the training of the young as the greatest of social calamities. For I can imagine nothing more paralysing to every virtuous effort, more withering to every noble aspiration, than that our children should be brought up in the belief that their characters are entirely formed for them by "heredity" and "environments"; that they Must do whatever their respective characters impel them to do; that they have no power of resisting temptations to evil, than such as may spontaneously arise from the knowledge they have acquired of what they ought or ought not to do; that if this motive proves too weak, they can do nothing Of Themselves to intensify and strengthen it; that the notion of "summoning their resolution," or "bracing themselves "for the conflict," is altogether a delusion; that they are actually in the position of a man who is floating downstream in a boat without oars, towards a dangerous cataract, and can only be rescued by some outside mechanism.

It may be confidently stated as a result of universal experience, that our "capacity of willing," that is, of giving a preponderance to the motive on which we elect to act, depends, First, upon our conviction that we really have such a self-determining power, and, Secondly, upon our habitual exercise of it.

It seems to me quite clear that on the Automatist or Determinist theory, such words as "ought," "duty," "responsibility," have to be used, if used at all in new significations. The welfare of that aggregate of Automata which we call Society, may require that every individual automaton shall be prevented from doing what is injurious to it; and punishment for offences actually committed may be reasonable inflicted as a deterrent from the repetition of such of-

fences by the individual or by others. But if the individual has In Himself no power either to do the right or to avoid the wrong, and if the potency of that aggregate of feelings about actions as being "right or wrong" which is termed Conscience, entirely depends upon "circumstances" over which he neither has, or ever has had any control, I fail to see in what other sense he should be held "responsible" for doing what he knows he knows that he "ought not" to have done, or for not doing what he knows that he "ought" to have done, than a Steam-engine, which breaks away from its "governor" in consequence of a sudden increase of steam-pressure, or which comes to a stop through the bursting of its steam-pipe, can be accounted responsible for the damage thence arising.

The idea of "responsibility" on the other hand which is entertained by Mankind at large, rests upon the assumption, not only that each Ego has a Conscience which recognises a distinction between right and wrong, and which (according to the training it has received) decides What is wrong in each individual case, but also that he has a Volitional power which enables him to intensify his sense of "duty" by fixing his attention upon it, and thus gives it a potency in determining his conduct which it might not have otherwise possessed. That this power is a part of the Ego's "formed character," and that it can only be exerted within certain limits, is fully admitted on the doctrine I advocate; but the responsibility of the Ego is shifted backwards to the share he has had in the formation of his character and in the determination of those limits. And here, again, the results of Scientific investigation are in complete harmony with the precepts of the greatest of all Religious Teachers. For no one can study these with care, without perceiving that Jesus and Paul addressed themselves rather to the formation of the Character than to the laying down rules for Conduct; that they endeavoured rather to cultivate the dispositions which should lead to right action, than to fix rigid lines of duty, the enforcement of which under other circumstances might be not only unsuitable but actually mischievous; and that they not only most fully recognised the power of each individual to direct the habitual course of his thoughts, to cherish his nobler affections, and to repress his sensual inclinations, but made the possession of that power the basis of the entire system of Christian Morality.

To myself it seems as if nothing was wanting either in my own Self-consciousness, or in what I know of the conscious experiences of other men, to establish the existence of the "self-determining power" for which I contend. I cannot conceive of any kind of evidence of its existence more cogent than that which I already

possess. And feeling assured that the source of my belief in it lie deep down in the nature of every normally-constituted Human being, I cannot anticipate the time when that belief will be eliminated from the thought of Mankind; — when the words "ought," "duty," "responsibility," "choice," "self-control," and the like, will cease to have the meaning we at present attach to them; — and when we shall really treat each other as Automata who cannot help doing whatever our "heredity" and "environments" necessitate.

