

THE ASPEN
INSTITUTE
and
MARXIST *PRAXIS*

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 1

THE ASPEN
INSTITUTE
and
MARXIST *PRAXIS*

by

Judy McLemore

Vol. 1
(Second Edition)

©2002
Institution for Authority Research
Dean Gotcher
Box 233
Herndon, KS 67739
iardeangotcher@yahoo.com

THE ASPEN INSTITUTE and MARXIST *PRAXIS*

by
Judy McLemore

*This is one of a series of papers on the roots of Total Quality Management and its philosophy, General Systems Theory. As a whole, these papers show in the Planners own words, that contrary to TQM's seemingly benign appearance, it is part of a long-range plan to control and remake, not only the citizens of the U. S., but the world. Most important, these papers attempt to reveal the Marxist **Praxis/ putting theory into practice** (brainwashing process) that has and is being used to accomplish this task. Due to the complexity of the subject matter, each paper is only one piece of the puzzle. Each paper in turn adds to and/or builds upon, interconnects, and helps clarify the others. The key individuals of the Aspen Institute didn't just pop up with its creation. Their efforts go back far beyond Aspen and continue into the future. Due to space, only an occasional note is made of these efforts [the networking of Thomas Mann, for instance], although some are picked up in other papers in this series.*

As we plunge headlong into the dark abyss of world government, various individuals and groups propose different theories as to just who and/or what groups are leading this death (of freedom) march--Foundations, the Council on Foreign Relations, Skull & Bones, the New Age Movement/Occult, the Trilateral Commission, National Training Laboratories, Tavistock Institute, Club of Rome, United Nations, the so-called environmental movement, International corporations, our government, etc. Suffice it to say that the totalitarian mindset of those individuals who make up the various groups that would enslave the masses, whether that mindset is Elitist, Communist, Humanist or Fascist, varies little. All are hardened atheists and their single-minded mission in life is the total control of universal man and his environment in order to, among other things, remake him in their atheistic likeness. This paper reveals, from the outside looking in, the **Hegelian dialectic in action/practice**.

The Aspen Institute, located in Aspen, Colorado, was founded by individuals with just such a mindset. Foundational to the Institute is the dialectical process, the god of the intellectual life of Germany. The damage done to this country and its people by this Institute is totally beyond calculation. Its beginnings resulted from a meeting, using a Goethe Bicentennial Celebration as a front, of Marxist-Hegelians from around the world (Hyman Aspen 9). The following is a glimpse of its early history as told by one of its own, Sidney Hyman.

In 1948, Robert M. Hutchins, Guisepppe Antonio Borgese, Arnold Bergstrasser and Walter Paul Paepcke organized a worldwide convocation to

commemorate the bicentenary of the birth of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (3, 249). The stated motive for this celebration was to ensure that the “**intellectual life of Germany**, which the Nazis had ruined,” (Hitler had taken over the brainwashing centers and used them for his own ends.) would be “revived and restored” in the “community of Western thought” (Hyman Aspen 21; Fermi 9).

Guiseppe Antonio Borgese (1882-1952), the “son-in-law of **Thomas Mann**” (Hyman 3), had immigrated to the U.S. from Mussolini’s Italy in 1931. He joined the faculty of the University of Chicago (where Hutchins was president) in the mid-1930’s and in order to “launch his political ideas,” he founded and consequently was editor of Common Cause--the monthly magazine of the Committee to Frame a World Constitution (19; Fermi 116). His “scholarly pursuits” included “Italian thought and action,” and the “interplay of German culture” with “that of Italy” (Hyman 10). Hutchins and Borgese “had worked closely” together “arranging contacts between the University of Chicago and the Goethe University in Frankfurt,” Germany (13). After V-J Day, Borgese and Bergstrasses initiated a program in which “University of Chicago professors were urged to accept teaching assignments at the Goethe University... in order to help revive German Intellectual life” (9), that is, learn Marxist *praxis* (how to apply the Hegelian dialectic in practice). After retiring from the University of Chicago where he stayed for 12 years, Borgese moved back to Italy in 1948 and died there in 1952 (Fermi 116).

Thomas Mann (1875-1955) was a member of the board of directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation which planned the Goethe Celebration (Hyman Aspen 44). Mann’s youngest daughter Elisabeth had meet Borgese at Mann’s home in Princeton and married him a year later. She was twenty-one and he was fifty-seven, seven years older than Mann himself (456). Elisabeth assisted Mann in his “literary and political ventures,” and would be an asset to Borgese as well. The Mann family had left Germany in 1931 and after staying 5 years in Switzerland, emigrated in 1937 to the U. S. where Mann obtained the position of lecturer at Princeton. He co-founded the **Emergency Rescue Committee** to bring like-minded comrades to America (Fermi 85, 262-263, 265). Mann, a poet and novelist whose work was based on “fact and fiction” as well as homosexual “fantasy and reality,” was a “bisexual” pedophile with a lustful passion for “**boys and young men**” which lasted apparently until his death at the age of 80. The father of six children, he was cold and detached as well as abusive. He was sexually attracted to his own son Klaus who would later commit suicide. Mann would refuse to cancel his lecture tour to attend his funeral. Later, his grandson Frido as well and daughter Michael, mother of Frido, would also commit suicide. Daughter Erika was convinced that Frido would “grow into a homosexual” because of “the way her father treated him.” Frido married Christine Heisenberg, the daughter of the scientist responsible for General Systems Theory’s uncertainty principle. Although Mann had married the daughter of a very wealthy and prominent Jewish family in

his late twenties, he was “less in love with her than with her background” and hoped that the marriage would further his “work.” Mann traveled extensively both in Germany and the U.S. giving “readings” of his novels and lecturing on such topics as “Goethe and Democracy” and “The Position of Sigmund Freud in Modern Cultural History” which he described as a “wide-ranging dissertation on the problem of revolution, with academic intentions” (Hayman 194-195, 200, 250-251, 276, 323, 376, 494, 527, 554, 556, 573, 582, 588, 603, 619). Mann burned the bulk of his diaries and stipulated that the remainder not be published until 20 years after his death. These diaries form the basis of Thomas Mann.

Among those who influenced Mann was Goethe, Nietzsche--to whom Adolf Hitler himself commissioned a shrine which consequently opened in 1938 (Lively & Abrams 71)--Schiller, Oswald Spengler, and Wagner, another Hitler hero to whom Mann had a “lifelong passion.” Throughout his life, his friends and contacts were many and varied. He gave lectures at the Carnegie Foundation for International Peace. He had private sittings with the Pope and Queen Juliana of the Netherlands and the Budapest Minister of Culture. He dined with George Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, who was a “Fabian” socialist who had visited Lenin in Moscow in the winter of 1920-21 where he advised him that for socialism to succeed it was “necessary to **reorganize** not only the material side of life but also the *psychology of the whole people*.” Wells advocated the **Fabians**’ “evolutionary collectivism” whereby the “existing capitalistic system” is “transformed into a collective one” by a “definite system of education for all society” (Trotsky 172, 180), and **Max Horkheimer** of the Frankfurt School* who had been a student/peer of **Max Weber** (Gunnell 154). Mann worked closely with another Frankfurt School member and U.S. emigrant, **Theodor Adorno**, who was his “mentor” concerning the effectiveness of “atonal music” in producing “cultural decadence.” He was a personal friend of **Sigmund Freud** as well. It was Freud who prompted Mann to write “The Tables of the Law” in order to “demythify and demystify biblical material” (Hayman 149, 316-317, 487, 495-496, 608).

It was through his friendship with Josef von Lukacs of Budapest that Mann became associated with his son, **Georg Lukacs**, another Frankfurt School member (Georg dropped the von). Josef was a “wealthy Jewish capitalist,” and son Georg “was introduced to many prominent European intellectuals, including [Max] Weber,” in his father’s house. In 1912, Georg had become “part of Weber’s circle as well as involved with the ideas of [Stefan] George.” **Weber** envisioned an

* The Communist founded Frankfurt School/Institute for Social Research was the center of Transformational Marxism. Its members integrated Freud’s “psychoanalysis and Hegelianized Marxism” and put dialectical theory into practice. After Hitler came to power, they fled the country and eventually made their new home at Columbia University where they immediately set about implementing (and training others to implement) this brainwashing process in America. (Read Martin Jay’s The Dialectical Imagination: A History Of The Frankfurt School And The Institute Of Social Research, 1923-1950.)

“organic cultural order informed [controlled] by an academic elite.” By 1915, Georg was “dedicated to radical renewal through cultural **critique**” (Gunnell 158-159). Georg had “joined the Hungarian Communist Party in 1918” and after “taking part in the uprising of 1919” (of which Antonio Gramsci also participated), he escaped to **Vienna** where Mann “intervened to save him from being extradited out of Austria” to Hungary. It was here that Mann personally got to know Georg although Mann’s work had “determined the essential features” of Georg’s early writings (Gunnell 257, 332-333). Mann developed a “deepening friendship” with Ernst Bertram who, after the war was “classified by the denazification court as a ‘lesser offender,’” whose “lover was Ernst Glocknes, a member of the *male group* that surrounded **Stefan George**.” Mann attended “poetry readings” at the apartment of Ludwig Derleth, another “member” of the **Stefan George Circle**, of which he based a character in one of his novels (554, 197-198, 252-253).

Incidentally, Stefan George, one of the most popular poets in Germany at the time, was among the German “intellectuals” who popularized “Nietzschean fascism” in Germany. He, like Mann, was a pedophile and a “guiding example” to the “Community of the Special,” an organization of German “pederasts” (men who “engage in or desires to engage in sex with boys around the age of puberty”) who argued that “Christian asceticism was responsible for the demise of homosexual relations,” therefore they sought a “complete transformation of Germany from a Judeo-Christian society to a Greco-Uranian one.” When Hitler was elected Chancellor of Germany in 1933, he “appointed George as President of the Nazi Academy of Letters” which he turned down (Lively & Abrams iii, 19-22, 26, 70).

During and after World War II, Mann had become such a promoter for anything and everything pertaining to Soviet Russia, he was denounced by California Congressman Donald Jackson as “one of the world’s foremost apologists for Stalin and Company” (Gunnell 585). Mann thought the idea of a “**world order** that is nothing but anti-Communist” was “worse” than one that was “Communist,” and his “antipathy to American anti-communism predisposed him to look charitably on Soviet expansionism” (563, 569). After the Soviets took over East Berlin, the “East German government wanted him to accept the Stalin Peace Prize and the National Prize, both of which he had to refuse, but he *resented having to do so*.” [Queen Juliana wanted to award him the cross of the order of Orange-Nassaw as well] (609). Moreover, Mann’s lesbian daughter Erika and homosexual son Klaus were both “denounced in a Munich paper as ‘leading agents of Stalin in the USA’” (349, 362, 555). Brother Heinrich was awarded the German National Prize for Art and Literature and invited to become president of the German Academy of the Arts in East Berlin which would “solve his financial problems by putting him in the power of a regime controlled by Moscow” (557). Heinrich died a natural death just before leaving America for East Berlin to accept this post.

Although Mann was afraid to accept the Stalin Prize, he did accept the “Weimar Goethe Prize,” which the East Germans offered him along with the “freedom of the city” (562). This was 1949, the year of the Aspen Institute’s birth. Combining a West Berlin lecture tour with his 3-day East Berlin visit to accept the Goethe Prize, daughter Erika noted that both East and West Germany “showered him with ‘godlike honors’” (565). In 1916, Mann had insisted that the “intellectual must never take *direct* political action” but by 1923, he “saw it as his duty to move into that dimension” (347). His entire adult life is a testament to that.

Arnold Bergstrasser’s [1896-1964] “formal training was in the social and political sciences,” but when he emigrated from Germany in 1937, he taught cultural sociology, history and German literature at Claremont College in California. In 1944, he was “called to the University of Chicago to teach in the Army Specialized Training Program for soldiers who were to be sent to Germany to become members of the military government.” When this mission was accomplished, he accepted an offer to stay in the German department at the University. Here Bergstrasser, “enlisting the collaboration of German-born colleagues in other departments” succeeded in “raising the level of German culture [Marxist *praxis*] in the community.” Among his “achievements” was the Goethe Festival at Aspen. He returned to Germany in 1951 “to pick up the threads of his interrupted career.” Having asserted that “reconciling political and ideological differences between American and German-born colleagues had not always been easy,” back in Germany Bergstrasser helped “plan and promote” the John F. Kennedy Institute of the Free University in Berlin, an institute “engaged in the study of all aspects of American culture.” He would promote this institute “until his death” (Fermi 102-103, 390). According to fellow Heidelberg émigré Hannah Arendt, before leaving Germany Bergstrasser “had successfully accommodated himself to the [Hitler] regime,” until it was “shown that he had a whole string of Jewish ancestors.” It was Bergstrasser, says Arendt, that was “the real moving force behind this [Goethe Celebration] program” (Kohler & Saner 136).

In 1929, Robert Hutchins had come to the University of Chicago from Yale Law School where he had “embraced legal realism.” By the mid-1930’s, he had turned against the “philosophical heritage” of John Dewey and turned toward a “neoclassical Aristotelian/Thomist natural law philosophy.” He recruited Mortimer Adler and his “emphasis” on the “great books” from Columbia to Chicago in 1930, as well as others who “joined the attack on scientism and the related version of liberalism.” Hutchins argued in his manifesto, The Higher Learning in America, that “metaphysics must do for the modern university what theology had done in the Middle Ages--provide an ordering principle and an ‘intelligible basis for the study of man in his relations with other men’” (Gunnell 132).

Hutchins spent 19 years as president of the University of Chicago [he resigned the presidency in 1947 and became chancellor] attempting to “restructure American higher education” (Hyman Aspen 3). [He became vice-president of the

newly formed Ford Foundation in 1950 with Aspen Institute trustee, Clarence Faust, who was “at the forefront of foundation work in support of education” (97-98)]. As head of the University, his “educational purpose” was to achieve “a unifying synthesis about man and his world” (21). He believed that the best formal education for students was “preparatory for a lifetime of **adult learning**” (17). Hutchins sought to “make the University of Chicago the place to *initiate* and *test* the *revolutionary changes* he felt were imperative” (15). As a result of his efforts, he “appeared to be ‘Blasphemous the First’ to some members of his own faculty and to most American educators in the 1930’s and 1940’s” (14). Hutchins’ reforms sound disgustingly familiar, for instance, viewing the “learning process as a lifelong enterprise; producing students capable of discussing ‘common problems,’ etc.” In Hutchins’ view, the “immediate objective” of education was to “make the student not learned, but capable of learning,” while the “larger objective” was to provide society with citizens who could “communicate” (16). [Hutchins’ believed “communication” was a “precondition for a world order” (20)]. The “strong resistance” he met led him to say that “every advance in education is made over the dead bodies of 10,000 resisting professors,” later rephrasing the thought by saying that “it is harder to change a curriculum than it is to move a cemetery.” Professor Mortimer Adler was Hutchins’ “principal co-worker” and “collaborator” in this effort as well as on many other “different and difficult projects” (15). (Their ideas on education reform would be taken up by the Aspen Institute.) One of these projects was the teaching of a two-year “**Great Books**” course at the University to a “select group” of undergraduates. [The “Ideas” in the Great Books were presented in “dialectical form.” (Hyman, Benton 494).] Those students who underwent the full two years of this brainwashing process “took away” what

often became the invisible hand that shaped the order of values, judgments, and personal commitments in their mature years. Among the students who were seminar participants in the last half of the 1930’s, what has just been said was true of Mrs. Katherine Graham, now the publisher of the Washington Post. It was true of Charles Percy, now the United States senator from Illinois. It was also true of Robert O. Anderson... (Hyman, Aspen 17-18)

Hutchins also joined with Adler in teaching “The Fat Man’s Seminar” which was “based on the Great Books.” This course, based on **Marxist Praxis**/putting dialectical theory into practice/action, targeted University “trustees” and “Chicago business leaders” (18). He was also the chairman of the **Committee to Frame a World Constitution**, on which he worked closely with Borgese (13). In a public statement preceding its 1948 draft publication, Hutchins explained the “precondition for a world order:”

...One good world requires more than the sacrifice of ancient prejudices (traditional beliefs, values, etc.). It requires the formulation and adoption of common principles and ideals [**consensus**]. It requires that this be done on a **world-wide** basis...communication lies at the foundation of any durable community. By communication, I do not refer to the means of communication, but to a common understanding of what is communicated... (20)

Hutchins' had been an undergraduate at **Oberlin College*** for two years before dropping out during World War I to join the army and was subsequently stationed in Italy. He later boasted: "I memorized long passages [of the first volume of the Witkowski edition of Goethe's Faust] while on guard duty, reciting the language of the enemy while in the midst of my sleeping compatriots" (14, 112).

Walter Paul Paepcke, an "admiring student of Goethe and of the German tradition" (Hyman, Aspen 26), was founder and CEO of the Container Corporation of America. He insisted that the Goethe celebration be held at Aspen, Colorado where he owned a good deal of land and real estate. His wife Elizabeth was the sister of **Paul Nitze**, who would later become an Aspen Institute participant and trustee and "successively head of the State Department's Policy Planning Board, Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, and Secretary of the Navy" (35). Paepcke and wife had been "regular participants" at The Fat Man's Seminar (18).

In order to fund the celebration, a Goethe Bicentennial Foundation was created as a nonprofit corporation. Among the "criteria" used to recruit "officers and directors" for the foundation was the stipulation that those chosen "must reflect the many facets of Goethe's own life" (43). As described by Hyman, Goethe had a "faith in man's *divine* ability to live" a "**communal life.**" He offered "creative diversity" and in the place of walls raised to "isolate one mind from the next, he offered an open road to *communion* among human beings." Goethe made

all facets of his life a harmony of mind and body, of imagination and precept, of power and responsibility, his philosophy of life synthesized the natural sciences and humanistic studies. Undogmatic, religious in essence...he looked to that humanistic heritage and the sciences for the metaphors which illuminate the underlying unity of everything. "All things," said he..."weave themselves into a **whole**."