University of London,
June, 1876

MIND AND BODY

The most startling fact which is revealed by Dr. Carpenter's book, *MENTAL PHYSIOLOGY*, is that much of what was known more than 100 years ago about human mental activity has been lost or, more likely, suppressed. Had this knowledge been available to us and also to practicing physicians, ministers, psychologists, and teachers, it is not likely that the sociological take-over could have progressed so readily. The following from Dr. Carpenter's discussion of the relations between Mind and Body was important 100 years ago and is more important today. This information helps to explain why it has been necessary for the sociological system-builders to destroy Christianity and the Spirit of Truth within each individual. A system controlled by a sociological hierarchy requires a population of empty, obedient automata. The destruction of the individual's channel to Truth is necessary before he will be totally obedient to environmental controls. Dr. Carpenter's discussion of the mutual relations between the Mind and Body follows:

The Conscious life of every individual Man essentially consists in an action and reaction between his Mind and all that is outside it, — the Ego and the Non-Ego. But this action and re-action cannot take place, in his present stage of existence, without the intervention of a Material Instrument; whose function it is to bridge over the hiatus between the individual Consciousness and the External World, and thus to bring them into mutual communication. And it

is the object of this Treatise to take up and extend the inquiry into the action of Body upon Mind, as well as of Mind upon Body, on the basis of our existing knowledge; so as to elucidate, as far as may be at present possible, the working of that Physiological Mechanism which takes a most important share in our Psychical operations; and thus to distinguish what may be called the automatic activity of the Mind, from that which is under volitional direction and control. — This inquiry has been started more than once, but has not until recently been systematically prosecuted. But so long as either the Mental or the Bodily part of Man's nature is studied to the exclusion of the other, it seems to the Writer that no real progress can be made in Psychological Science; for that which "God hath joined together," it must be vain for Man to try to "put asunder."

To the prevalent neglect of the study of the mutual relations of Mind and Body, may be traced many of the fallacies discernible in the arguments adduced on each side, in the oft-repeated controversies between the advocates of the Materialistic and the Spiritualistic hypotheses; — controversies in themselves almost as absurd as that mortal contest, which (as fable tells us) was once carried on by two knights respecting the material of a shield seen by them from opposite sides, the one maintaining it to be made of gold, the other of silver, and each proving to be in the right as regarded the half seen by himself. Now the Moral of this fable, as respects our present inquiry, is, that as the entire shield was really made-up of a gold-half and a silver-half which joined each other midway, so the Mind and the Brain, notwithstanding those differences in properties which place them in different philosophical categories, are so intimately blended in their actions, that more valuable information is to be gained by seeking for it at the points of contact, than can be obtained by the prosecution of those older methods of research, in which the Mind has been studied by Metaphysicians altogether without reference to its material instrument, whilst the Brain has been dissected by Anatomists and analyzed by Chemists, as if they expected to map-out the course of Thought, or to weigh or measure the intensity of Emotion. The Psychologist who looks at his subject in the light of that more advanced Philosophy of the present day, which regards Matter merely as the vehicle of Force, has no difficulty in seeing where both sets of disputants were right and both wrong; and, laying the foundations of his Science broad and deep in the whole constitution of the individual Man and his relations to the Universe external to him, aims to build it up with the materials furnished by experience of every kind, Mental and Bodily, normal and abnormal, — ignoring no fact, however strange, that can be attested by valid evidence, and accepting none, however

authoritatively sanctioned, that will not stand the test of thorough scrutiny.

Although few (if any) Philosophers would be disposed to question that the Brain is the instrument of our higher Psychical powers, the ideas which are entertained of the nature of this instrumentality have been seldom clearly or consistently defined. Some, who have attended exclusively to the close relationship which indubitable exists between Corporeal and Mental states, have thought that all the operations of the Mind are but manifestations or expressions of material changes in the Brain: — that thus Man is but a thinking machine, his conduct being entirely determined by his original constitution, modified by subsequent conditions over which he has no control, and his fancied power of self-direction being altogether a delusion; — and hence that notions of duty or responsibility have no real foundation, Man's character being formed for him, and not by him, and his mode of action in each individual case being simply the consequence of the reaction of his Brain upon the impressions which called it into play. On this creed, what is commonly termed Criminality is but one form of Insanity, and ought to be treated as such; Insanity itself is nothing else than a disordered action of the Brain; and the highest elevation of Man's psychical nature is to be attained by due attention to all the conditions which favour his physical development.

The most thorough-going expression of this doctrine will be found in the "Letters on the Laws of Man's Nature and Development," by Henry C. Atkinson and Harriet Martineau.* A few extracts will suffice to show the character of this system of Philosophy. "Instinct, passion, thought, etc., are effects of organized substances." "All causes are material causes." "In material conditions I find the origin of all religions, all philosophies, all opinions, all virtues, all 'spiritual conditions and influences,' in the same manner that I find the origin of all diseases and of all insanities in material conditions and causes." "I am what I am; a creature of necessity; I claim neither merit nor demerit." "I feel that I am as completely the result of my nature, and impelled to do what I do, as the needle to point to the north, or the puppet to move according as the string is pulled." "I cannot alter my will, or be other than what I am, and cannot deserve either reward or punishment."

It seems to the writer that every system of Philosophy which regards the succession of Mental Phenomena as determined solely by the ordinary laws of Physical Causation, and which rejects the

*It was Harriet Martineau who translated Auguste Comte's Positive Philosophy into English.

self-determining power of the Will (or, which is the same thing, regards the Will as only another expression for the preponderance of Motives, or as the general resultant of the action of the Physiological Mechanism), virtually leads to the same conclusion.

Now this honestly-expressed Materialistic doctrine recognizes certain great facts, as to which the unprejudiced and observant Physiologist can entertain no doubt; notwithstanding that their validity may be denied by those who have had comparatively little opportunity of studying them, or who have so made up their minds to a foregone conclusion, as to be ready to admit nothing which is not in accordance with it. The whole series of phenomena which so plainly mark the influence of the Body on the Mind, of physical upon psychical states, — the obvious dependence of the normal activity of the Mind upon the healthful nutrition of the Brain, and upon its due supply of Oxygenated Blood, — the effect of Intoxicating agents and of Morbid Poisons in perverting that activity, and especially in withdrawing the "Mechanism of Thought and Feeling" from Volitional control, — the remarkable influence of local affections of the Brain, traceable in some cases to defective supply of blood, in others to blows on the head, in producing strange disturbances of Memory, — the large share which certain states of bodily disorder on the part of Parents, or conditions tending to induce defective nutrition during the periods of Infancy and Childhood, have been proved to possess in the induction of Idiocy and Cretinism, — the distinct Hereditary Transmission of acquired habits, which, modifying the Bodily constitution of the Parent, repeat themselves in that which he communicates to his Offspring, — these and numerous other phenomena might be cited in support of the Materialistic doctrine, and must be taken account of by any one who would seek the solution of this mystery.

But these phenomena are not to be looked at to the exclusion of the facts of our own internal Consciousness. In reducing the Thinking Man to the level of "a puppet that moves according as its strings are pulled," the Materialistic Philosopher places himself in complete antagonism to the positive conviction, which — like that of the existence of an External World — is felt by every right-minded Man who does not trouble himself by speculating upon the matter, that he really does possess a self-determining power, which can rise above all the promptings of Suggestion, and can, within certain limits mold external circumstances to its own requirements, instead of being completely subjugated by them.

The Writer entirely agrees with Archbishop Manning, in maintaining that we have exactly the same evidence of the existence of this self-determining power within ourselves, that we have of a

material world outside ourselves. For however intimate may be the functional correlation between Mind and Brain — and Archbishop Manning seems disposed to go as far as the Writer in recognizing this intimacy — “there is still another faculty, and more than this, another Agent, distinct from the thinking brain” * * * “That we are conscious of Thought and Will, is a fact of our internal experience. It is a fact also of the universal experience of all men; this is an immediate and intuitive truth of absolute certainty.”