* Oberlin College became the home of Hungarian émigré Oscar Jaszi after he immigrated to America in 1923. Here Jaszi, together with Karl Geiser, largely constituted the political science department. In Hungary, he had "founded and led the radical Society for Social Sciences--an association patterned after the Fabians and devoted to social and political reform." He was later associated, along with Frankfurt School member **Georg Lukacs**, with the Hungarian Free School for the Social Sciences which targeted the working class for **re-education**. (Gunnell 102-103)

Since Goethe placed his faith in the spirit of man, his first concern was with the means of...releasing that spirit...

To Goethe, the basis of the human community was communication... What he wanted, said he, was “the **union** of **groups** of good mental standards which hitherto had little contact with each other, the recognition of one common purpose, the conviction of the necessity to keep informed about the current course of world events, in the real (what is) and the ideal (what ought to be) sense.” It was not necessary for everyone to agree with everyone else. “The question to ask,” said Goethe, “is not whether we are perfectly agreed, but whether we are proceeding from a **common** basis of **sentiment**.”* (11-13)

More than 2,000 individuals from around the world gathered at Aspen on June 27, 1949, to discuss Goethe and his relationship to the “unity of mankind” (45). Hutchins and Borgese jointly prepared a statement (this “statement” became a “testament that would animate the Aspen Institute of the future”) (48), which was released at the start of the convocation. It read in part:

If **man** is somehow **one** and if the **world** is somehow **one**, it is not too soon to wonder what it is that unifies[#] both man and the world. World organization will be human community or it will not be at all. And the great society...will not become the human community until it finds the common spirit that is man... (81)

In his speech on the closing day of the convocation, Hutchins’ remarks echoed the thread running through the conference. He concluded by saying:

There is no reason why...we cannot use the incredible means of communication...to promote the unity of mankind...

In one good Goethean world the means of communication...would be used...to exchange students, professors, ideas and books and to develop a supranational community founded on the humanity of the whole human race. The essence of the Civilization of the Dialogue is communication. The Civilization of the Dialogue resupposes mutual respect and understanding; it does not presuppose agreement...In Wilhelm Meister, there is a speech which, it seems to me, is appropriately addressed to this assembly on this

* [sentiment--opinion colored by emotion; an appeal to the emotions; combination of feelings and opinions] in other words **CONSENSUS**.

[#] For Hegel, as for these Hegelian Aspenites, the world evolved into an **organic whole** via **putting the dialectical process into practice**.

great occasion: “Since we came together so miraculously...let us together become active in a noble manner!...Let us make a league for this...” (86)

Hyman, a participant at the convocation, explains:

In Hutchins’ terms, the Goethe bicentennial was...a marked success in “**adult education.**” Men and women from diverse walks of life had come together not only to listen to what eminent scholars had to say, but also to communicate with them and with each other about a great range of common concerns. It was something he had long struggled to bring about in the context of a great university...Could it be recreated and kept alive in some form once the convocation was over? (88)

Indeed it could! The task ahead was not “gaining more knowledge and more goods” but taking existing knowledge and goods to “do the right thing with them.” This perspective would become the basis of the Aspen Institute (87). After the Goethe convocation, Paepcke took the lead in organizing what would become the **Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies**. This would be a place where eventually everyone from supreme court judges and congressmen and senators to CEOs and international political figures would come to participate in the “Executive Seminars” based on Marxist *Praxis*. Some came to facilitate while others were targeted victims. Paepcke sought advice on this endeavor from an old pro, Spanish philosopher **Jose Ortega y Gasset**, a convocation participant and later trustee of the Institute. Ortega proposed the creation at Aspen of a “Hochschule” for advanced studies, a “High School” of sorts for the “Humanities,” a humanities concerned with “specifically human facts” and “most principally-- current human problems.” Its “**educational mission**” would be to promote a “**total synthesis of human life**” and to make “a single discipline” of the “physical and biological sciences and the humanities.” This “synthesis” would be “achieved” “on the basis of a library with very few but **masterly chosen** volumes. The “physical” environment of Aspen was designed to produce just enough “comforts” so that the “human individual, free from material hindrances, can...allow his inner self to live intensely and *give himself fully to thinking, imagining, loving, and feeling.*” Any conveniences that did not produce this “effect” were considered “excess” because they would cause man to give himself “over to comforts instead of himself” (93-94).

The “first and second educational principles of the new school should be Spartanism and elegance.” Spartanism included “continuity of effort” and “endurance.” “Elegance,” explained Ortega, “**must penetrate, influence a man’s entire life**, from his gestures and ways of talking...to the **most intimate side** of his moral and intellectual **actions.**” The “normal curriculum” would include public lectures which would bring together five or six intellectuals who were “equal

mentally” and whose “**opposed views**” were “held at the same level,” that is, given the same weight whether they were Marxist, Capitalist, or whatever. The theme of such courses, lectures, and colloquies “must be extremely vivid, deeply human (to elicit emotional responses), and should offer a great incentive to the general public even if **they must be treated with a thorough-going scientific rigor.**” These “intellectuals” would serve as “**models**” to participants. The “idea,” said Ortega, is to

create in the Aspen summer a “world.” A “world” however, is not a fortuitous gathering of individuals. It is a living together informed by unity...Such unity, however, will not crystallize unless there is a permanent instrument of general collective life in Aspen. (95)

A passage that served as a “directional signal” to the Institute was: “The domain assigned to human *reason*^{*} is that of *work and action*” (84). Primary to the Institute’s “purpose” was helping man “rediscover” the “spiritual truths which will enable men to control science and all its machinery” (98). The founders were motivated by their desire to “**bridge the gap between the ideal and the real**” (viii). Their work at Aspen would be in “spotting emerging *problems*, in examining them from different perspectives, and in formulating *alternative responses* to them” (6). Hyman explains that the

Institute takes its unity from an idea and a commitment shared by the participants in its inner life, regardless of the city, nation, or continent where they otherwise make their home. The idea is, that any salient problem of contemporary human existence now shares a common frontier or merges with every other salient problem, and that any solutions framed for a particular problem must take into account its linkages to the rest. The commitment is to all the meanings packed into the strategic word “**humanistic**”—to search for ways in which “man,” in Martin Buber’s phrase, “can reach for the divine, not by reaching above the human, but by striving **to become...**” (7)

Consequently, the Institute’s “conferences and workshops” focused on “problems of contemporary life” that were “transnational, transregional, and transsocietal” (6). Many of the Institute’s trustees had been “prominently associated” with the Goethe convocation, either as officers and directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation or as featured speakers. The rest came from “education, business and government” (97-98).

* “Reason...was the critical tribunal on which Critical Theory was primarily based.” (Jay 61)

So on the initiative of Paepcke, a “version” of “The Fat Man’s Seminar in the Great Books” was developed by the Institute to be offered in the summer at Aspen (96). To help launch this 1950 “trial run,” Mortimer Adler “recruited,” among others, the help of Reinhold Niebuhr, Karl Menninger (who would later bring social scientists from **Tavistock** to his clinic in Topeka, Kansas), Clare Booth Luce (wife of Henry Luce, Jr.), Clarence Faust (who had been “among the leaders of the Great Books Movement at the University of Chicago, but was now at the forefront of *foundation work in support of education*”), and Robert Hutchins (then the vice-president of the **newly formed Ford Foundation**) (97-98).

Yale’s Skull & Bones member, Henry Luce, Jr.,* the creator of the Time, Inc. publishing empire and a friend of Hutchins, had been a member of the American Policy Commission. This Commission had been formed at the University of Chicago by mutual friends, **William Benton**[#] (a Senator from Illinois (148) and “master of communication” who Hutchins recruited to be vice-president of the University of Chicago (18)) and Paul Hoffman^{##} and was the “forerunner of the Hoffman-Benton-led **Committee for Economic Development**” (100). During this trial run of The Fat Man’s Seminar, Luce sat in on one of these brainwashing sessions of which his wife, Clare Booth, was a facilitator. Later that night at the home of Paepcke, he suggested that it was the “**unwashed** American businessman” [those who supported free enterprise rather than monopoly capitalism/communism] that should be targeted “to share and experience directly” what he had seen occur that night. “He is the man you want,” explained Luce, “because he is the man who needs you the most” (101). In other words, it was the brain of the

* Luce’s membership in Skull & Bones, as well as former president George Bush--who introduced America to the phrase, “New World Order”--was disclosed in a documentary on Secret Societies on T.V.’s A&E, 11-22-98. A video tape of this program may be obtained by calling 1-800-423-1212.

[#] Hutchins, Benton, Luce as well as Ralph Ingersoll had been classmates and friends at Yale (Hutchins entering as a junior from Oberlin). Ralph Ingersoll, who would later be a “central figure for a while in the publishing empire of Henry Luce, Jr.,” was the “creator and publisher of the short-lived newspaper PM.” Taking a leave of absence from Luce Publishing, Ingersoll turned to Benton in 1939 to help him get PM started and off the ground. For his work, Benton was given one thousand shares of stock in PM. Benton, then vice-president of the University of Chicago, later went to work for PM under a “half-time agreement with the university” (Hyman Benton 68, 219-221). PM was a “close American cousin to the Parisian Stalinist daily Ce Soir and “high-level” Soviet agents “including **Louis Dolivet**, could be found hovering near PM throughout its existence” (Koch 190). See “The New School for Social Research,” another paper in this series, for more information on Louis Dolivet.

^{##} Paul Hoffman, the first administrator of the Marshall Plan who succeeded General William Donovan as the “leading spirit” of the **Committee for a United Europe**, tapped Benton to “help formulate the committee’s policies for promoting the economic and political integration of Europe.” The committee financed studies (“guided by specific recommendations made principally by **Jean Monnet**, and Robert Schumann and Paul-Henri Spaak”) that helped “lay out the economic grounds” for what later became the European Common Market, the forerunner of today’s European Economic Union. (Hyman, Benton 509-510)

traditional businessman that needed washing the most. This idea “led to a swirl of excited talk” that

recognized that the postwar **Committee for Economic Development** was doing important work in getting businessmen to devote time, effort, energy, and money to the task of clarifying their own minds and those of their fellow citizens about the major alternatives of national economic policy...But the need was for something that went beyond the limits of economics--or even beyond the Fat Man’s Seminar in the Great Books...**The need was for business leaders to sit at the same table with leaders in the world of letters, theology, government, labor, and science to discuss a broad range of problems of contemporary society and Western civilization**... (101)

Luce’s desire to wash the brain of the American businessman resulted in the Institute’s “Executive Seminar,” which targeted “established or potential heads of corporations.” Hence, The Fat Man’s Seminar became the Executive Seminar, the brainwashing dialectical “rock” upon which Aspen was “built” (220) and has remained the “cornerstone of the Aspen Institute from 1951 to the present” (102).

THE EXECUTIVE SEMINAR--A LESSON IN BRAINWASHING [i.e. the Dialectical Process in Action/*Praxis*]

Philosophy of praxis is both a euphemism for Marxism and an utonomous term used by (Antonio) Gramsci to define what he saw to be a central characteristic of the philosophy of Marxism, the inseparable link it establishes between **theory and practice, thought and action**. (Gramsci xiii)

The “creator and mainspring” of the Executive Seminars was Mortimer Adler (Hyman Aspen 134). In the “cadre of seminar leaders Adler recruited were some of the *most experienced* and gifted teachers [change agents/facilitators] in the nation” (130). The Executive Seminars consisted of a “sequence of sessions spread over twelve days” where **groups**, who had been assigned to read before-hand carefully chosen “selections” from carefully chosen books, would meet for “discussions” and “argument.” These selections contained a “sweep of tough thinking about social, economic, and political problems,” and were “from the Bible, from Plato, Aristotle, Sophocles, and Thucydides,” as well as “selections from the Federalist papers, from *Karl Marx*, from *Sigmund Freud*.” All “dealt with ideas such as *equality, liberty, justice, and property*--ideas of central importance to an understanding of ‘democracy’ and ‘capitalism’ as well as of *their opposites*, ‘totalitarianism’ and ‘communism.’” The selections were designed to “widen the arc of **perceptions** about the same four fundamental ideas” and

to avoid the bogus clarity where only one side of a case is seen, the readings for a given day would include conflicting views about major issues.

Seminar participants would then be asked to formulate the terms of the conflict, to state where they stood with respect to the rival sides, **and to defend their positions under challenge.**

Although the premise of the readings and discussions assumed that the truth was **in principle discoverable**--else, why bother to seek it by means of an argument?--**the seminars would teach no dogmas but would encourage the participants to examine all dogmas, starting with their own**. Further, the Executive Seminar would not provide businessmen with pat answers to the practical problems they faced... (106-107)

Obviously, it was “not the aim of the Aspen Executive Seminars to make a better treasurer out of a treasurer, or a better credit manager out of a credit manager, or to show how an advertising vice-president can be more effective in promoting a product” (107). As Luce had suggested and what the *process* was designed and proven to do was to wash or rid the brain of the individual of his/her traditional beliefs, convictions, and values. Not unlike the industrialist who collaborated with Hitler, many of the businessmen recruited for Aspen came initially because “they hoped to sell something” to Paepcke and his Container Corporation but instead, were “subjected to a treatment” that would eventually change their very worldview. From all accounts, very few failed to succumb to the “unsettling impact” (218) of these seminars. One discerning and therefore irate participant, a banker, drew a “fellow participant” aside: “This whole program is nothing more than a New Deal or **Communist plot to undermine the free enterprise system**. Look at the stuff we’ve been asked to read, and just listen to the outrageous things being said in the discussions!” raged the banker. Unfortunately, the banker had unknowingly expressed his views to the enemy, a fellow who had been involved in the “Great Books movement” (108-109).

Businessmen as well as “moderators” and “special guests” from non-business backgrounds who were “exposed to the early Executive Seminars, developed a lasting attachment to the Institute” (111). As a result of this “leader education,” a “spirit of fraternity sprang up” among those who attended (150). **Between 1951 and 1964, more than “400 corporations” had participated and “more than 2,000 alumni of the Executive Seminars held places of leadership in business, labor, government, the professions, the universities, and the arts and sciences.”** In the years ahead, the Institute continually held “refresher” seminars for the alumni at Aspen, Washington, New York and various other major cities around the country (176). These alumni would play a major role in the Institute’s plans to deceive the masses.

Paepcke also created a summer musical festival (and school as well as Health Center) at Aspen which “acted as a magnet which drew to the Institute’s

Executive Seminars figures of the first rank in the realms of commerce and industry, government and the professions, the arts and sciences” (130). He “drew heavily on his personal profits from his Aspen companies to cover the deficits of the Institute” (121). This paid off! Between

1954 and 1955, Paepcke could look across the country and derive satisfaction from the flattering way in which the external form of the Aspen Executive Seminar was being imitated in one place and another... (130)

Initially, “adversary” figures in the ranks of “labor” were brought in to the Executive Seminars to interact with the businessmen. Then the “black community,” and by the end of the sixties radical “student leaders were brought into the seminars to challenge the values of the business executives” (117-118). By 1975, almost half the participants targeted were judges, political leaders, scholars, writers, artists, etc. Hyman boasts that 25 years after the Executive Seminars began, participants

in the Executive Seminars have tended to show the same pattern of responses, regardless of the year when they came to Aspen or the people who flanked them. In the opening sessions, for example, some businessmen tended to be restrained, wary, noncommittal, afraid to speak in an unfamiliar vocabulary lest they stammer and appear ridiculous in the eyes of their peers. Others tended to be unbuttoned, voluble, confident, seemingly certain when they spoke, the gods in heaven would be edified. But as the days passed, both types found it increasingly difficult to adhere to their initial stance. The first could not evade questions when they were asked to explain themselves. The second could not speak and go unchallenged. **Members of either group could be badly shaken, wounded in their pride of intellect, embarrassed by the exposure of their limited perceptions**, angry on that account...Most seminars, however, reached a moment where the crisis of self-esteem was passed and **men began to speak their minds freely**... (118-119)

In 1957, at Paepcke’s urging, Robert O. Anderson took over as president of the Institute because Paepcke’s Container Corporation was “about to embark on an overseas expansion program in advance of the impending official birth of the *European Common Market*.” Anderson was “among other things, the chairman of the board of the Atlantic Richfield Oil Company, the foremost rancher in New Mexico, the owner of assorted mining and manufacturing companies, a former president of the Dallas Federal Reserve Bank, a director of the Chase National Bank, a director of the Columbia Broadcasting Company, president of the Lovelace Clinic...a trustee of the University of Chicago, a trustee of the California

Institute of Technology” and “a figure of central importance to the Aspen Institute and its network of affiliated institutions” (125). The post of “chairman” of the Institute’s board of trustees was created for Paepcke, who remained involved in the Institute until his death three years later (138-139). The fees charged for participation in the Executive seminars “never covered the operating cost” (176), so Anderson, like Paepcke before, would use his personal wealth to fund the Institute. By 1971, the “base of support” for Aspen had been widened “most notably by contributions of foundations and corporations.” By 1975, the Institute had received “substantial” project and program **grants from the likes of the City of Berlin, the German Marshall Fund, the National Endowment for the Humanities, Carnegie Foundation, Ford Foundation, Henry Luce, Andrew Mellon, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, Rockefeller Family Fund, Russell Sage, Atlantic Richfield Foundation, Edna McConnell Clark, Commonwealth Fund, Danforth, Spencer Fund, North Star, Charles Kettering and Lilly Endowment, among others. Corporate contributions were made by ABC, CBS, NBC, IBM, Thomas J. Watson--head of IBM (see IBM/Watson below), Sperry Rand, Weyerhaeuser, A.T.& T., Chase Manhattan Bank, Exxon, First National Bank of Chicago, Ford Motor Company, Coca Cola, Sears Roebuck, Smith Barney, General Mills, Motorola, Container Corporation of America, Goodyear, Bristol Myers and Borg Warner, to name a few (375-376).**

As mentioned earlier, Anderson was a product of the University of Chicago’s Great Books movement and “one of its *missionaries* in the business community” (146). When he became president of Aspen, the Executive Seminars were given even more prominence by being “put on a year-round basis.” Anderson was determined that the Institute remain a forum where individuals, organized into groups,

could cross disciplines in an *open* manner and *speak their minds freely*. It must remain a place whose *institutional neutrality* would permit it to consider any topic however “controversial” and *to bring to bear on it a great diversity of view-points, however heretical*. It must help **define the questions of public policy** worth asking, must help **clarify** the range and implications of **alternative answers to them**, but the conclusions drawn by individuals who shared the work of *clarification* must in every case *be their own*. (145-146)

How’s that for facilitating individual “commitment” and “ownership” of these totalitarian’s predetermined goals and objectives?