We can scarcely desire a better proof that our possession of this power is a reality and not a self-delusion, than is afforded by the comparison of the normal condition of the Mind with those various abnormal conditions in which the directing power of the Will is in abeyance. For the “subjects” of these conditions may really be considered (so long as they remain in them) as mere thinking Automata, puppets pulled by directing-strings; their whole course of thought and of action being determined by Suggestions conveyed from without, and their own Will having no power to modify or direct this, owing to the temporary suspension of its influence. — To whatever extent, then, we may be ready to admit the dependence of our Mental operations upon the organization and functional activity of our Nervous System, we must also admit that there is something beyond and above all this, to which, in the fully-developed and self-regulating Intellect, that activity is subordinated: whilst, in rudely trampling on the noblest conceptions of our Moral Nature as mere delusions, the purely Materialistic hypothesis is so thoroughly repugnant to the intuitive convictions of Mankind in general, that those who really experience these are made to feel its fallacy, with a certainty that renders logical proof unnecessary.

Let us turn now to the opposite doctrine held by Spiritualists in regard to the nature and source of Mental phenomena; and consider this in its Physiological relations. To them the Mind appears in the light of a separate Immaterial existence, mysteriously connected, indeed, with a Bodily instrument, but not dependent upon this in any other way for the conditions of its operation, than as deriving its knowledge of external things through its Organs of Sense, and as making use of it to execute its determinations — so far as these are accomplished by Muscular effort. On this hypothesis, the operations of the Mind itself, having no dependence whatever on those of Matter, are never themselves affected by conditions of the Bodily organism; whose irregularities or defects of activity only pervert or obscure the outward manifestations of the Mind, just as the light of the brightest lamp may be dimmed or distorted by passing through a bad medium: while, further, as the Mind is thus independent of its Material tenement, and of the circumstances in

which this may chance to be placed, but is endowed with a complete power of Self-government, it is responsible for all its actions, and served to account for; and is not less opposed to facts of most familiar experience. For in placing the Mind altogether outside the Body, and in denying that its action is ever disordered by Bodily conditions, the Spiritualist puts us in the dilemma of either rejecting the plainest evidence, or of admitting that, after all, we know nothing of the nature of the Mind itself; all that we do know, being that lower part of our Mental nature which operates on the Body, and is in its turn affected through it. — Those who would fully and consistently carry out this doctrine, are driven to maintain that even in the state of Intoxication there is no truly mental perversion; and that, in spite of appearances, the mind of the Lunatic is perfectly sound, its bodily instrument being alone disordered. But it cannot be overlooked, that in the delirious ravings of Intoxication or of Fever, or in the conversation and actions of the Lunatic, we have precisely the same evidence of mental operation, that we have in the sayings and doings of the same individuals in a state of sanity; and ample testimony to this effect is borne by those who have observed their own mental state during the access of these conditions, and who have described the alteration which took place in the course of their Thoughts, when as yet neither the Sensorial nor the Motor apparatus was in the least perturbed. Nothing can be more plain to the unprejudiced observer, than that the introduction of intoxicating agents into the Blood-circulation really perverts the action of the Mind; disordering the usual sequence of phenomena most purely psychical, and occasioning new and strange results which are altogether at variance with those of its normal action. And when once the reality of this influence of Physical conditions upon purely-Mental states is forced upon the Physiologist, he cannot avoid recognizing it as a general fact of our nature; so that he comes to be impressed by the conviction, that whilst there is something in our Moral constitution beyond and above any agency which can be attributed to Matter, the operations of the Mind are in a great degree determined (in our present state of being) by the Material conditions with which they are so intimately associated.