Anderson and Company determined that the Institute needed to “expand its *field of action* beyond the framework of the Executive Seminars.” Since their inception, the seminars had brought in “major representatives of the American Scientific Community” to “enter into *face-to-face discussions*” with business

leaders but this “was not enough.” It didn’t permit a “sustained examination” of the “breach” between the “humanities” and the “sciences” and thus the Institute’s goal of “synthesizing into a single culture” the two “rival cultures” (151). To this end, the Institute initiated a series of one-week seminars from 1961-1965 on “science and society” funded by the *National Science Foundation*, that brought together “humanists, scientists, business leaders, university executives, labor leaders, clergymen, editors, and key governmental officials in both the civil and military order.” Included were movers and shakers from the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Army research, and the Department of Defense, to International Planned Parenthood Association, and the U. S. Department of Education (153). The Institute **framed** the “central **question**” put to these “American leaders” and the “continuity among some of the participants in the successive seminars, augmented by *cadres* of new participants” permitted the “question” to be asked at “regular intervals,” thus “leading to progressive *clarification* of the subject matter under *discussion*” (154). As a result, “the Aspen initiative helped stimulate many regional seminars in universities and among private organizations” on the “relationship between science and government” and the “interplay between the sciences and the humanities.”

In addition, the

discussions spreading outward from Aspen helped prepare the **ground for the creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) as a matching piece to the National Science Foundation. Two men who played major but different roles in the birth of the NEH--Barnaby C. Kenney, president of Brown University, and Thomas Watson, president of the *International Business Machines Corporation*--had long been intimately associated with the activities of the Aspen Institute (154).**

If you will recall, it was the *International Business Machines Corporation’s (IBM)* “Director of International Education” who later “conceived” of The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education which contained the Business Roundtable’s “agenda for educational *change*.” This “agenda,” written by the RAND Corporation’s “Senior Social Scientist” Paul T. Hill and David Hornbeck, provided the “blueprint” for the nation’s Outcome-based Education restructuring movement. At the time, IBM’s Chairman of the Board, John Akers, was also chairman of The Business Roundtable Education Task Force (Hill and Hornbeck, Acknowledgements and Introduction).

At the same time, it was decided that the Institute needed a “division” of theoretical physics, molecular biology and theological studies with the Institute “oversee[ing]” their “activities.” It is indicated, but not explicitly stated, that the idea behind this was to bring like-minded “scientists” together to produce theories

or “speculative constructs” (which build on, support, and give creditability to each) of which the Institute needed to support its revolution while at the same time, giving these “scientists” an “insurance policy” against any true scientific critique (Hyman Aspen 155-157, 215). It is so-called new theories in physics and findings in biology that are used to justify the new pantheistic worldview of General Systems Theory--the philosophy of Total Quality Management.

The influence the Institute and its cadres has had on America is unbelievable. For example, in order to “extend” its “humanistic studies,” the Institute targeted Hollywood. The goal was for the Institute to become the “meeting ground on which the fragmented and competitive parts of Hollywood and its environs in the industry might compare values, exchange ideas, and ultimately improve their work” because at that time, typical movies still projected the “dreams of an industrial society by industrial means” (traditional American beliefs and values) and in the Institute’s view, this needed to be “seriously challenged.” The first Annual Aspen Film Conference was organized in 1963. The idea was to provide a “**common meeting ground**” for the industry and “the ideas and criticisms of interested outsiders” in order for “the movie industry to subject itself to **searching self-examination**.” The keynote speaker, Lionel Trilling, spoke of the day “when films would be made that would have validities and powers equivalent to those to which we respond in...fictional narrative and stage drama,” i.e. emotionally. He noted that “new and intense efforts” were being made to “overcome the financial controls which have limited the artists of film in their *right to say what they think ought to be said, to show what they think ought to be shown*” and furthermore, the “cultural circumstances which kept the film in economic chains--namely, the efforts by financial interests to *satisfy the tastes and preferences of large egalitarian populations--were undergoing a change*.” Trilling’s remarks were initially met with “naked animosity,” but by “earnestly discussing” Trilling’s “thesis,” the industry’s “attitudes began to change” (Hyman Aspen 163-165).

Later, “young film makers” were targeted to add to the mix. Typically, the “matters discussed at the Aspen Film Conferences later became the themes for debates carried on elsewhere in private forums or through the public media.” In addition, the papers/material prepared for the conferences “was soon put to use as teaching aids in colleges” (166). Still later, the film “with its rapidly advancing technology as in television” became the “subject of sustained inquires by the Aspen Institute’s major program on Communication and Society” (167).

The Institute targeted business schools. The Institute co-sponsored, with the Committee on Educational Development’s Subcommittee on Education, a special conference on “economic education” for three successive years. The conferences began with criticism of the existing economic education provided by the nation’s business schools which “lagged far behind the pace of changes both in the business world and in the subject of economics itself” (167). Aspen’s economics education

saw man as not only governed by his own economic interests but by his “convictions, his nostalgia, his will, and his passions.” Furthermore, his “interests” aren’t confined to profits but include the “desire for a sense of personal worth, for attention, for variety, for leisure, for independence, for security, for friendship, for social utility, for knowledge.” In fact, the “concept of interest” is not confined to the bounds of a single person but moves outward until its “underlying social philosophy must take into account not only the facts of utility but those of **justice**.” The “careful economic theorist,” therefore, is aware that “marketplace competition, in the psychological meaning, is a noneconomic interest,” that “applied economics in business life” must take account of “errors and motives such as prejudice, curiosity, and the various forms of human interplay which do not conform to the pattern of economic rationality” and that the “essential factor of *wants*--their propriety and how they *are met through a system of **distributive justice***--cannot be assessed with the tools of economic analysis alone. They can be *assessed* only with the help of other disciplines such as *philosophy, history, political science, ethics, sociology, psychology, cultural anthropology, and statistics*” (168).

Moreover, the old school curriculum seldom reflected advances made in economics through the “perfection of mathematical tools,” or the developments in “new fields which could be applied to the problems of **organized economic complexity**.” Students in the old schools continued to be taught economics in “ways which left them ill prepared to cope with the realities of an American business world that was being swept by winds of *swift social, political, cultural, and technological change*.” Aspen cohort, **Daniel Bell**, “with his great gift for illumination” saw that the salient features of this rapidly changing world “*pointed to the coming of ‘the post-industrial society.’*” In fact, this thesis of Bell’s was put into practice by way of the dialectical process.

One of its features--the economic sector--showed a change from a goods-producing to a service economy [how better to cripple America?]. The second--occupational distribution--showed a growing preeminence of the professional and technical class [according to Tavistock’s John Sutherland, professional refers to social scientists and technical individuals (change agents) who put social scientist’s theories into practice.]

The third--the axis on which social wheels go round- showed the growing **centrality of theoretical knowledge** as the source of innovation and of policy formulation for society (putting theory/plans into practice.

The fourth--future orientation or forecasting --showed an increasing dependence on the control of technology and on technological assessment. The fifth feature which absorbed all the others--**decision-making**--showed the creation of a new **intellectual technology** (ability to implement and facilitate the dialectical process) as a method for identifying and executing

strategies for rational (predetermined and limited) choice among variables.
(169)

Bell's thesis had "obvious implications for the academic training of future businessmen" and "as his thesis became known," the Institute and CED brought together the

deans of twenty-five leading schools of business in America, along with representatives of industry, the **foundations**, and the business press. Nothing like the encounter had ever occurred before in the history of American business and education... Was it possible to **reconstruct the curriculum** of business schools so that their graduates would be armed with the tools of perception, research, analysis, and decision equal to the demands of a social, political, cultural, and economic **world in flux**? (169-170)

For some of the business schools, the Aspen conference merely "reinforced a move that was already under way to "bend" their business curriculum "more on the side of **theory**," [resulting in business graduates putting Aspen's theories into practice.] In other cases, individuals who had been brought up on the old education and "ascribed to it the success they had attained in the business world" were barriers to this change. However,

a vocal segment of American youth would soon make the whole structure and ethos of the American business community and the business schools with it--the object of polemical attacks. At the same time **the 'post-industrial revolution'... continued to unfold in ways which increasingly cast into bold relief the decisive role of 'intellectual technology' in social change, not only in the United States but around the world, not only with respect to the conduct of business but in all other realms of human activity.** (170)

After Joseph E. Slater became the president of the Aspen Institute, the Institute would respond to the challenge of [implementing]the 'post-industrial revolution' in many ways. For example, it would join with the International Congress for Cultural Freedom in sponsoring in Aspen an international conference on 'The Role of the Intellectual.' It would mount a series of special conferences on 'The Educated Person.' It would bring the challenge to the center of some of its '**thought leading to action**' programs and especially to its program on Science, Technology, and Humanism. (170)

In 1963, Alvin C. Eurich, who heretofore had been a member of the Institute's board of advisors, and "an unfailing source of constructive, far-seeing counsel," replaced Anderson as president, with Anderson becoming chairman of the board of trustees. Eurich had been "successively the executive vice-president

of Stanford University, the acting president of Stanford, chairman of the *Stanford Research Institute*, and the first president of the State University of New York.” He then became “vice-president and director of the Fund for the Advancement of Education, and from 1958 to 1963 served as the executive director of the Ford Foundation’s Educational Program.” In addition, he was also a “member of the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, of President Truman’s Commission on Higher Education, of President Kennedy’s Task Force on Education,” and a “consultant” to the public affairs program of NASA, the Surgeon General, and the Peace Corps. He was also on the board of directors of Prentice-Hall Publishing (173). The Aspen Institute, suggests Hyman, perhaps appealed to Eurich as “an instrument more readily adaptable to innovative experiments in **adult education--with an international dimension to it**” (174). While at Aspen, Eurich also created the Academy for Educational Development in New York City (216). If you recall, so-called “adult education” was the baby of Kurt Lewin and the National Training Laboratories and was based on the principles of brainwashing. Later, its “theoretical principles” were applied to TQM with Deming’s blessings (Scholtes Forward).

Beginning in the early sixties, the Institute began increasing their special conferences and in 1965 decided to “classify groups of particular problems” under a “common name.” In turn, conferences, seminars and workshops on each group of problems would be held on a continuous basis extending for several years. Between meetings, “research and exploration” would be done and a “nucleus of continuing participants” would “convey to others what had been learned or *clarified* in earlier sessions. The new round of *inquiry* could then start at a higher rung of *perception*. Beyond that fact, all the participants--whether they later framed legislative proposals, testified before Congressional committees, wrote books, made broadcasts, issued reports, served on advisory committees, or engaged in other activities--*would be armed to bridge the gap between thought and action*” (212).

Also in 1965, John G. Powers, a trustee of the Institute and former president of Prentice-Hall where Eurich was a fellow board member, wanted to “introduce American businessmen to Far Eastern culture.” Supported by Eurich and aided by Phillips Talbot, Powers organized a seminar in which business executives were “introduced to aspects of Oriental culture,” as expressed in “philosophy” and “religion,” among other things. In a public statement, Eurich said that the seminar was a “natural outgrowth of the Institute’s **organic humanistic concerns**.” He explained that if man is to understand the direction in which he is drifting and

conceive clearer goals for himself, he cannot remain confined by the blindness of Western thinking. No one nation, no one culture, no one language, no one civilization can claim any longer to possess universal truth...

There must be a meeting and a marriage of the major cultures of the world, a fruitful interaction in which the best of each nation's insights and values can be available to all men. (211)

The Executive Seminars on Far Eastern Thought were repeated for several years on an experimental basis (211). Then a two year absence ensued, but thereafter, Far Eastern thought would become "institutionalized" in the Executive Seminars (263). And in 1966, the Institute added a Scholars-in-Residence program for "scholars in the humanities and social sciences" (216).

In 1967, William E. Stevenson, who had since 1952 filled many different roles at the Institute including moderator and trustee, took over the presidency. He had graduated at Princeton (law), went to Oxford as a Rhodes Scholar and "secured his legal training at *Inner Temple, London*." In 1946, he gave up his law practice to become president of **Oberlin College** where he stayed for the next 14 years. Hutchins, who had been an undergraduate at Oberlin prior to WWI, was one of Stevenson's "circle of friends, and in fact, he saw in Hutchins "the greatest figure in the twentieth-century history of American education" (111-113). As a note of interest, it was the political science department at **Oberlin College** where **Hungarian Oscar Jaszi** found a home after his emigration to America in 1923. In fact, Jaszi, along with Karl Geiser, another Hungarian émigré, constituted this entire department. Jaszi became "closely involved" with **Charles Merriam** for the first decade, on whom he depended for "aid in publication as well as financial support, while Merriam employed him in his comparative civic education project." In Hungary, Jaszi had founded and led in 1900 the "'radical' Society for Social Sciences--an association patterned after the **Fabians** and devoted to social and political reform." Later, he and **Georg Lukacs** was associated with the "Free School for the Social Sciences" which "was dedicated to educating the working class" and using "positivist social science as a critical instrument of political liberalization." Rather than "revolutionary Marxism," they advocated "parliamentary politics, education, and state planning," that is, transformational Marxism/Critical Theory (Gunnell 102-104).

Stevenson had taken the presidency only as a temporary measure and in 1969, Joseph E. Slater replaced Stevenson. He and Anderson immediately began their "collaboration" in "refounding" the Institute (Hyman Aspen 230). The "central purpose" of Slater's life had been "to create a network of institutions and people who can generate and transmit tremors that will ultimately '**change things in an orderly way**'" (229). A mere glance of his accomplishments will testify to that fact.

Slater was an instructor in economics at Berkeley when Pearl Harbor was bombed. He joined the Navy, was commissioned ensign and after cutting through "walls of living red tape," landed in a London office. Here he worked on "plans for post-war Europe" then joined Robert Murphy's staff in Versailles. At

Versailles, where everyone else was an “amateur,” Slater was one of those Hegelians who “could imprint their thoughts on the shape of the plan.” He helped “design the *structure* for the Disarmament and Armed Forces Secretariat of the Allied Control Authority” (230). Later in Germany, he “participated in the ‘sealing’ of all the German ministries” and helped supervise the “dismantling of the German Army” (Slater was only in his early twenties at this time) (230-231).

Between 1945 and 1948, Slater “helped plan and establish the Economic and Financial Directorates of the Four Power Allied Control Authority in Berlin, and the Bi-Zonal Economic Council for Germany.” The “quality” of his “staff work” was noticed by *General William H. Draper* (who was a “master of the craft”) (241), so Draper made Slater an executive aide and U. S. secretary to the Economic Directorate. Slater “found in Draper one of his mentors in the immediate postwar years and one of his collaborators in later ventures” (231).

Slater spent 1948 and 1949 in Washington where he helped create the “United Nations Affairs Division of the U. S. Department of State’s Political and Security Planning Staff.” In 1949, individuals “who knew of his work in Berlin” were “instrumental in bringing him to Bonn when **John J. McCloy*** was appointed

* **John J. McCloy** was a former student of **Felix Frankfurter** and one of his point men and “trouble-shooter in the war Department” (Murphy 10).

McCloy was the president of the **World Bank** from 1947 to 1949 as well as Chairman of the Board of the Chase Manhattan Bank in 1960. He was the United States Military Governor and later High Commissioner for Germany from 1949 to 1952. In 1950, Dwight Eisenhower founded The American Assembly, a so-called non-partisan educational institution that facilitated “wide consideration of public issues,” at Columbia University where he was president and where the Frankfurt School had reorganized. After becoming President of the United States, Eisenhower appointed a “Commission on National Goals” to “set up a series of goals in various areas of national activity” and to develop an outline of “coordinated national policies and programs” apparently in pursuit of those goals. Eisenhower requested that the Commission be administered by The American Assembly. Private financing and fiscal management of the Commission were provided by the Assembly with funding from the “Carnegie Corporation,” the “**Ford** Foundation,” the “Rockefeller Foundation,” the “Alfred P. Sloan Foundation,” “U. S. Steel Foundation,” among others. The members of the Commission included former and then current University presidents, corporate heads, the president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce, the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe from 1953 until 1956, George Meany of the AFL-CIO, James R. Killian, Jr. of MIT who was Special Assistant to the President from 1957-1959, Judge Learned Hand, James B. Conant, president of Harvard from 1933-1953, then ambassador to Germany from 1955-1957. The Commission in turn chose 14 other individuals to come up with recommendations for the Commission’s consideration. **John J. McCloy** was chosen to come up with the “Foreign Economic Policy and Objectives.” (Those whom McCloy chose in turn to help him included then president of the **Committee for Economic Development**, the director of Standard Oil who was a former U. S. executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development). The Report of the Commission and its recommendations weren’t expected to “command unanimous acceptance, but rather, to “evoke active discussion” which they deemed the “path to a national **consensus**” under the so-called “democratic **process**” (Goals for Americans Preface, xi, xii, 330).

Louis Sohn, a Polish emigre and author of “World Peace Through World Law,” was a law professor and lecturer on “world organization” at Harvard. He was a “consultant and legal advisor to agencies of the United Nations,” and “a member of a committee of scientists and political scientists”

U. S. High Commissioner for Germany.” McCloy was another “master of the craft” (241), that is, a facilitator/implementor of the dialectical process/Marxist *Praxis*. On behalf of McCloy, Slater wrote the U. S. “position paper” regarding the “*structure of Allied Control*.” He also “organized the office of the Secretary General of the Allied High Commission, and served as the secretary general in it--meaning that he dealt with *all aspects* of German life, not merely those of an economic and financial nature” (Hyman Aspen 232).

In 1952, Slater went to Paris and helped organize and launch the “Office of the Executive Secretary of the U. S. Representatives in Europe,” of which he also served as secretary general, with Draper in “over-all charge.” This institution consisted of the “U. S. Departments of State, Defense, and Treasury to NATO and to the Organization of *European Economic Co-operation*” and because Draper was in “over-all charge, it was not only the largest United States office overseas, but the only operation where the total United States mission was developed into a single, unified organization and *not into a series of separate units reflecting organizational positions of each constituent governmental department*” (Hyman Aspen 232). Slater formed a number of “friendships” during these years and those friends “would eventually emerge as leaders of the first rank in their respective countries; some he would later bring under the roof of the scientific and cultural institutions he would help establish, and some he would draw into the Aspen Institute as members of the board of trustees” (232-233).

In 1953, Slater became the chief economist for the Creole Petroleum Company (mother company was Standard Oil of New Jersey) in Venezuela. Here he organized and launched the Creole Foundation with grants of over \$3 million per year. Slater formulated a “long-range plan of action” and concentrated these funds on a “select number of programs, embracing well-defined sets of *interacting trans-societal* problems.” This work would provide the “governing precedent” for his later work (234).

In 1957, “McCloy became the president of the **Ford Foundation** and sought Slater out to determine if he was interested in resuming their old association in a new context.” Indeed he did. Slater resigned from Creole and “joined the Ford Foundation in New York as the deputy director of its program in

advising John McCloy when McCloy later became President Kennedy’s co-coordinator of United States disarmament activities (Fermi 130-131).

After World War II Frankfurt officials sought to “entice” the Institute for Social Research/Frankfurt School back to its home in Germany. With the “encouragement” of “American occupation officials” including “High Commissioner John J. McCloy,” the “city [Frankfurt, Germany] was able to make an offer that [Max] Horkheimer found impossible to reject.” Moreover, McCloy “sponsored” special legislation “signed into law” by then President Truman that granted Horkheimer a “continuation of his American citizenship despite his return” to Germany. In addition, “McCloy Funds” supplied half the necessary total for the re-establishment” of the Institute to its place of origin (Jay, 282-285).

international affairs” (234). Philip Coombs, Shepard Stone and Walseman Neilson were already at Ford when Slater arrived. Coombs was “active in the field of international education” and would later become the Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs in the early Kennedy Administration and Slater would serve as his Deputy (235). In 1963, UNESCO--which had been co-founded by Aspen’s William Benton--would establish the International Institute for Educational Planning (IIEP) in Paris for “study, research and training.” This would be a part of UNESCO’s plan to provide “direct assistance” to “Member states” in the “planning of educational development,” that is “economic and **social development**” of the masses worldwide. The “Director” of IIEP was Philip Coombs and it “was created with the initial assistance of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the Ford Foundation,” while the government of France “provided its headquarters” (Educational Planning in the USSR, UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, Foreword).

The IIEP study and research program started early in 1964 and “from the outset,” it was decided that what was needed, and in fact a “necessity,” was to examine and make “known the wealth of definite experience already acquired” by countries that were the “first to undertake the establishment of plans for the development of their educational systems and especially those in which that effort was a part of their general economic and social planning” which was “especially the case with the Soviet Union.” Hence, “during meetings in Moscow” between Philip Coombs and an IIEP staff member with the “leading authorities of the [Soviet] State Committee for Cultural Relations and the National Commission of the USSR for UNESCO,” it was decided that IIEP would organize an “international study mission.” Thus, an IIEP “mission of international experts” prepared a “case study” which was “devoted to the Soviet experience in planning its educational system” (Forward). The case study was published in 1968 and entitled Educational Planning in the USSR. It is basically a blueprint of today’s restructuring efforts in American schools!

Shepard Stone, who was Slater’s immediate supervisor at Ford, would subsequently become the president of the Association For Cultural Freedom and in 1973 he would join Aspen’s board of trustees where he would help organize **Aspen Institute Berlin**, the European affiliate of its parent in the U. S. Stone would also serve as its first director. On a “purely personal basis,” Neilson would later “undertake special task for Slater, would keep him abreast of developments in the world arena--including those *rooted* in the proliferation of *multinational corporations*---and would eventually help formulate the terms for an Aspen program in *international affairs*. In addition, he would provide Slater with fresh insights on the internal changes within the ‘nonprofit world’ and how these were bound to affect the *interplay between that world and the world of government*.” (Hyman Aspen 235).

In 1959, Slater took a leave of absence from Ford to serve as secretary of President Eisenhower's Commission on Foreign Assistance--a commission to reappraise all aspects of the U. S. foreign aid program (235-236). [Note how these individuals move back and forth from government to foundations and later, to corporations.] This Commission was known as the Draper Committee, after its chairman William Draper, an old comrade of Slater's. McCloy also served on this committee. Here Slater meet Amos Jordon, a brigadier general who would become "the chairman of the Political Science Department at West Point as well as serve as the executive officer of Aspen from 1972-1974. In connection with Slater's work on the Commission, he served as the deputy manager, under Douglas Dillion, of the Development Loan Fund, then the major arm of the U. S. foreign assistance program (236).

Upon completion of the Commission's work, Slater returned to Ford and in 1960 took another leave of absence to serve as deputy to Philip Coombs, who had been appointed Assistant Secretary of State for Education and Cultural Affairs in the State Department. Here, Slater "soon swept through the place with the energy of a Kansas twister." He created eleven "Standing Working Groups" that covered "all conceivable aspects of education and cultural exchanges--*plus a few that were inconceivable.*" When he had reached the "limits" of what he could get by with in the State Department, he returned to Ford (236-237).

Long-range planning, begun in World War II, was the key for Slater and company's eventual take-over of America. Not unlike all Marxists geared for the eventual take-over of a country, every move this group made from the time it opened its doors (and even that was part of their plans) had a distant goal in mind. Seemingly disconnected programs and policies advocated by Aspen were simply laying the groundwork for their planned future objectives. Consequently, back at Ford, Slater "drew on what he had already formulated for the Creole Foundation, for the Draper Committee, for the Development Loan Fund, and for the Educational and Cultural Division of the State Department" and drew up a "ten-year-plan of action" concerning the "policies and programs the foundation was to pursue in the decade 1962-72." He then was made the director of Ford's *International Affairs Program*. Taking this new assignment "together with his previous work in 1957-59" under Shepard Stone, Slater

played a major role in establishing such institutions as the following: Institute for Strategic Studies (London); the Overseas Development Institute (London); the International Program of the CED; the Latin American Affairs Program of the Royal Institute of International Affairs (universities in Europe and Japan); the International Comparative Music Institute (Berlin); the **United Nations Institute for Training** and Research; the China and Atlantic Programs of the **Council on Foreign Relations**; the Italian **Council on Foreign Relations**; the Southeast Asian Training and

Research Center at Kyoto University; the China Institutes of the Universities of Leeds, Hamburg, Munich, and Berlin; the Korea Center for Asian and International Studies; and the School of Oriental and African Studies at the Royal Institute of International Affairs. (237-238)

In taking on the presidency of Aspen in '69, Slater had already been at the Institute since 1967 as a scholar-in-residence. While at Ford, Slater had been thinking about creating an institution “as an extension of his three-way interests in international communications, foreign affairs, and educational exchanges” but he needed a place away from his New York office where he could draw up a “document which would clearly state the nature, *structure*, and purpose of the new institution he had in mind.” He discussed this with Eurich, then president of Aspen whom Slater had known since Eurich’s days at the Ford Foundation, and Eurich invited him to Aspen “as a scholar-in-residence to work on his project” (238). This institution materialized as the *International Broadcast Institute* based jointly in Rome and London (239).

While a scholar-in-residence, Slater gave a lecture entitled “Biology and Humanism.” Anyone familiar with General Systems Theory will catch the drift. The two points of this lecture “central to all others” was that the world was “caught up in a *biological* revolution as great as any in *physics*, and the revolution involved ‘men, not things.’” Therefore, it was imperative “to force the nature of that revolution into the light” and weigh its “profound implications for man and society.” The second point was that the “best way to open lines of communication between the United States and Communist China” was “by joint bio-medical efforts, since *human needs transcended differences in political, economic, social, and cultural ideologies*.” At dinner after the lecture, Jerome Hardy, publisher of *Life* magazine and a trustee of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies, offered Slater the presidency of Salk because it “was at odds with itself, and lacked leadership.” Slater initially refused but a few months later after he had launched the Broadcast Institute (January of 1968), he accepted and took over as both chairman and president of Salk “while continuing his working relationship with the Ford Foundation” (239-240). He immediately recruited McCloy to fill the role of chairman, as well as other “friends from the past” to serve on the board of trustees. This included Sir Allan Bullock, vice-chancellor of Oxford University and both a Fellow and trustee at Aspen, whom Slater had known since his Berlin days (240).

Slater proceeded to formulate an “eight year program of action, two under the ten-year plan he had previously formulated for the Ford Foundation.” In February, he brought in John Hunt as executive vice-president for operations. Hunt had graduated from Harvard, done his post-graduate studies at both *Sorbonne and the University of Iowa*, and been on the faculty of an “experimental preparatory school” for 5 years before beginning a “new career” in the “complex world of

international organizations, with their cadres of temperamental *soloists*.” His “initial entry point was as the assistant to the executive director of the Paris-based *Congress for Cultural Freedom*.” Later known as the *International Association for Cultural Freedom*, this group included “writers, scholars, scientists and public figures from various parts of the world” and its “many-sided *programs are carried out by affiliated groups throughout the world*.” Hunt had moved up to the post of director in 1958, with Shepard Stone as president, and remained so until 1967 (241).

At Salk, Hunt’s “insights into human character and motivation” enabled him to “decode” what Slater said he wanted done. In order to provide Salk with an “instrument for systematic inquiry” into the “social and human implications” of scientific advances in *molecular biology*, Slater, with Hunt’s executive support, created the *Council on Biology in Human Affairs*. Later, to enlarge the “frame of inquiry,” Slater created the Stockholm-based *International Federation of Institutes for Advanced Studies*—“a web of organizations whose *multidisciplinary* interests provided the infra-structure for a ‘free floating university.’” At the same time, Slater linked “neurological studies under way” at Aspen with the “early learning processes” in children (of which he had a long-standing interest) because he determined that “if pre-school learning for children was soundly conceived from a *biological* and *psychological* standpoint, the effect would be to reduce the scale of later needs to subject the children to ‘remedial learning’” (242).

Slater later resigned the presidency of Salk “but retained a link with it as a trustee and Special Fellow.” (Salk and its credibility would later be used by Slater, among other ways, when he targeted the U. S. Senate and House of Representatives in the process of weaving the affairs of Aspen into a “single humanistic whole” (385, 345). Hunt resigned as well and later accepted a position with the oldest foundation in France, the Royaumont Institute. The

primary mission of Royaumont was to encourage progressive movements in the human sciences, but the directors had come to be dissatisfied with the way the mission was being executed. They asked Hunt to assume responsibility for managing the international program of the institute. And so he did. In co-operation with friends from the Salk Institute, he organized and then became the executive vice-president of the **Royaumont Center for the Science of Man**. The center...was dedicated to... **bringing the life sciences such as the new biology into a working relationship with human sciences such as anthropology and psychology...** (246) [emphasis added]

Hunt eventually would be “brought into the family of the Aspen Institute” starting in 1973 and “full time” by 1974 (247).

Immediately after Slater became president of Aspen, a celebration was held to celebrate the twentieth anniversary of its founding. Robert Hutchins was the

featured guest and recipient of a \$10,000 Aspen Award in the Humanities (through a bequest from Anderson) (249). In his speech, “which ran parallel with the views of Anderson and Slater” (251), Hutchins noted that the “*post-industrial society he envisioned* could be ‘one in which men set seriously to work to straighten out their relations with one another and in which they sought, not material goods, but moral, intellectual, or what might be called cultural goods.’ Such a society could be a **learning society**...In such a society the role of educational institutions would be ‘to provide what is notably missing from them today, and that is the **interaction of minds**.” Hutchins complained that universities had no “unifying principle, were “not independent,” nor engaged in “*thought and criticism*,” but rather were a mere reflection of their traditional communities. These universities needed to become “centers of independent **thought and criticism**.” Explained Hutchins:

It seems fairly clear that the transition from an industrial to a post-industrial age will involve severe dislocation...The way to fortify ourselves is, therefore, to establish wherever we can colleges of liberal arts and those centers of independent thought and **criticism** for which I would prefer to reserve the name of university. If [these] can become incandescent, if they can be points of light, then culture and civilization can be preserved and expanded as they have been by small groups during dark days of the past. (250-251)

After Slater assumed the presidency of Aspen, at the “center of everything that was to follow in the history of the Aspen Institute was the relationship between Anderson and Slater.” This relationship consisted in the ability of both men to use money and power to carry out their personal agendas. Both men were well experienced in using “oil” money [Anderson used his own and Slater used someone else’s as well as “governmental resources and private philanthropy”] and the accompanying power that money brings. This is only an example of how communism, whether revolutionary or transformational, is financed by wealthy so-called capitalists. Furthermore

both men shared a keen interest in communication and education. Slater, for example, had tried to bring the communications community and the educational community together in order to promote “early learning.” He had initiated the creation of many overseas educational institutions and had brought into being the International Broadcast Institute. He was concerned with the whole field of public broadcasting, and had worked on a Ford Foundation* project in 1962 which contemplated the creation of a “fourth

* Sociologist Paul Lazarsfeld, who came to America in 1933 from Austria “under Rockefeller auspices,” headed the “Rockefeller-sponsored Princeton Radio Project” which was “devoted to the study of the effects of radio on American society.” They already had extensive know-how from propaganda use in Germany, what they wanted was complete control and application. (Gunnell 183-184)

network” to **demonstrate over a period of time what sustained quality broadcasting [propaganda for conditioning the masses] could achieve.** Anderson was equally interested in all such matters, being, among other things, a director of the Columbia Broadcasting Company. Finally, Slater had been daily at grips with issues of science, technology, humanism and economics--in all the posts he had held since the end of World War II. Many of the same issues had been of vital concern to Anderson in his capacity as president of the Lovelace Clinic and as a trustee of the California Institute (of Technology). (247)

MARXIST PRAXIS

(putting theory/thought/ideas into practice/applied)

One...advantage of the Marxist approach to history...is its fusion of theory and practice, contemplation and intervention, observation and interposition. This is perhaps the proudest boast of Marxism in general...Marxism is intended to provide more than an understanding of history. It is intended to serve as a guide for making history.

...The unity of theory and practice--of knowledge and action... recognizes that thought and action are inseparably bonded in the experience of life itself...

...Of course, such a unification also imports enormous perils into the making of history, perils monstrously evident in the way “Marxist” theory has been used to justify cruel and inhumane actions...Yet the idea of a unity of theory and practice is a laudable one, however much that idea may have been abused in actuality... (Heilbroner 80-81)

As one of his first moves as president of Aspen, Slater drew up a **Five-year Action Program** (1969-74) for the Institute that would carry forward the planned “**thought leading to action**” programs which “were to receive financial support from Anderson personally” (Hyman Aspen 251). In December of 1969, the plan was unanimously approved by the Institute’s board of trustees (253). The “**Action program** clearly indicated that the Institute meant to focus on explosive issues of **social change.**” In addition, it “consisted of a long list of *needs and developments*” that affected the “human condition,” and an inventory of subjects for Aspen seminars which were “trans-national and trans-societal in nature, and which also had profound humanistic implications.” Therefore, a statement on “public posture” was included in the Action Program:

The Aspen Institute must not allow the potential reaction of the **general public** or of any vocal segment of broad or local interest **to be**

of cardinal influence in the carrying out of its programs. At the same time, it cannot discharge its proper role upon the basis of criteria that informed members of the public do not readily understand.

The Institute should pursue such a course that its broad objectives and operations will be generally comprehended and supported so that elements of its program will be largely accepted even when they are not universally approved. The Institute must retain its non-partisan character nationally and internationally. It should rely on the **quality** of its activities [praxis/dialectic in action] and its **expanding convinced alumni for the support and understanding which it requires**. (254)

A combination of the “changes and needs” would hereafter be the focus of Aspen. The Institute

must reaffirm its commitment to humanistic studies, to the body of knowledge which included history, literature, the arts, *religion*, and philosophy; *to the social and cultural applications of science*; to the individual in *relationship* to himself, to his fellow man, and to his environment (collective/ group); **to the endless pursuit of freedom from outmoded dogma (Christian beliefs and values), freedom to go beyond convention, freedom of the imagination and the will, freedom from...materialism, ‘freedom also to be in conflict with oneself’**“ (254-255).

In other words, the dialectic process in action will be applied to the group to destroy the existing faith and beliefs of individuals by way of cognitive dissonance/inner conflict. Furthermore, this same “commitment” requires that the Institute “light up the means by which individuals and groups could discharge their personal responsibilities in the common tasks of improving the **quality** of human life...”

The “**humanities**,” explained Slater in the **Action Program**, “must seek a more vigorous role” in forming the “*social, moral, and aesthetic values* of our culture.” This would “require closer mutual understanding and cooperation between those concerned with the humanities, our social and political leaders, and...**men of science to examine how these forces can work together** to help resolve human dilemmas and the...urgent problems facing mankind,” or in other words, how to gather leaders into groups so that they can be facilitated into a predetermined agenda. “On these accounts,” the Action Program stressed that the “continuing involvement of ‘men of affairs’ in the Executive Seminars would ‘remain the central activity of the Institute’ and would have the first claim on its attention.” Moreover, since the “*perceptive industrial and business leaders*” wanted to “*play a large and direct role*” in the *solutions* to social problems, the Executive Seminars “would help them understand the fundamental issues involved

in the **work of social change**” (255). In addition, the Action Program emphasized the need to reinstate (it had been suspended for two years) the Far Eastern Seminar and “its future activities should be planned and assisted by a panel of the nation’s most knowledgeable experts on Asian thoughts.” Also the Japan Seminar was to become a regular part of the Institute’s program and the “works by Chinese, Indian, and Japanese authors should be included in the readings of the regular or core Executive Seminar” (256). And since the “activities” of the Institute’s Center for Theoretical Physics had proven that “summer study groups for periods of three weeks to three months could be both effective and comparatively inexpensive,” the same

arrangement should be adapted to the work of the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies. It should form summer study groups--whether ad hoc or for a series type of conference--that would examine critical problems of humanistic concern whose solutions required collaboration between representatives of business, government, civil, and academic life. In matters bearing on the **relationship between science and society**, such study groups could be co-ordinated with or cosponsored by...the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Science, the National Academy of Engineering, the Aspen Center for Physics, or the Salk Institute’s Council on Biology in Human Affairs. The Institute should also...host an annual meeting of the leading communicators in the country (read: Aspen Alumni)--particularly from radio and television--in order to evaluate the media and develop both general and specific recommendations for the improvement of program quality (conditioning of the masses) in broadcasting. (256-257)

The “**thought leading to action**” programs embedded in the **Action program** were: (1) **Communications and Society**; (2) **Environment and the Quality of Life**; (3) **Education for a Changing Society**; (4) **Science, Technology, and Humanism**; (5) **Justice, Society and the Individual**; and (6) **International Affairs** [Later, Pluralism and the Commonweal was added]. It was determined that in the future, the Institute should confine itself to these activities “rather than compile a paper record of business on many fronts solely for ‘public relations’ purposes” (257). It was agreed that Slater would make the foundations “collaborators in formulating and executing particular projects. He would also promote various forms of collaboration with other institutions in the United States and overseas.” In this way, “co-operating institutions could maximize...their resources by avoiding duplication of efforts and by bringing their own ideas to bear on the design of a *common task*--although they might subsequently concentrate on a particular aspect of that design” (258). Some of the “efforts envisioned in the Five-Year Action Program materialized ahead of schedule, some on schedule, and some are now (1975) moving from a state of ‘becoming’ to a state of ‘being,’” boasts Hyman.