This combination of two distinct agencies in the Mental constitution of each individual is recognized in the whole theory and practice of Education. For whilst, in its earlier stages, the Educator aims to call-forth and train the Intellectual Faculties of his Pupil, and to form his Moral Character, by bringing appropriate external in-

fluences to bear upon him, every one who really understands his profession will make it his special object to foster the development, and to promote the right exercise, of that internal power, by the exertion of which each Individual becomes the director of his own conduct and so far the arbiter of his own destinies. This power is exercised by the Will, in virtue of its domination over the automatic operations of the Mind, as over the automatic movements of the Body; the real self-formation of the Ego commencing with his consciousness of the ability to determine his own course of thought and action. Until this self-directing power has been acquired, the Character is the resultant of the individual's original constitution, and of the circumstances in which he may have been placed; and so long as the circumstances are unfavorable to its development, and to the operation of those higher tendencies which should furnish the best motives to its exercise, so long the Character of the individual is formed for him rather than by him. A being entirely governed by the lower passions and instincts, whose higher Moral Sense has been repressed from its earliest dawn by the degrading influence of the conditions in which he is placed, who has never learned to exercise any kind of self-restraint (or, if he has learned it, has only been trained to use it for the lowest purposes), who has never heard of a God, of Immortality, or of the worth of his Soul, — such a being, one of those heathen outcasts of whom all our great towns are unhappily but too productive, — can surely be no more morally responsible for his actions, than the Lunatic who has lost whatever self-control he once possessed, and whose moral sense has been altogether perverted by bodily disorder. But let the former be subjected to the training of one of those benevolent individuals who know how to find out "the holy spot in every child's heart;" let patient kindness, continually appealing to the highest motives which the child can understand, progressively raise his Moral standard, and awaken within him the dormant susceptibilities which enable him to feel that he has a Conscience and a Duty, that he has a power within himself of controlling and directing his thoughts and actions, and that the highest happiness is to be found in the determinate pursuit of the true and the good, — then, but not till then, can he be justly considered responsible for his actions, either morally or religiously, — then only does he rise above the level of the brute, and begin to show that he is indeed made in the image of his Creator.

It is solely by the Volitional direction of the attention that the Will exerts its domination; so that the acquirement of this power, which is within the reach of every one, should be the primary object of all Mental discipline. It is thus that each individual can

perfect and utilize his natural gifts; by rigorously training them in the first instance, and then by exercising them only in the manner most fitted to expand and elevate, while restraining them from all that would limit or debase. — In regard to every kind of Mental activity that does not involve origination, the power of the Will, though limited to selection, is almost unbounded. For although it cannot directly bring objects before the consciousness which are not present to it, yet, by concentrating the Mental gaze (so to speak) upon any object that may be within its reach, it can make use of this to bring in other objects by associative Suggestion. And, moreover, it can virtually determine what shall not be regarded by the Mind, through its power of keeping the Attention fixed in some other direction: and thus it can subdue the force of violent impulse, and give to the conflict of opposing motives a result quite different from that which would ensue without its interference. This exercise of the Will, moreover, if habitually exerted in certain directions, will tend to form the character, by establishing a set of acquired habitudes; which, no less than those dependent upon original constitution and circumstances, help to determine the working of the "Mechanism of Thought and Feeling." In so utilizing it, the Will can also improve it by appropriate discipline; repressing its activities where too strong, fostering and developing them where originally feeble, directing all healthful energy into the most fitting channel for its exercise, and training the entire Mental as it does the Bodily organism to harmonious and effective working. And thus in proportion as our Will acquires domination over our Automatic tendencies, the spontaneous succession of our Ideas and the play of our Emotions show the influence of its habitual control; while our Character and Conduct in Life comes to be the expression of our best Intellectual energies, directed by the Motives which we determinately elect as our guiding principles of action.