Communications and Society

Robert Anderson, as director of the Columbia Broadcasting System (CBS), arranged for the annual CBS conferences to be held at the Institute. This allowed a “change of name as well as *venue*” and in May of 1970 the annual “Aspen Broadcasters’ Conference came into being.” At the Institute, all “elements of the broadcasting industry (the “heads of commercial networks, producers, directors, writers, advertisers, as well as people involved in public broadcasting”) could be periodically brought into *intense face-to-face encounters with leaders of **thought and action** outside the broadcasting industry.*” In this new arrangement, Aspen determines the “theme” of the conferences, (for example, “American Self-Renewal in an Interdependent World,” “Values and Scarcity”) and “provides the participants from outside the industry.”

...Speakers and other participants provided by the Aspen Institute present or dispute the facts germane to a theme, define the questions posed by the facts, and present or challenge alternative lines of public policy bearing on the social realities under consideration. But it is for the industry to decide how it will deal with the questions of choice that come to the front...The Aspen Institute, on its part, takes seriously its self-assumed responsibility for regularly exposing the leaders of the industry to...diverse sources of informed opinion about public-policy issues that do in fact call for acts of choice. (265-266)

This was only the beginning of what was to come. It was determined that “**communications**” represented an “enterprise even more fundamental than formal education” to an “**open society**” (302). As far back as 1931, Hutchins “saw in the news media of radio broadcasting and talking motion pictures *instruments for mass education*, not just for mass entertainment” (18). The goal of Aspen was to gain control of public communications in order to use it as a “humanistic force” (322) to do everything from change the attitudes and behavior of the masses and rewrite history to determining what “news” would be presented, and thus, what news would not be presented. The *Communications and Society Program* was headed by Douglass Cater, an old friend of Aspen’s who had participated in the Institute’s “1966 conference on education,” had been a “participant in the Executive Seminars,” and more recently a “scholar-in-residence” (280). He had been a “special assistant” to President Lyndon Johnson and as such, had “concentrated on the President’s programs in the fields of *education and health*; not the least of the things he did was to shepherd through the Congress the act which created the *Public Broadcasting Corporation*” (281). Cater was also the author of The Fourth Branch of Government, in which he had

observed how the image of government, projected by the media, was being accepted as reality, not only by the lay public but by those involved in government itself. He further observed that the vast power communications media have to *shape* government policies and leaders...was the power **to select which of the words spoken and which of the events that occurred in Washington during the day were to be projected for mankind to see. It was also the power to ignore--and words and events which failed to get projected might as well not have occurred** (280-281). [Emphasis added]

An “intimate collaborator” of Cater’s was Professor Ithiel de Sola Pool of the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)** (333). Pool, an “Aspen Communications Fellow” and “regular participant” in the program (300) was a “specialist in communications and public opinion” (287).

Individuals chosen for Cater’s “advisory council” were those who “could be counted on to bring many perspectives to bear on policy issues in communications.” These individuals included Slater and Edward Barrett (former dean of the School of Journalism at Columbia University) and Sig Mickelson (former president of CBS News), both “part of his [Slater’s] network of friends,” as well as comrades Elie Abel (the existing dean of the School of Journalism at Columbia University), Louis Cowan (professor, Columbia Graduate School of Journalism, president of the *Broadcast Institute of North America*, and former president of the CBS Television Network), Peter Goldmark (former president of CBS Laboratories and current president of Goldmark Communications), the already mentioned propaganda specialist Ithiel de Sola Pool of **MIT**, James Killian (a director of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, former chairman of the *Carnegie Commission on Educational Television*, and the former **president of MIT**), Harry Ashmore (president of the *Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions*), Charles Benton (president of Films, Inc.), Kermit Gordon (president of the Brookings Institution), and De Vier Pierson (a Washington attorney who had served in the White House under Johnson) (280, 286).

The Aspen program on Communication and Society “directly contributed to the formulation of public policies in ways which take into account the *humanistic and social components* of communications questions” (301-302). Aspen would target public television as well as pay cable (323-328); team up with the (then) new **MIT Communications Policy Research Program**; and create a “continuing seminar in Washington” to that end (333-334). By the mid-seventies, the program had “drawn into its orbit over *five hundred leaders* in the communications field and thus expanded the community of those vitally concerned with *humanistic and social claims on communications*” (300). In addition, the creation of the Aspen Community Fellows program brought in “regular

participants” such as Bill Moyers, William Harris of **MIT**, William Rivers of Stanford, Daniel Schorr, Henry Geller (former General Counsel for the FCC), and representatives from the Chicago Sun-Times and Washington Post. Individuals from the likes of Fortune Magazine, The Public Interest, Ohio University, Princeton, and the University of Colorado “actively contributed to the work of the program” as well (300-301). The “social or humanistic demands on communications technology were never far removed from the thoughts of Douglass Cater” (335). Therefore, the Program’s activities “have been heavily directed to social invention” (338).

Environment and the Quality of Life

Under this program, an environmental “crisis” was created out of thin air to be used as the future “organizing force” for the planned New World Order. In “preparing the ground” for this “crisis,” a “series of summer institutes” on the environment was held at Aspen (starting in June, 1962), co-sponsored by the National Science Foundation and Colorado College. These institutes “aimed at a ‘multiplier’ principle in education” and thus were “expressly designed for high school teachers.” Consequently, the teachers who participated “became the nuclei for similar programs” organized at the “state and local levels.” The “cumulative impact these efforts had on school children starting in the early 1960’s may have helped prepare the ground for the leap in the intensity of the interest young people showed by the end of the decade in ecological and environmental matters” (161-162).

At the same time, an “interdisciplinary conference” was held at the Institute in 1962 on “Climate in the 11th and 16th Centuries.” This conference was co-sponsored by, among others, the National Academy of Science and “prefigured the Institute’s future role in promoting an *informed* national and *international* approach to environmental issues.” In the “year-long” research work performed “in anticipation” of the conference, comrades in different countries had collected “data” by “all modes” of so-called “scientific *detective work*.” This was brought to the conference and “laid out on the floor of the Institute’s seminar room for study and *argument*” and resulted in “transforming the nature of climate research” (159-160).

Even while still at the Ford Foundation, Slater had determined that the “old-line conservation organizations tended to focus only on single aspects of the environment and even then from a perspective that seldom went beyond a particular region in the United States.” To rectify this, Slater wanted to **create a new international environmental institution** similar to the *Institute for Strategic Studies* which he had been “instrumental in creating in London with Ford Foundation support.” This group was a “service” organization which “periodically provided interested parties with a world-wide overview of security issues and their

underlying facts.” It was headed by Alistair Buchan, a journalist who had “distinguished himself as a Washington correspondent for the London Observer” and was no doubt very adept at propaganda. The new global environmental institution Slater had in mind would be a “counterpart service institute” to the Institute for Strategic Studies and its role would be to “conduct an international overview of environmental issues, to identify problems and their linkages, to mobilize and present in lucid form sets of facts on which an informed national and international debate on policy issues could go forward” (252).

Anderson agreed to fund the “first step toward the new international institution Slater had in mind.” The first step, of course, was to conduct a “survey” to see where everyone stood on the issue. The “conservationist” chosen to do the survey “either misunderstood the assignment or could not discharge it other than *conventional* ways” so his final report “was of no use” as a “building block” for the institution Slater had in mind. It “could only provide the basis for a ‘**consciousness-heightening**’ event known as **Earth Day**, financed by Anderson.” Slater “would not settle for so ephemeral a result” so he picked his brain for just the right “talent” to redo the survey and decided on Thomas J. Wilson Jr., who was experienced in “policy analysis and formulation” (252-253). Wilson, among other things, had been a “special advisor” to Skull & Bones member “W. Averell Harriman during the Marshall Plan.” In the United States diplomatic service he “held the rank of minister and was a member or advisor to numerous United States delegations to the United Nations and other international organizations such as NATO.” When Slater telephoned him in late 1969 about doing the survey, he was “back in the State Department serving as senior planning advisor to the Office of Counsellor.” He readily accepted the offer and said he could start in early February (253).

In doing the survey, Wilson observed “the general tendency to conceive of environmental issues in terms limited to the technical and legal aspects of air and water pollution control and, as a related matter, to see the implications of these issues only within the narrow boundaries of a single community, state, or region. The first tendency raised the *danger that the social and humanistic dimensions would be neglected*; the second pointed to an equally serious *neglect of the **internationally unifying force** implicit in the concept of Spaceship Earth*” (267). [Emphasis added]

Wilson’s study was published in book form under the title of International Environment Action: A Global Survey. When he initially gave Slater the manuscript, he explained that Aspen should leave the “specifically technical aspects of environmental problems” to the scientists and

should concentrate on its social fall-out--on the long-term [unprovable] implications environmental issues had for the individual, society, value systems, and the institutions of decision-making. It should do this,

moreover, not in any parochial context, but in a global context, taking into account the unitary nature of the biosphere and its interactions with a man-made environment. (267)

The first chapter of Wilson's survey was published in a pamphlet in the summer of 1970 and "widely distributed among government officials and *opinion leaders* and was excerpted for publication in newspapers, magazines, and books." In it, Wilson argued that the "*structure and quality* of our institutions" would be a "critical variable in the success or failure of society to cope with emergent issues of the human environment, issues which are *inseparable* from fundamental decisions on **how society is to be managed for what purposes.**" Wrote Wilson:

The crisis has more to do with **economic-political-social change** than with more and better sewage treatment and smoke abatement... It is a crisis not just for the environment but for traditions and institutions as well. (267-268)

From August 29 to September 3 of 1970, an international conference was held at Aspen entitled, "Technology: Social Goals and Cultural Options," to discuss the "social and ethical" aspects of the matter. It was co-sponsored by the *International Association for Cultural Freedom* and brought "scientists, economists, historians, philosophers, journalists" from around the world. New York Times' James Reston (a participant) later reported in his column that his "fellow conferees were agreed on the *goals* of human society and on the fact that 'the human family was approaching an historic crisis which **will require fundamental revisions in the organization of society,**" but the "means" to achieve this reorganization "was a babble of disagreement" (268).

In spite of all this posturing, Aspen already had their long-range plan in hand which included the means to reorganize society. The conference was merely part of that plan. It "reinforced the case for the creation of an *international institute on environmental issues*" [as envisioned by Slater] and "Wilson's advocacy of a world-wide response to the crisis of the environment," and most important, it "put the Institute into an advanced position where it could help prepare the conceptual basis for the **United Nations Conference on the Human Environment** set for Stockholm in June, 1972." This UN conference had been officially approved by the UN General Assembly in 1968. The proposal had been submitted by Sverker Ostrom, the Swedish ambassador to the UN "with whom Slater had *quietly* worked." Heretofore, the UN "had given little thought to environmental problems" (269).

Maurice Strong, "another of the friends of Slater," was "recruited from his position as head of Canada's International Development Research Center" to become secretary-general of the UN conference. One of Strong's "first moves was

to recruit Thomas Wilson as a personal consultant” because institutional problems of “environmental control” were complex. This because

International controls would entail intergovernmental agreements. Different nations differed in their environmental priorities. The need to provide broad national representation in the agencies of the world community **would introduce** eccentric or **obstructionist elements** into their administrative structure. Above all, international environmental management would tend to **impinge** upon traditional concepts of **national sovereignty.**” (270)

These transformational Marxists realized that what they were seeking would require some piece-meal efforts; therefore, the UN conference could adopt an “action program” for “post-Stockholm follow-through work, the responsibilities for which should be vested either in existing institutions or in *new ones* to be formed.” To “adapt, alter, or design international or intergovernmental agencies for the purposes indicated would require *sustained probing and imaginative mental efforts.*” To get at the “sources of unconventional thinking” required for this subversion, Strong “reached above the heads of official national or international bodies and into private organizations, including the Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.” Strong justified his actions to UN officials thus:

...I have been convinced for years that governments and international agencies must break down the old frontiers between “public” and “private” agencies and reach out to engage the leading talents of the **nongovernmental world** if such problems are to be resolved or even managed in a tolerable fashion.

As things stand now, large reservoirs of existing knowledge and experience lying in the private domain are not being brought to bear in a systematic way on problems of the human environment. The gap between these resources and the political process of policy formulation and decision-making must be bridged with a system of co-operative working arrangements.

...Public administrators...need the stimulation of steady exposure to innovative concepts, ideas and perceptions that are generated on the leading edges of intellectual endeavor. Above all, perhaps, the leaders of public institutions need to be reminded, over and over again, that their ultimate purpose is to help bring about a more humane **International Society**... (271-272)

These “large reservoirs of existing knowledge” turned out to be a pre-determined agenda waiting to be carried out. With Anderson furnishing the “seed money,” Slater’s International Institute for Environmental Affairs (IIEA) was launched [Strong “was kept informed of every turn in the shaping of IIEA” (277)]

and subsequently chosen by Strong and Wilson to help “prepare the grounds” for the UN conference (278). It “was understood that the **Aspen program in the environmental field would be carried out through the IIEA**” (273).

Slater chose Jack Raymond, former foreign correspondent for The New York Times, to be president of IIEA. Slater had known Raymond from his days in “Berlin,” and had renewed that friendship from time to time. Raymond had been the “bureau chief for the Times in Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union, and Romania, and was then posted to the Washington bureau of the Times, with the Pentagon as his beat.” When tapped by Slater, Raymond headed a “large public relations firm” based in New York (273). In 1973, IIEA headquarters would be moved to London under the head of Barbara Ward (*Lady Jackson, who insisted that the IIEA “meld the issues of development with those of the environment,” thus it was then renamed the International Institute for Environment and Development*) (296).

But in the meantime, Wilson was chosen to “serve as the IIEA vice-president for programs, to head its Washington office and to direct the *international* workshops to be held in Aspen on all aspects of the environment which affect the quality of life.” Wilson “not only knew who and what made the wheels go round in Washington and in international organizations, but was the *kind of writer who could take a seemingly dry subject and convert it into an explosion of dry gunpowder*. Soon there issued from him a succession of articles, speeches, and testamentary material for appearances before Congressional committees...” (272-274). The

sum of what Wilson contended and refined entered into the ongoing purpose of the Aspen program on Environment and Quality of Life. The purpose was to help bring to the surface the social implications of environment-related conflict, to help search for points of convergence and harmony among goals, values, and priorities, and to pose in unmistakably clear terms the choices to be made among alternative lines of action... (276-277)

Aspen and the IIEA shared “a number of trustees” (273), while Aspen’s Anderson and Roy Jenkins, a “leader of the **British Labor party**,” [which was communist] were co-chairman. There were five vice-chairmen serving under them—“one for each of the five *regions* in the world.” Another twenty individuals made up a “general board of directors.” The “dominant figures” which made up the “Advisory Council” were **Robert S. McNamara**, then president of the *World Bank* and **Maurice Strong** who had “rendered important help in finding and recruiting *qualified* individuals for the governance of the IIEA” (277).

The “conceptual framework” for the UN conference was “laid out first in a draft manuscript” written by hand-picked comrades Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson) of Great Britain and Rene Dubos. The IIEA formed a committee of “corresponding

consultants” who reviewed and criticized the draft by correspondence (the Delphi technique), and were designated a measure of “co-authorship” for the final result. The “World Bank and the Ford Foundation provided the financial support” (278).

Once the UN conference was over “things were in readiness in Aspen itself for a follow-through” and IIEA and Aspen immediately and jointly, rolled into the second Aspen international environmental workshop,” and this one focused on adding “energy” to the environmental “crisis.” The “initial interest in energy was based on the *assumption* that when the subject emerged as a public policy issue...it would become apparent that the environmental problem was vastly more complex than air and water pollution and solid waste disposal” (293). This seven-week workshop resulted in the development of a “world overview” of “global energy problems.” The “object was to place the energy issue in the relevant context of environmental and international affairs, to probe the implications for institutional *adaptations*, and to recommend the first steps for *political action* that would be valid regardless of disputes about supply-demand data and technological prospects in the energy field” (293).

Wilson wrote a paper on the materials and ideas considered by this international group of wanna-be dictators. His “main accent was on the need to *adapt and reform existing institutional structures...*” (294). In the spring of 1973, yet another “international” workshop was held in New York, co-sponsored by Aspen and the *Institute on Man and Science*, which added “population problems” to the crisis. Typically, UN agency officials and NGO’s were among the participants. Still another one was held in the following summer on the “relationship of population growth to food supplies.” The plans and “action-oriented ideas” that resulted from these workshops became the agenda for the already planned UN World Population Conference in Bucharest in August of 1974 and the UN World Food Conference in Rome the following November (288, 292, 296-297).