It is obvious that the view here taken does not in the least militate against the idea, that Mind may have an existence altogether independent of the Body which serves as its instrument. All which has been contended for is, that the connection between Mind and Body is such, that the actions of each have, in this present state of existence (which is all of which Science can legitimately take cognizance), a definite causal relation to those of the other; so that the actions of our Minds, in so far as they are carried on without any interference from our Will, may be considered as "Functions of the Brain." — On the other hand, in the control which the Will can exert over the direction of the thoughts, and over the motive force exerted by the feelings, we have the evidence of a new and independent Power, which may either oppose or concur-with the

automatic tendencies, and which, according as it is habitually exerted, tends to render the Ego a free agent. And, truly, in the existence of this Power, which is capable of thus regulating the very highest of those operations that are causally related to corporeal states, we find a better evidence than we gain from the study of any other part of our Psychical nature, that there is an entity wherein Man's nobility essentially consists, which does not depend for its existence on any play of Physical or Vital forces, but which makes those forces subservient to its determinations. It is, in fact, in virtue of the Will, that we are not mere thinking Automata, mere puppets to be pulled by suggesting-strings, capable of being played-upon by every one who shall have made himself master of our springs of action.

It may be freely admitted, however, that such thinking Automata do exist: for there are many individuals whose Will has never been called into due exercise, and who gradually or almost entirely lose the power of exerting it, becoming the mere creatures of habit and impulse; and there are others in whom (as we shall hereafter see) such Automatic states are of occasional occurrence, whilst in others, again, they may be artificially induced. And it is (1) by the study of those conditions in which the Will is completely in abeyance, — the course of thought being entirely determined by the influence of suggestions upon the Mind, whose mode of reaction upon them depends upon its original peculiarities and its subsequently-acquired habits, — and (2) by the comparison of such abnormal states with that in which the Ego, in full possession of all his faculties, and accustomed to the habitual direction of his thoughts and control of his feelings, determinately applies his judgment to the formation of a decision between contending impulses, and carries that decision into action, — that we shall obtain the most satisfactory ideas of what share the Will really takes in the operations of our Minds and in the direction of our conduct, and of what must be set down to that automatic activity of our Psychical nature, which is correlated with Cerebral changes.

Thus, then, the Psychologist may fearlessly throw himself into the deepest waters of speculative inquiry in regard to the relation between his Mind and its Bodily instrument, provided that he trusts to the inherent buoyancy of that great fact of Consciousness, that we have within us a self-determining Power which we call Will, And he may even find in the evidence of the intimate relation between Mental activity and Physical changes in the Brain, the most satisfactory grounds which Science can afford, for his belief that the phenomena of the Material Universe are the expressions of an Infinite Mind and Will, of which Man's is the finite representative.

QUOTED REFERENCES

1. THE SCIENCE OF POWER, Benjamin Kidd, G. P. Putnam's Sons, N.Y., London, 1918, Page 309.
2. EDWARD BELLAMY, SELECTED WRITINGS ON RELIGION AND SOCIETY, Joseph Schiffman, Ed. Liberal Arts Press, New York, 23, N.Y. 1955, Page 18.
3. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Ross L. Finney, Ph.D., MacMillan, 1928, Page 118.
4. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Auguste Comte, Vol. III (1853), Lenox Hill Pub. & Dist. Co. New York, N.Y. 10017, Page 8.
5. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. I (1851) Page 35-36.
6. THE POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY OF AUGUSTE COMTE, Translated by Harriet Martineau, George Bell, London, 1896. Vol. III. Page 3.
7. Ibid., Vol. II., Page 170.
8. ENCYCLOPEDIA BRITANNICA, "Auguste Comte", Volume 6, Page 191, Fourteenth Edition.
9. POSITIVISM IN THE UNITED STATES (1853-1861), Richmond Laurin Hawkins, Ph.D., Harvard University Press, 1938, Page 95.
10. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. I, Page 264.
11. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Page 242.
12. Ibid., Page 145.
13. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGION, Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D., Professor of Sociology, U. of Missouri, MacMillan Company, 1923, Page 177.
14. OUR CHANGING SOCIAL ORDER, Gavian, Gray, & Groves, D. C. Heath & Company, Boston, 1941, Page 17.
15. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. III, Page 38.
16. CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIAL SCIENCE, Charles A. Ellwood, Ph.D., MacMillan Company, 1923, Page 19.
17. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. I, Page 268.
18. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Page 61.
19. "Tyranny of All the People," ARENA MAGAZINE, July, 1891, Rev. Francis Bellamy.
20. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Page 117.
21. Ibid., Page 56.