As a result of the UN conference in Stockholm, the Aspen inspired **United Nations Environment Program** (UNEP) was launched by the General Assembly and was directed by Maurice Strong (290, 292). Aspen and the **UNEP** held yet another conference (with participants from 14 countries) to, among other things, determine how to “avert social and political disasters in the decades ahead” and to determine the “outer limits” to the “carrying capacity of Planet Earth” with respect to matters such as “population load,” “contemporary stress,” and the “management” of “social problems.” This conference resulted in a set of recommendations for “priorities” for “**UNEP-endorsed studies and activities**” (297-298). U. S. participants included Rene Dubos and Carroll Wilson of the **Massachusetts Institute of Technology**. Furthermore, at the Stockholm conference the **International Chamber of Commerce** “formally pledged support for the UN program on the environment and organized an Environmental Problems Project of

its own to *work in ongoing co-operation with the United Nations Environment Program*” (290).

Incidentally, Carroll Wilson was one of the leaders in the **Club of Rome** [founded in 1968] which Aurelio Peccei, an Italian industrial manager, headed. Peccei, Rene Dubos, Barbara Ward and Gunnar Myrdal were chosen by the Aspen group to be a part of the Distinguished Lecture Series at the Stockholm Conference. This Lecture Series, co-sponsored by IIEA and the International Population Institute, was literally imposed on the UN General Assembly by Maurice Strong (290-292). It was the Club of Rome and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology who jointly produced a report in 1972, “The Limits to Growth,” with an agenda similar to Aspen’s. Two years later, Club of Rome member Ervin Laszlo--who, according to W. Edwards Deming, developed the philosophy of **Total Quality Management**--wrote a how-to book, A Strategy For The Future: The Systems Approach to World Order. [This is covered in another paper in this series.]

The “work performed in support of the Stockholm Conference by IIEA, by the Aspen workshop, and by its participants in other roles, offered a striking **case history** of how **nongovernmental organizations** [the new soviets] can contribute to the public policy-making process,” explains Hyman. It would be safe to say that what the UN has done in the last 25 years or more likely, since its inception, has been solely dictated by Aspen and its cohorts. Today, we are seeing, but only beginning to actually experience the nightmare of all this “long-range planning” become reality.

Early 1972 marked the beginning of Aspen’s attempt to weave all their affairs into a “**single humanistic whole**” (343) by a “**sustained, self-aware search for ways to inject the full force of the term ‘humanistic’ in everything the Institute was currently doing or hoped to do.**” A statement of Slater’s reflects this goal:

Few institutions in our society today deal with the humanities as disciplines. Even fewer seek actively to bring humanistic values and knowledge to bear on...domestic and international problems which face American society and...all modern technological societies. Among available resources for dealing humanistically with social crisis resulting from technological development and rapid social change, the Aspen Institute has a special role--not only in its concern for engaging leaders in humanistically oriented dialogue but also in the **special relevance** of many of its programs to the crisis of change. (343)

In the Spring of 1972 the Aspen Institute formed an “arrangement” with the “**Educational Testing Service** and its affiliate, the **Institute for Educational Development**” to provide “solutions to the problems of education and learning

systems being posed by the **scope and pace of change** in all aspects of contemporary life.” Within a year, they had jointly developed “three clearly defined projects” that “could be mounted without further delay.” One of the projects was in “the field of early child learning.” The second project “involved the relationship among education, work and the quality of life,” and the third was on “the future state of higher education.” Once these projects were in progress, “*new concepts could be formulated leading to new lines of activity in response to newly perceived needs.*” This tactic is the fascist/transformational Marxist concept of and key to taking over a society’s institutions so-called democratically without allowing that society to know where that takeover is going or even that it is being taken over, and is the key to Total Quality Management as well. Slater wanted to begin immediately, while the Education Testing Service and its affiliate needed to spend some time in “formulating an ‘operational philosophy’ before moving ahead” primarily due to their “institutional constituencies.” After some debate, in September of 1973 the Education Testing Service assumed responsibility for the project “in the field of early child learning” which was “ready for field work” and Aspen “pressed ahead with the programs on **education, work, and the quality of life**, and with the one on the future of state higher education.” They then “formally” dissolved their “arrangement” but agreed that “informal contacts and mutual consultation would continue” (340-341).

In preparation for this grab at “wholeness,” in July 1972, Aspen and the *International Association for Cultural Freedom* co-sponsored an international conference, chaired by Sir Alan Bullock, on “**The Intellectual and Power: His Role and Responsibility.**” A “high proportion” of the 33 participants were Aspen board members although nearly half were from foreign countries. The board itself, “an international body of men and women who were not letterhead figures, but were *personally and directly engaged* in the substantive work of the Institute,” exemplified the future role of the intellectual and use of his power. In a “former day,” the “intellectual” had played the role of the “outsider” and as such, was the “permanent critic” of the “process of production and administration” and the “general culture of society.” But the current reality of the “post-industrial society” called for the intellectual to accept and perform a different “function,” that of change agent/practitioner. Of course, the “post-industrial society” theorist Daniel Bell was a participant (347).

The “new role demanded by the intellectual” was perhaps an attempt to prevent a possible Hitler/German re-run because “it would be all the more disastrous if the intellectuals, as in the case of the German intellectuals during the time of the Weimar Republic, adhered to a bystander’s role, yet continued to raise the expectations and the demands of what society and government can be asked to provide its constituent members.” Consequently and henceforth, the “new role” of the intellectual would include “political activist” or change agent, a moving “in and out of different points of the spectrum at different times.” As an “advisor to

men of political power,” he could generate “a normative **consensus** concerning *what should or should not be done in the political realm.*” This new role of the intellectual would require patience because it could take years before “his ideas gained wide acceptance and were *put into effect*” (347-349). In the “summer of 1973,” yet another Aspen conference was held on “The Role of the Intellectual.” It was here that Anderson and Slater made the “decision to establish **Aspen Institute Berlin**” (248).

Target Politicians. What “followed” from Aspen’s decision to use the “full force” of the term humanistic to bring about “wholeness” was the “new form” in which Slater “pursued his long-standing concern over the social, political, and cultural implications of the advances being made in *molecular biology.*” This new form consisted of Aspen organized “tutorials” for members of the U. S. Senate and the House of Representatives, under the guise of “bring[ing] them abreast of the revolution in the biomedical sciences, and its implications for man and for future legislation.” Slater lined up “molecular biologists” from Salk for the initial briefing which resulted in an invitation to Aspen to “organize further briefings on Capitol Hill--perhaps several a year--so that lawmakers could be kept abreast of developments in biomedical research and of their ‘*profound ethical and legislative implications*’” (344-345). While Slater was at Salk, it “had been brought home to him that the more man understood about the molecular mechanism* of life, the closer he moved to the *role of a trustee of his own evolution.*” That’s totalitarian poppycock used by Ervin Laszlo for the ability to control society. Moreover, Slater learned that “the more man added to the body of knowledge about the *functioning of the human mind, the greater would be the implications for his liberation or servitude*” (344), and without doubt, it was servitude that Slater had in mind.

Target Existing Institutions. Another means to “weave things into a single humanistic whole” was to establish the Executive Seminars “in local communities and regions around the country.” Slater tapped his old friend, John Hunt of the **Rayaumont Center for the Science of Man**, to work with the **National Endowment for the Humanities** on a “feasibility study” to this end (345). At the onset the study apparently revealed that few institutions were interested in “co-operating with a regionalized Aspen Program.” It was later determined that “flawed approaches” were being made and moreover “under *existing administrative arrangements* the Institute could not control the quality of any regionalized programs” offered in its name. Aspen decided to suspend the feasibility study but it “was understood that the grant would be reactivated when the manner of the approach to other institutions had been *rethought and new provisions were made for quality control.*” (346).

* See Feedback Thought in Social Science and Systems Theory by George Richardson, University of Pennsylvania Press, 1991.

Target Women. It should be obvious by now that whatever issue, policy, committee, group, organization etc. the Institute associated itself with, it soon controlled. These people were able to move into any institution or organization at will and take over with little difficulty and use it and its people for their personal agenda. In effect, this “party” would have made Antonio Gramsci proud! At any rate, this “wholeness” take-over included a long-term scheme to “emancipate the subject of sex role” from the “limited circle of intellectuals who had heretofore concentrated on it.” With a grant from the Rockefeller Fund, Libby A. Cater (one of the wives of Slater’s “associates at the Institute”) kicked off this scheme by organizing a week long Aspen conference that “was meant to synthesize existing knowledge about the dynamics of sex differences in society, to formulate new lines of inquiry into the realities of the case, and to set the agenda for a large-scale conference” that was to follow. The participants in this agenda-setting conference were individuals “who had *thought systematically about the implications of changes in these roles in every enclave of American society*” and “representatives from major institutions affected by those changes.” One-third of the thirty participants were “men.” In preparation for future plans, this group decided that a “substantial number” of “qualified professional women” would be brought into the Executive Seminars by way of “fellowships” and would “participate as full-fledged members of the *year-round work* of the Institute’s **“thought leading to action programs”** (350-351).

Target Artists. As evidenced in the Garden of Eden, in the name of good the “serpent beguiled Eve through his subtlety,” and so it was with Aspen in everything it did. This quest for wholeness included a “long-range Aspen Arts program.” This because Slater realized from the beginning that “the *identifying term ‘humanistic’ would be deeply flawed unless it had an Arts Program along with its other activities.*” This “two prong” program included the “direct involvement of artists in the Institute’s activities straight across the board from the Executive Seminars to the **‘thought leading to action’** programs.” The second prong was to promote so-called “musical education” beginning in “pre-school years” and “extending to all levels of education” and even “society” at large. This effort called for an international workshop which brought artists together with “leaders in education, communications, and the foundations.” This included Sir Alan Bullock, Asa Briggs of Oxford, Thorsen Husen (a “Swedish educator who knows as much about educational developments in the United States and Japan *as in Europe*”), Daniel Schorr, Lloyd Morrisett, Douglass Cater, and “Frank Keppel of the Aspen Program on Education for a Changing Society.” The

object of the workshop was to formulate the issues of ‘musical literacy’ in various countries, to identify the obstacles in the way, and to formulate ways and means for overcoming them. **As in other aspects of the search**

for ‘wholeness,’ the workshop gained in clarity and focus from **the intense face-to-face discussions among diverse individuals who brought their special fund of knowledge to bear on a common interest.**” (351-352)

The “larger examples of the movement to weave **all things into a single humanistic whole**” concerns the remaining “**thought leading to action**” programs “envisioned in Slater’s 1969 plan”--**Science, Technology and Humanism; Justice, Society, and the Individual; International Affairs; and Education for a Changing Society.** By mid-1974, the other two programs were “fully operational” and although a “great deal of work had gone forward” on the remaining four, it was at this time that they were “formally inaugurated with the appointment of their respective directors.” By summer of 1975, a “‘critical mass’ has been achieved with respect to all of them” (353).

Science, Technology, and Humanism

Walter Orr Roberts, who had headed the Climate research project (covered above) for Aspen, was chosen as director of the *Science, Technology, and Humanism* “thought leading to action” program. These issues represented a “personal challenge of the highest urgency and significance” to Roberts. This because “throughout the world” more and more people were voicing their “hostility” to an “old vision--stemming from Francis Bacon” (353-354). Bacon’s dream was to discover all of nature’s laws and apply them to society then “the world will be merely the raw material of whatever utopia man may decide to make” (Durant 134). The basis for this hostility included the belief that “scientific and humanistic thought are diametrically opposed *in spirit*” and that science and technology had become “autonomous ends in themselves” and were “directly responsible for conditions where the world is becoming uninhabitable” (Hyman Aspen 354).

In Roberts’ opinion, very serious consequences could follow if this hostile view led to “scientific and technological arrest” in various societies. For the solution to the world’s cardinal problems...must include major scientific and technological components. He does not argue that the future should be entrusted **solely** to the care of the scientific and technological community. His argument is that...humanistic purposes will not be advanced by the rejection of science and technology, no more than science and technology can assure human self-fulfillment without the integration of humanistic social purposes into their practices... In today’s world, therefore, no nation-state and no region can ignore **the imperative need to use the powers of science and technology in ways in which the controlling perception will be humanistic in cast.** (354-355)

The “purpose” of this program was to “mobilize *humanists, leaders of public action*, business leaders, and members of the *scientific and engineering* community for joint concentration on a *series* of concrete and conceptual problems which have a direct bearing on the humanistic uses of science,” a wedding or synthesis of Marxist/Hegelian idealists and Marxist dialectical materialists, if you will. Both groups wanted to control and remake man, only they differed somewhat on means and ends. Specific projects in this connection would “entail co-operative efforts with other programs of the Aspen Institute or with other interested organizations” (355). The purpose of one of these projects was to

seek ways and means to **bridge the gap between scientific and humanistic thought**, as well as the gulf between both of them **and the public decision-making process**. The specific questions posed in this connection are of the following order. What are the underlying similarities and differences between the fundamental operative values involved in the **theory and practice** of the physical and life sciences and the humanities? What are their common philosophical roots? Does the...assumption of social responsibility impede the creative instincts of practitioners in these fields?...How do laymen in different societies view the mysteries of science...? What values are indigenous to science...and what values are lacking? What is the difference between factual and value judgments? The questions...interlock with those that impinge on the work of all the other Aspen programs. (356-357)

Another project of Robert’s group was to

study the **implications of the application of new technologies to the education of men and women of diverse cultures**. It will inquire into the **kind of education that is suited to a post-industrial and post-traditional society**...But can and should a common education ideal be formulated for the latter part of the twentieth century in such a way that the development of an educated person--at home in the realm of technology--becomes an accepted individual and social goal around which educational philosophy may once again cohere? There are obvious cross-linkages between the inquires into this question and the Aspen program on Education for a Changing Society. (356)

...The essence of communism is social justice--the elimination of poverty, the elimination of suffering, the elimination of all differences that erect walls between people. The essence of communism is the global village in which everyone benefits equally within an interdependent and socially conscious world. The essence of communism is rearing of children by the village. Even Hitler’s version, which he called “National Socialism,” was

intended to deliver great and lasting benefits to the masses, once a few million redundant people were, well, eliminated. (Vazsonyi 57-58)*

...[We] need to face the fact that the Rule of Law and the Search for Social justice cannot exist side-by-side because social justice requires those who possess' more of anything have it taken away from them. The Rule of Law will not permit that....First, they take away opportunity. Next they take away possessions. In the end, they have to take away life itself. (59)

...all those who believe that socialism has merit...but communism is abhorrent and out of the question, are fooling themselves. It is all one package because all of it is predicated on the same way of thinking. One either signs on to the package or one does not. Partial consent is an illusion. (66)

...The Search for Social Justice...is the current Americanized version of the Franco-Germanic line--The Idea--of which communism is the end state. Unlike communism, "social justice" sounds wonderfully warm, humane, even lofty. Since social justice is pure demagoguery with no foundation in reality, it is flexible enough to enhance and camouflage anyone's personal agenda. (67-68)

Justice, Society and the Individual: The “issues of **justice** and law” had been “raised and discussed in all the core Executive Seminars, and in various workshops or special conferences held in Aspen or elsewhere.” In fact, Anderson stressed the “**centrality**” of these issues to the very “nature of contemporary society and the life of individuals in it” (Hyman Aspen 357). Indeed, the “whole of moral and political philosophy was involved in an adequate treatment of the problem of **justice**” (359). Even before the **Action Program** on “*Justice, Society, and the Individual*” was formally inaugurated, much work had already been done in this connection, and funded by “yearly grants” from the Joseph Hazen Foundation. Joseph Hazen was a former legal counsel to the Warner brothers “in development of their motion picture interests.” He was also a producer and had “prospered in oil ventures” (357). After participating in some Executive Seminars in 1970, Hazen had decided that “**judges were the very people who could benefit the most from exposure to the Aspen Executive Seminar.**” He later recalled

It seemed to me...that most political, social and economic questions in the United States tend to come before the courts in the form of legal questions. If so, then how our controversies about **justice** and injustice were resolved would **depend** on large measure on the **perceptions and values of our federal judiciary. The decisions by circuit court judges and courts of appeal judges would permeate the whole of our society.** (358)

* Hungarian-born Vazsonyi was a victim of both Communism and its variant, Fascism.

be To bring judges into the Executive Seminars would mean that they would intimately exposed to a cross-section of people from all walks of life...They would not be deferred to in the Executive Seminars. They would challenge and be challenged in turn, would be compelled to explain themselves, might be prodded to embark on new avenues of inquiry, study, and reflection. “Why is it,” Hazen asked, “that many great books have been written by prisoners [bloody revolutionaries?], and not one by a guard or warden?” **It was his way of suggesting that judges, too, were in urgent need of education and re-education.** (358)

Hazen had talked his scheme over with Slater, volunteering to pay for “fellowships” so that “judges of the Circuit and District Courts could come to Aspen to participate in the Executive Seminars” and he accepted on an experimental basis.

The first five who came out were enthusiastic about the experience. Word spread through the federal judiciary. The **Chief Justice* of the United States encouraged what had begun**, and Hazen arranged to continue his grant of fellowships to federal judges so that a **sizable percentage of all who comprise the national membership of the Circuit and District Courts may eventually participate in the Executive Seminars.** (359)

The program on “**Justice, Society and the Individual**” would take into account:

considerations that are antecedent to the **theory of justice** and on which it is dependent--considerations such as...the social character of man, and questions about human equality. In addition, there would be the need to consider a number of notions internal to the idea of justice itself, such as those of **theory of justice**--including questions about the necessity, **authority**, and limits of government; questions about the several kinds of liberty in political society and about the relation of freedom to authority, law, and government; questions about the resolution of conflicts concerning political, economic, and social equality. In addition, there would be the need to consider...notions internal to the idea of justice itself, such as those of right, duty, obligation, claim, and status. There was also the fact that theories of justice differ and perhaps conflict, depending on how they for-mulate the criteria of the just and the unjust in terms of...equality and inequality of individuals and of the ways in which they should be treated; and those concerned with what is lawful and unlawful, constitutional and unconstitutional, and, in the broadest of views, **right and wrong.** (359-360)

* Warren Burger, a member of the “Aspen Institute International Board of Trustees.” (318)

In a planning meeting on the program in New York in 1973 with participants including Mortimer Adler, William Groman, Charles Frankel of Columbia University, *Chief Judge Irving Kaufman of the Second Circuit Court*, and John Niels (a former Wall Street lawyer turned professor at Sarah Lawrence), a disagreement arose. Some participants insisted that the program “begin with specific action-oriented projects,” while others insisted that “before any action-oriented projects could be mounted, the lineaments of a ‘just society’ must be clarified first.” In the end, a “compromise draft plan” was produced (360).

Dean Robert B. McKay of the New York University School of Law was recruited to head the new program. McKay had been “deeply involved with problems related to equal educational opportunity,” with “legislative districting,” the “criminal justice system,” the “administration of justice,” and “legal education.” He was vice-chairman of National News Council and vice president of the Legal Aid Society. He had served as chairman of the New York State Special Commission on Attica, the Mayor’s Rent Control Committee, and the New York City Board of Corrections (360-361).

McKay studied the plan and remarked that he was being “entrusted with a unique vehicle for the examination of almost any aspect of the contemporary world, using the lens of justice to consider whether proper standards of liberty, equality, and fairness have been applied.” His first order of the day was to “define and delimit” the scope of “inquiries to be pursued by the program;” to catalogue all existing institutions, programs, and organizations “concerned with the **infusion of justice into the social structure**” and in this connection to “identify major social problems that require analysis in terms of the implications for **justice** as they arise in the context of a search for ends and means.” On the other hand while all this was being set in place, McKay proceeded in four different areas with “programs that would find their internal unity in the idea of **justice** and the rule of law.” This involved (1) “action-oriented activities” concerning the “right of access to equal opportunity;” (2) “punishment and responsibility” with a view toward “catalytic action that can convert into actual policies an existing *consensus* about what needs to be done to *reform the whole of the American correction system;*” (3) “training for professional responsibility” with a view toward “clarifying the system of licensing in the professions, along with questions of morality and **justice** which arise in the practice of the professions;” and (4) “law training for nonlawyers” (361).

Moreover, McKay was anointed “general counsel” for Aspen “straight across the board” because “issues of **justice** crop up at every turn in the work of the Institute.” For example, in the Environment and the Quality of Life program, “critical issues of **justice** are posed by the need to balance the rival claims of environmental protection, the rights of private property, and the need for industrial development,” as well as “Who...should get what, when, and how” concerning

“scarce” resources. In the Communications and Society program, issues of justice crop up in matters such as “the right of privacy,” the “right of access to the media,” “‘fair comment’ by the media,” “shield laws to protect reporters” and so on. Then “there are the questions of **justice** which are indivisible with the concerns of the program on International Affairs. **How can one foster the development of a world community held together by a network of common laws and common concepts of justice**? How can such a community provide itself with better means for the resolution of disputes?” McKay’s role also included “scanning,” that is, “highlighting the interconnections among the particular questions of **justice** that arise at diverse points in the work of the Institute,” and bringing “new sources of *perception* and judgment to bear on the search for *solutions* to the questions noted” (362-363).

Concerning the “**International Affairs**” **Action Program**, Aspen was international in scope from day one and with the already existing “co-operative arrangement” between Aspen and the “Asian Society,” the Institute in 1969 had “swiftly **expanded its explicit partnerships with non-profit organizations having aims parallel to its own**” many of which were “international in nature.” In the private sector, these included the “International Council for Educational Development” and the “Overseas Development Council.” In the public sector, as indicated above, they included the “United Nations Environment Program, whose director, Maurice Strong, is a trustee of the Aspen Institute” and the “World Bank, whose president, Robert McNamara, is also an Institute trustee.” In 1970, Aspen had created a “Statesman-Humanist Award.” The “first recipient was Jean Monnet, the ‘father’ of the **European Common Market**,” who “formed a partnership” with Felix Frankfurter when he came to the U. S. after the fall of France (Murphy 213). The second recipient was Willy Brandt. In 1973

Aspen Institute Berlin was established as an integral part of the Aspen Institute, and began to function in the spring of 1974 with the **active backing of the Berlin Senate**. Aspen Institute Berlin will address major humanistic problems confronting societies and individuals everywhere-- problems worked on by all the Institute programs.

The Institute had effectively carried out a large number of continuing international activities, including an annual arms control workshop, a series of task groups leading to Karl Kaiser’s widely used book on U. S.-European relations, an **annual meeting of top leaders of the United Nations**, and sessions on the international dimensions of the major issues with which the Institute had been concerned. (Hyman Aspen 364)

In choosing a director for the International Affairs program, Slater’s “search for the person he wanted had the complexity and high seriousness of a quest for a new Grand Lama of Tibet.” Harland Cleveland, a globalist and New Ager, was

chosen to head the program. Like MIT and the Club of Rome, Cleveland believed that “systems thinking” could “help mankind enhance control of its destiny,” and computer “**simulations**” could enable “**groups**” to make “decisions in the more mindful knowledge of alternative futures” (366). In this connection, Cleveland explained that the “central aim” of the International Affairs program would be “*to develop concepts, ideas, and action proposals for adapting old transnational institutes and inventing new ones.*” They would begin by “building outward from the Aspen’s Institute’s **existing web of contacts around the world--to create a continuously functioning multinational network of analytical minds whose collective product is ideas about international action.**” A first step would be “an *international consultation leading to the draft of a general strategy for ‘next steps’--during perhaps the next ten years--in the mutation of international institutions, ‘public’ and private.*” (367).

At the same time, a “two-year work program” from the fall of 1974 to the summer of 1976 would explore four areas in “**how the world can be managed for mankind.**” These four areas would include:

(1) “**International Management of Conflict**”--Major workshops would be “organized in Aspen, in regions of the United States, at **Aspen Institute Berlin**, at a proposed Aspen-Hawaii and Aspen-Japan, and at other locations” convenient “to Latin American, African, and Asian *participants.*” The object of the workshops would “be to consider procedures for the identification, prevention, and the resolution of conflict; to limit conventional and strategic arms; to revive international peace-keeping-- ‘consortium of the concerned’; to establish a Golden Rule of *active* and timely international consultation; to practice ‘preventive diplomacy’--as in the case of the conflicts about resources.” (367)

(2) “**Management of Global Technologies**”--Which “will have linkages with the Aspen program on The Environment and the Quality of Life, and on Science, Technology, and Humanism.” It would entail a “search for ways in which the ambivalent **technologies of destruction or development**, of pollution or prosperity, **of coercion or consent can be organized** to work *for* rather than *against* individual human beings.” (367-368)

(3) “**International Management of Money and Commerce**”--This “consists of efforts to formulate suggested standards of behavior for multinational enterprises (with suggestions for action by governments covering both incentives and inhibitions on the development of international business); and to explore to what extent, if any, such private

standards and national-government actions should be translated into international agreements and institutions.” (368)

(4) “**International Management of Development**”--This will “focus on the new basis of the relationship between *rich and poor nations*. The *coming* struggles over resources...will require ways of thinking and institutional arrangements which *get beyond* the postwar concepts of national development planning *aimed at economic growth* and supported by aid-as-charity...in the years just ahead, *minimum human needs* threaten dramatically to outdistance the world’s capacity to supply them--at least under present assumptions and arrangements. This aspect of the Aspen program in International Affairs may be seen as a continuing international inquiry into the ethics, **justice**, and politics of development and the distribution of resources to serve human needs. It thus lends strength to, and draws strength from, the Aspen program on **Justice, Society, and the Individual**.” (368) [This idea of worldwide redistribution of wealth is advocated by the MIT/Club of Rome plan as well.]

The program on **Education for a Changing Society** formally “mounted an action-oriented program” in 1974. Of course, Aspen “since its inception had been a form of education for a changing society.” The delay in mounting an all-out national and international program “was symmetrical” with the delay in mounting the Justice, Society, and the Individual program:

Specifically, education, like justice, cuts into and across a wide range of subject matters--ethics, politics, and economics; art and science; change and progress, virtue and truth, knowledge and opinion; desire, will, sense, memory, mind, and habit; family and state; man, nature, and **God**. Indeed, virtually everything at the focus of the Institute’s own attention was shot through with educational aspects. (368-369)

Francis Keppel, former dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education, was tapped to head the program. Keppel’s relationship with Aspen had begun much earlier as a participant in the 1966 conference: “The Relationship of Colleges and Universities to Government.” To digress a bit and recap this conference’s origins: As a result of Anderson’s desire to “classify groups of particular problems under a common identifying name” where “each group could be the subject of continuing conferences” extending a number of years, therefore “arming” the participants “**to bridge the gap between thought and action**,” Eurich had formulated an Aspen program called “Man in 1980.” This resulted in conferences in 1965-66 on Population Problems, Planning for Higher Education, *Educational Development Below the College Level*, and Moral and Ethical Values.

The 1966 conferences attempted to “deal *more firmly* with the issues” that had been “raised in exploratory discussions of the preceding year.” At the time of the conference, Keppel was then the “United States Commissioner for Education” under the Johnson Administration and “subsequently the Assistant Secretary for Education in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.” [Douglass Cater, then a “special assistant” to President Johnson, also attended] (212-216)

In developing the Education for a Changing Society program, Keppel based the “programmatically content” on two “assumptions”:

...The first is that **the impetus for change in educational institutions** ranging from pre-school through the university is more likely to **derive from changes** in the wider society—such as **judicial and political decisions involving the rights of children, civil rights, and equity financing**--than from pedagogic initiatives within the institutions themselves. Hence to meet the problems of social change lying ahead, education will need allies, resources and directional signals from other sectors of society that are now concerned with matters such as taxation, housing, urban development, industrial and governmental training, scientific research, pension programs, program for senior citizens, and so on.

The second major assumption is that the present definition of education is in need of substantial change. Keppel...shares a view central to Douglass Cater’s Aspen program, that the revolution in communications has had a massive impact on human learning; television [by design] in particular has affected the way children learn about society and the way adults learn about public affairs and the arts. In the case of his own program, **Keppel’s working definition of education includes all lifelong learning of an institutionalized character directed toward the goal of human fulfillment and social benefit.**” (369-370) [Emphasis added]

Based on these two “assumptions,” Keppel’s program began by “identifying” the nature and “force” of societal factors that would “impinge” on “the lives of individuals and of educational institutions.” For instance, how would “**changing individual and societal goals and expectations**” affect education. How would the need to “upgrade the capacity of the citizenry to grasp the scientific and technological aspects of political issues in a range from environmental balance to arms control” [via propaganda] affect education. What promise do the “values” that are “developing” from the “new insistence on equal opportunity and education rights” hold. What issues do “changes in demographic patterns, *in resources and the allocation of funds, in the nature of occupations and the demand for educated manpower*” raise for “learning” and for “educational institutions” (370).

In addition, Keppel’s program would focus on the “**internal or external factors that would enable--or prod-- educational institutions actually to adapt**

themselves to the needs of a changing society.” For example, what kind of “selection policies and institutional innovations are necessary” to ease the “cross-tensions between the rising rival demands for equal educational opportunities and for quality in education.” What “roles” should be “played by governmental authorities, by educational administrators, and by leaders of unions and associations” in order to “remedy” the “governance of educational systems,” and what “*criteria for consultation and collaboration*” needed to be formulated for these groups (370).

The Education for a Changing Society program would make the “interplay” between the “internal and external” aspects of “early learning at one end of the educational scale and **lifelong learning** at the other end” the “factors that will enable educational institutions actually to **adapt to the needs of a changing society.**” As pertains to early learning, it would study the “effects of extensive day care on *family relationships, personality development, and social interaction,*” with the objective of formulating “criteria for those governmental policies which directly or indirectly impinge” on, for example, policies related to “day care centers,” “welfare and employment,” and “**labor-management contracts and other industrial practices.**” This program would

look at something more than special educational programs for the illiterate, the handicapped, the unemployed without skills, and the skilled but displaced professionals. It will also study the grounds for dissatisfaction with present working conditions, along with the nature of the demand for career changes in middle years; and still further, on-the-job advancement opportunities for women and minorities, or their access to professional careers...the Aspen program will explore the impact on education of issues such as vested and portable pensions; the potential for American education of workers’ “sabbaticals” as part of labor and government contracts; “sandwich courses” for employees; and tax policies to encourage private sector investment in employees’ educational development. (371)

“If it seems sensible to take seriously the idea of **lifelong learning,**” said Keppel, “**change will be required not only in schools and colleges, but in existing policies and practices in the private and public sector.**” He divided his program into two phases, a “preparatory” phase (1975-77) used to “formulate educational policies that can be proposed for adoption by the Congress and the federal administration, by state and local governments, and by private institutions.” The “object of the second, extending from 1977 to the 1990’s will be to help **prepare the ground** for the actual **adaptation of education to the needs of a changing society.**” [It is this phase that is now being implemented.] As part of the preparation for the actual implementation of their school restructuring, a plan was devised

starting right now, to make promising young figures in government, scholarship, and educational institutions active collaborators in shaping the Aspen program which Keppel heads. There are...difficulties in forecasting years in advance who in particular will hold leadership posts in the 1980's and beyond. Yet it is possible to identify the type of person between the ages of twenty-five and forty who might play such a role and who can be prepared in advance to fill it. A long lead time for advance preparation is necessary since the task ahead, enormous in itself, is complicated by the fact that all too many **forces** in society have a vested interest in bending their weight to the end that educational institutions will stand still--though the wide society around them is in [planned] **oceanic flux**. (371-372)

Pluralism and the Commonweal was a "thought leading to action" program launched in 1975. Although it was not part of Slater's 1969 5-year plan, it was a "logical extension of the Institute's commitment to *a pluralistic society, hospitable to democratic and humanistic values.*" It also was a "response" to a need to balance two "countervailing imperatives" which

confronted democratic societies the world over--without regard to differences in how they organized the economic functions of productions and distribution. **First, a democratic people**, acting through their instruments of government **must respond collectively to common challenges** if they are **to achieve common goals**.

Second...there must be multiple centers for social invention independent of formal organs of government. That in turn implies the presence and survival of a wide range of...institutions comprising the "non-profit" sector of **communal life**. (372-373) [Emphasis added]

Waldemar A. Nielsen [mentioned above], was chosen for director of this program. It's "purpose" would be to "assess in different societies the *changing roles and responsibility of the private and public sectors*, and to formulate responses to new problems, new dangers [opposition], and new opportunities *rising from these changing roles.*" He noted that in the United States and elsewhere in the world, the "diverse centers of thought and action which are the instruments of pluralism, are fighting for survival in the face of developments that have brought them under siege." Therefore, in stating the "conceptual basis" for his program, Nielsen explained that

a variety of centers of thought and diverse sources of initiative...are an important assurance of creativity, adaptability, and orderly progress in every sphere of human existence...multiple centers of action, coupled with an active sense of private responsibility for the general welfare, make for a...more open, and less callous society... (373)

By 1975, Aspen had moved its headquarters to New York while the headquarters of the directors of the “thought leading to action” programs were based in Washington D.C., Boulder, Colorado, New York City, Boston, Princeton, New Jersey and Palo Alto, California (6). The facilities at Aspen continued to be used for the Executive Seminars and “intensive summer workshops where the year-around preparatory efforts pursued elsewhere come to a head,” while an “international extension of all its full range of ventures is now operating in Europe at Aspen Institute Berlin.” In addition, a number of Aspen’s programs were “being conducted in collaboration with a network of other national and international institutions” (376-377). The order of the day for Aspen’s programs and activities was for “joint planning of activities directed toward a commonly agreed goal” and the resultant tasks “to be carried out collectively by all or many of the different programs.” Slater wrote in the 1975 “President’s Letter:”

...With a common purpose and approach, the Aspen Institute can more effectively bring to bear its unique characteristics on the central problems of today. Among these unique characteristics are the active participation of Institute Trustees and Fellows in the full range of Institute Activities, leadership that combines intellectual and managerial achievement with...social activism, and an international network of individuals and institutions motivated by a commitment to thought, instructive action and the...**extension of humanistic values**. Also characteristic of the Institute are its approach to problems based on an **analysis of the** situation as a **whole**, its orientation toward the development of policy alternatives, its consideration for the human past and present and its commitment to the future, its emphasis on humanistic values as an essential guide to decision-making and its systematic efforts to achieve impact on public debate and policy-making with a view to developing national goals in its various areas of concern.

As we start a new stage, our efforts must be...to realize more effectively our total commitment so that **we may be faithful to our calling of humanism and reflective thought leading to constructive action**. (377-378) [Emphasis added]

In concluding his book, Hyman explains that the “governing attitude” which “informs the inner life of the Institute” has a “negative and a positive side.” On the negative side of this attitude, they are “unaware” of the ordinance “Conquer but spare.” When they are in a majority, they insist that the “majority has a clear title of right to take all.” When in a minority, they “insist that the majority has no right to anything except at the sufferance of the minority.” The positive side of this attitude understands that the “data of the political process” are the “wants and needs” of “real” people who “must be addressed in the language of choice, which is the language of ‘if.’” If we do this, the possible consequences might be thus and

so; but if we do that, the possible consequences might be the other way around.” Real people “must be galvanized into acts of choice” and “share” in the “decisions affecting their destiny.” The positive side understands that the “problems of success can be as difficult as the problems of failure” and the “**object of politics is justice** and not the exercise of power merely for the sake of dominion itself” (379-380). Unfortunately, human nature being what it is, history has proven again and again that the negative side always wins out.

Keep in mind that this was only a glimpse of Aspen from its inception in 1948 until 1975 and is therefore limited to that period and not beyond. Today, Aspen is still going strong and holds its Executive Seminars as before. It has now become part of the establishment. Elected representatives make yearly treks to Aspen for “orientation.” In assessing Aspen’s effectiveness from its inception to 1975, Hyman explains that “Mental and moral sensibilities...work their effects slowly and quietly” with no “trumpets to announce either the onset of a new mental and moral order or the decay [read: destruction] of a pre-existing one.” However, Aspen has/is playing a major role in “reshaping of the mental and moral life of an epoch” (8), the results of which we are now suffering. More important is the eternal souls who lost their faith at Aspen.

Appendix

Below is a partial list of individuals who were affiliated with the Aspen Institute, of which many played major roles in preparing America for what we're seeing today. Some of the names the reader may recognize.