22. THE SCIENCE OF POWER, Page 124.
23. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. I, Page 281.
24. KNOWLEDGE PROCESSES AND VALUES IN THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES, a handbook for teachers published by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, Page 45.
25. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. IV., Page 249.
26. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Page 8.
27. THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIOLOGY, Franklin Henry Giddings, M. A. MacMillan, 1896, Page 17.
28. THE SCIENCE OF POWER. Page 7.
29. A SOCIOLOGICAL PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION, Page 416.
30. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. IV., Page 273.
31. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGION, Page 18.
32. THE SCIENCE OF POWER, Page 144.
33. Ibid., Page 236.
34. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGION, Page 200.
35. KNOWLEDGE PROCESSES AND VALUES IN THE NEW SOCIAL STUDIES, Page 43.
36. THE RECONSTRUCTION OF RELIGION, Page 203.
37. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. IV., Page 251.
38. Ibid., Vol. IV., Page 17.
39. SYSTEM OF POSITIVE POLITY, Vol. I., Page 81.

OTHER REFERENCES

- HOLY BIBLE, King James Version.
- THE DIALOGUES OF PLATO, B. Jowett, M. A. Random House, New York.
- OUR LIBERAL MOVEMENT IN THEOLOGY, Joseph Henry Allen, Roberts Brothers, Boston, 1882.
- SOCIAL CONTROL, Joseph S. Rousek, Ph.E. (Ed.), D. Van Nostrand Co., 1947.
- AUGUSTE COMTE AND POSITIVISM, John Stewart Mill, Ann Arbor Paperbacks, University of Michigan Press, 1961.
- THE MAGIC OF NUMBERS, Eric Temple Bell, Whittlesey House, McGraw-Hill, New York-London, 1946.
- LOOKING BACKWARD, Edward Bellamy, Random House, New York, 1951.
- EQUALITY, Edward Bellamy, D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1897.
- A CENTURY OF EDUCATION, J. M. Dent & Co., London, 1908.
- THE WORLD'S PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS, Ed. by Rev. John Henry Barrows, D. D., The Parliament Publishing Company, Chicago, 1893.
- SOCIOLOGY, Paul B. Horton, Chester L. Hunt, McGraw-Hill, 1964.
- SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL LIFE, Raymond W. Mack, Kimball Young, American Book Company, 1968.
- SOCIOLOGY FOR HIGH SCHOOL, Suzanne Harris Sandkowsky, Oxford Book Company, New York, N.Y., 1969.
- SOCIOLOGY, Paul H. Landis, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1967.
- SOCIOLOGY, ITS PURPOSE AND SCOPE, Harold J. Reddan, John J. Saal, William H. Sadlier, Inc., 1970.
- VALUES AND TEACHING, Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmin, Sidney B. Simon, Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, Ohio, 1966.



Erica Carle is Education Editor of WISCONSIN REPORT, a weekly newspaper dealing with legislative issues and governmental news. She has also been a teacher, recreational director, radio-TV writer/producer, director of home talent shows, and free lance writer. She is married, the mother of three grown children, and is a graduate of the University of Wisconsin in Occupational Therapy.

"Give Us The Young" is based on personal research and observation of sociology, its goals, methods, and influence.

"Give Us The Young" contains all the essential information previously presented in "The Hate Factory."