Dean Acheson (former secretary of state)--"helped shape the Aspen Institute" and "Special Participant" (Hyman Aspen 190). Acheson was a "friend" of communist spy Alger Hiss and the law partner of his brother, Donald (Isaacson and Thomas 466-467). Prior to Hiss's exposure as a spy, Acheson had "worked [with] and counseled" him and a "silver tray on Acheson's desk bore Hiss's signature, alongside those of other members of the 'Nine-Thirty Club--or Prayer Meeting,'" [meetings held in 1946 by Acheson and attended by Hiss and the others]. Acheson "had secretly helped Hiss prepare his defense before the House Un-American Activities Committee" before his later trial and conviction. At a press conference on the day Hiss was sentenced, Acheson stated: "I should like to make clear that whatever the outcome of any appeal which Mr. Hiss or his lawyers might take in this case I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss" (490-491). This arrogance reveals the extent of control Acheson and comrades had in this country during this time. Today, the control is even more complete, but it's hidden now as it was then, at least to the public.

It was Supreme Court Justice (1916) Louis Brandeis, one of the leaders of "Progressivism" and Felix Frankfurter, then professor at Harvard Law school and Brandeis' personally "paid political lobbyist and lieutenant," who were responsible for Acheson and Hiss' government positions throughout their political careers. "Working together over a period of twenty-five years," Brandeis and Frankfurter "placed a network of disciples (including Dean Acheson, a former law clerk of Brandeis, and Alger Hiss) in positions of influence, and labored diligently for the enactment of their desired programs." After "his own appointment to the Court" (1939), Frankfurter continued placing a "network of disciples in various agencies and working through this network for the realization of his own goals." These appointees, in turn, served as the "eyes and ears" of Brandeis and Frankfurter and as "point men in the effort to place more troops in the agencies." Their work together, when seen as a whole, represents a "vast, carefully planned and orchestrated political crusade first by Brandeis through Frankfurter and then by Frankfurter on his own to accomplish extrajudicial political goals." It was the "**progressive movement**" of which Brandeis was a leader, that was "so dear to his heart." So "extensive was the extrajudicial behavior of both Brandeis and Frankfurter that one is left puzzled as to how it could have remained secret for so long." Indeed, both individuals' "involvement remained hidden not just from the general public" but from their "closest allies and supporters" (Murphy 10-13, 20, 40, 111, 116-118).

Moreover, Robert Hutchins went to Washington in March 1950 to "talk to **Justice Felix Frankfurter**" just prior to William Benton making his "maiden speech" in the Senate." **Frankfurter explained to Hutchins "the bitter attack being mounted against Secretary of State Dean Acheson** and the fact that no one in the Senate had yet come to Acheson's defense." Frankfurter "wondered why Benton in particular had not done so. Hutchins put the question to Benton, who was persuaded that he had a duty to

speak out on behalf of Acheson and the State Department.” As a result, Benton’s “takeoff point” in his maiden speech to the Senate (a proposal for the **Marshall Plan**) was a “defense of Acheson” (Hyman Benton 428). Later, Benton “led the Senate fight against Senator Joseph McCarthy” which ultimately led to his censuring by the Senate (511, 602-603).

Mortimer Adler--Adler published a book in 1991, Haves Without Have-Nots: Essays For The 21st Century On Democracy and Socialism, that was dedicated to Mikhail Gorbachev “whose perestroika opened the window to this [book’s] vision of the future in the United States, Eastern Europe, and the Soviet Union.” The chapters in the book “derive their substance” from “seminars or lectures” by Adler given at Aspen (xiii). Adler explains: “In my long experience of conducting Aspen seminars, in which the Communist Manifesto is read and discussed, I have always begun by saying that Marx is more right than wrong” (62). When the “six mistakes in Marxist-Leninist doctrine are corrected,” says Adler, the “positive picture that emerges” is that “communism chose the wrong **means** to establish socialism.” Rather than the abolition of private ownership replaced by state capitalism as the Soviets had done, Adler says “A society that aims at nonegalitarian socialism serves basic human **needs**...Private-property capitalism, not state capitalism, is the effective **means** for producing enough consumable wealth and providing a decent standard of living to satisfy all the reasonable wants of its members” (66). Moreover, the same reforms used to rectify poverty in welfare states must be used to “rectify the injustices suffered by have-not **nations**,” that is, to “eliminate the inequitable distribution of resources and wealth” on a worldwide scale (319). This “can be done only by the **regulation of a world economy by a world government**” and “what is true of poverty on a worldwide basis is similarly true of racism on a worldwide basis” (320). Adler advocates the “centralization of ultimate authority in the organs of a world government” including “police power,” with a “decentralization of the functions to be performed by its subordinate components, each exercising the measure of residual autonomy that is requisite for an effective performance of its special function” (321-322). This describes the function of the Systems hierarchy advocated by MIT, Club of Rome, etc. and Ervin Laszlo who developed the philosophy of Total Quality Management and whom Edwards Deming said to read to understand that philosophy.

Robert Amory (deputy director of the CIA)--Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (Hyman Aspen 149).

Dr. Ernest Anderson (Los Alamos Scientific Laboratories)--Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

Herbert Bayer--trustee and Aspen Institute Founding Fellow who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 199).

Louis Benezet (president, Colorado College)--Aspen trustee (148).

Leonard Bernstein--"Special Participant" who also "helped shape the Aspen Institute" (190, 198).

William Benton--Benton was a man "for whom ideas took on meaning only when related to practical action." He was an Aspen trustee and member of the "American Policy Commission," the forerunner of the **Committee for Economic Development (CED)** (100). (The members of the CED, headed by Hoffman and Benton, would be hand-picked by Hoffman and Benton and later accused by a *local unwashed* Chamber of Commerce of being a "left-wing, communist-infiltrated organization.") The American Policy Commission was founded by Benton, Hoffman and **Harold Lasswell** and was based on Marxist *praxis*. Its goal was to form an "educational union" between "economic professors and corporate presidents" and "a staff of social scientists" from the University of Chicago to set forth ways to bridge the "gap between **knowledge and public policy**," that is, theory and practice. Lasswell, then a faculty member at the University of Chicago and an "after-hours companion" to Benton, (when Benton later worked in the state department, Lasswell would be his "advisor") had "pioneered in the study of public opinion and propaganda." His interest had then turned to the question of "power in all its forms--political, economic, military, **social, cultural, religious**." Consequently, he "applied to **group political behavior** a number of concepts drawn from the field of psychology and psychoanalysis." It was Lasswell that Benton relied on to work out the "details" of the American Policy Commission. Its interesting that in 1955, Benton would travel to the Soviet Union to "study at close range the media and management of Soviet propaganda." Upon arrival, he diverted his attention to the "study of Soviet education," even enrolling his 13 year old son in "Moscow School Number One." Although American embassy officials in Moscow had never heard of such schools, there were "scores of such schools conducted in many languages where Russian boys were being trained to serve their country abroad as diplomats, scientists--or spies." The "National Defense Education Act of 1958" basically grew out of this visit and this drive for federal aid to education was led by Benton, "Adlai Stevenson and **Anna Rosenberg**." Moreover, Benton then went on to "tackle the larger needs of American education" through the subcommittee on education of the Advisory Council of the National Democratic Committee. Headed by Benton, the policy drafted by this group influenced the "measures President Kennedy advocated for education, measures which were to be enacted in great part during his and the Johnson administration" (Hyman Benton 194, 232-233, 267-268, 381, 513-520).

Paul Hoffman "was married to **Anna Rosenberg**, who was an "intimate friend and collaborator" of **Franklin and Eleanor Roosevelt**. Born into a "half-Jewish Hungarian household," Anna had come to the U. S. with her family as a young girl. Her firm, Anna Rosenberg Associates, "specialized in labor-management problems and public relations." One of her clients in the thirties was Nelson Rockefeller, who she introduced to President Roosevelt and "his appointment as Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs followed." Benton had met Anna when "he himself became a consultant to Nelson Rockefeller." It was Rockefeller and his consultants who determined "what Inter-American affairs were all about." Out of these sessions "Nelson Rockefeller put together a program--confined by statute to the Western Hemisphere--which made him the 'grandfather' of many of the programs Benton himself was to extend around the world

after he became assistant secretary of state for public affairs.” Said Benton of Anna, “She alone could recast our advice in political ways that would win acceptance from the President, the Congress, the Bureaucracy and the press. We would have been lost babes in the Washington woods without her.” Although Roosevelt wanted to appoint her secretary of labor or ambassador to Moscow, she refused but in 1942 she closed the doors to her firm to accept her appointment by Roosevelt as “manpower commissioner of New York.” Here, she became close friends with General George C. Marshall, the U. S. Army chief of staff. At the beginning of the Korean War, Marshall, who was then secretary of defense, recommended to President Truman that Anna be appointed assistant secretary of defense, “the first woman ever to hold such a post” (384, 235-237).

Benton was an early “hero” to the “Jewish community” in America. Indeed, “every major Jewish organization in the United States has honored him with its highest award.” Benton, being non-Jewish, even received the rare honor of “trusteeship of Brandeis University [of Abraham Maslow fame], followed by an honorary degree from it.” (Ibid. 594) Benton’s achievements include everything from the “**American founding father and patriarch of UNESCO**” to playing the key role in initiating and facilitating the Senate into “censuring” Joseph McCarthy. Although Benton had initiated and facilitated McCarthy’s censure, it was a Republican Boston banker and member of the American Policy Commission, Senator Ralph Flanders, who Benton tapped to issue the “ultimate censure vote” (234, 541, 602-603, 607).

Francois Bourricaud (University of Paris)--A participant in Aspen’s “The Intellectuals and Power--Their Role and Responsibility” (Hyman Aspen 179).

Thornton Bradshaw (president, Atlantic Richfield)--A participant in Aspen’s “The Intellectual and Power--Their Role and Responsibility” (179).

Sylvain Bromberger (MIT)--A participant in Aspen’s continuing workshop on “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Lester Brown--A participant in Aspen’s continuing workshop on “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Heinrich Bruening (the last of Germany’s pre-Nazi leaders who came to America and joined the Harvard Faculty after Hitler came to power)--Member of the board of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation (44).

Sir Alan Bullock (former vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford)--Aspen Fellow and trustee (5).

Warren E. Burger (Chief Justice of the U. S. Supreme Court)--member of Aspen Institute International Board of Trustees (318).

Henry Steele Commager--Frequent Scholar-in-Residence at Aspen (311).

Jack Conway (key aide to Walter Reuther, United Auto Workers; became head of the Public Employees Union)--Moderator at Aspen (116-117).

Marion Countess Doenhoff (publisher of Die Zeit)--Aspen Institute trustee who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 200).

Gaylord Freeman (president and chairman, First National Bank of Chicago)--Aspen board member who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute.” In an encouraging letter Freeman wrote to Eurich, he “vividly described the unsettling impact of the Executive Seminars on business executives--and their importance for that very reason” (190, 191, 149, 218).

Gerald Ford (representative and later president of the U. S.)--A conference participant who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 196).

Richard Gardner (Columbia University Law School)--A participant in the continuing workshop of “National Alternatives and Their Implication” (182).

Jose Ortega Y Gasset (former professor of metaphysics at the University of Madrid)--Gasset was a Spanish philosopher and celebrated “humanist” who founded the Institute of the Humanities in Madrid in 1948. He was a participant at the initial Goethe celebration and advisor to Paepcke on the Executive Seminars and an Aspen trustee (46-47, 93, 97).

William Gomberg (Wharton School of Finance and Industry)--Aspen trustee (148).

John Herron--Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen (148).

Shirley M. Hufstedler (judge on U. S. Court of Appeals in Los Angeles)--Aspen trustee who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (148).

Robert Ingersoll (president of the Borg-Warner Corporation)--Aspen trustee and future Ambassador to Japan (148).

Lady Barbara Ward Jackson (president of the International Institute for Environment and Development in London)--A “Special Participant” who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute (190, 202).

William Janss (president of the Janss Investment Company)--Aspen trustee (149).

Barnaby C. Kenny (president of Brown University)--Moderator at Aspen (119).

Robert Kennedy (U. S. Attorney General)--A conference participant who “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 194). From what I gather from other sources, Robert was considered one of Aspen’s own.

Glen A. Lloyd (chairman of the Board of Trustees at the University of Chicago and senior partner of a leading Chicago law firm)--Vice-chairman of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation and original member of the board (43, 148).

Thomas Mann (writer)--Member of the Board of Directors of the Goethe Bicentennial Foundation (44).

Thurgood Marshall (U. S. Supreme Court)--A “Special Participant” who also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 193).

George C. McGhee (president of McGhee Production Company; counselor to the U. S. Department of State and future U. S. Ambassador to Germany)--Aspen trustee (149).

Robert S. McNamara (former secretary of defense)--Aspen trustee and “frequent participant in various Institute programs.” He “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 203).

John F. Merriam (president of a “western utility company”)--Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen. Merriam was also chairman of the Committee on Educational Development’s Subcommittee on Education. Aspen and this group co-sponsored a “special conference” on “economic education” for three successive years. It began with a 1963 conference on the “kind” of economic education then provided by the “nation’s business schools” and obviously why it was outmoded (148, 167).

Jean Monnet--(The first recipient of the Aspen Humanistic Statesman Award, 258) Best known for his “work in bringing about the European Common Market.” Born to an aristocratic family, Monnet was a diplomat “attached to the British Purchasing Commission,” a liaison agency to the United States government which consisted of various “British diplomatic missions in Washington.” After the fall of his native France, he came to Washington in 1940. Here he formed a “partnership” with **Felix Frankfurter** and through him, “met decision-makers at the highest levels of government,” including the “president” and of course “John McCloy.” His motives in 1940, as was Frankfurter’s, was to “prepare the United States for fighting the war” (Murphy 212-213).

Sir Leslie K. Munro (a New Zealander and president of the **United Nations General Assembly**)--Aspen trustee (Hyman Aspen 149).

Harald Pabst--Member of the original board of trustees at Aspen (148).

John G. Powers (Academy for Educational Development; former president of Prentice-Hall)--Powers “helped shape the Aspen Institute.” He had been an Aspen trustee but was then serving as a “special advisor to the Institute’s president.” It was this “Aspenite who wished to introduce American businessmen to Far Eastern Culture.” Encouraged by Alvin Eurich and aided by Phillips Talbot, Powers organized the “Executive Seminars on Far Eastern Thought” at Aspen. They were held for several years but were halted and then

brought back later. Some of the problems were “springing either from forthright differences of opinion or from **emotional unease**” and “would haunt the attempts to introduce Japanese, Chinese, and Indian texts into the *regular* Executive Seminar.” Eurich said that the seminars on Far Eastern Thought was a “natural outgrowth of the Institute’s organic humanistic concerns” (190, 206).

Walter Reuther (president of the United Auto Workers Union)--Member of Aspen’s advisory board; Special Participant in the Executive Program; Aspen trustee and also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 197).

Walter Orr Roberts (solar astronomer; director of the High Altitude Observatory--a joint venture of the University of Colorado and Harvard in Climax, Colorado; president of a commission of the International Astronomical Union; president-founder of the Corporation for Atmospheric Research- a consortium of forty-nine universities; member of the U. S. Defense Department’s Defense Science Board; member of the Special Committee of the International Geophysical Year in Barcelona (1956) and Moscow (1958); member of NASA’s Solar Physics Subcommittee of the Space Science Steering Committee; president of the **American Association for the Advancement of Science, [AAAS]**--Roberts was attracted to astronomy “mainly” because of its effects on the “**whole** of the earth below--climate, man, beasts, soil, water, crops, cultures, economics, social patterns, and political structures.” The “quality” of his “theoretical” research would eventually make him “internationally” known as the “refounding father” of solar astronomy. In effect, he was a “political scientist, **always searching for ways in which the theoretical and applied (theory and practice) sciences could promote the transnational cause of human welfare.**” As president of AAAS, Roberts would “press that search” as a member of its Committee on Science in the Promotion of Human Welfare and chairman of its Committee on the Public Understanding of Science. He would “press that search” as well as a member of the Council of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, as a member of the **Committee of Consultants for the United Nations Stockholm Conference on the Environment**, and as a “vital intellectual force” as a member of the Aspen family. Roberts’ participation with Aspen began in 1953 when James H. Smith Jr., Assistant Secretary for Air in the **Eisenhower Administration** and “enthusiast regarding the Aspen Institute,” invited him to Aspen to participate as a special guest in an Executive Seminar. By the end of the first session, moderated by Mortimer Adler, Roberts and Adler had “formed an intimate and durable friendship.” Thereafter, Roberts was a constant participant in Aspen’s Executive Seminar, either as “special guest” or “moderator,” where he “often” played the “role” of “scientific adversary to Adler’s philosophical humanism.” Such eventually led to the assertion that the “iron line of division traditionally drawn between science and the humanities was **false**” (114-116). The goal was to merge the two which resulted in the application of the laws of nature to human groups, organizations, etc., as well as merging science with religion [occult]--an apt description of General Systems Theory, the philosophy of TQM.

Daniel Schoor (Washington correspondent of CBS News)--“Frequent” participant at Aspen that also “helped shape the Aspen Institute” (190, 201).

Herbert Schlosser (president of NBC)--Participant at Aspen's annual Broadcasters' Workshop and also "helped shape the Aspen Institute" (190, 208).

James H. Smith, Jr. (Assistant Secretary for Air in the Eisenhower Administration)--Aspen trustee (115, 149).

Soedjatmoko (former Indonesian Ambassador to the U. S.)--Aspen trustee and Scholar-in-Residence (192).

John V. Spachner (executive vice-president of the Container Corporation of America)--Aspen board member (149).

Maurice S. Strong--(executive director of the United Nations Environment Program)--Aspen trustee; Leader of several Institute programs and also "helped shape the Aspen Institute" (190, 205). Strong's involvement in the New World Order (especially in education and the occult through the United Nations) is and remains so great that it would require a paper in itself.

Robert L. Stearns--Member of the original board at Aspen (148).

Adlai E. Stevenson--Served as "Special Guest" in Executive Seminar and a participant in the Aspen Health Center (144-145).

Phillips Talbot--Moderated the Asian program on Far Eastern Thought (178).

Lionel Trilling (Columbia University)--Conference participant; Scholar-in-Residence who also "helped shape the Aspen Institute" (190, 195).

Brian Urquhart (special assistant to the secretary-general of the **United Nations**)--Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

George H. Watkins (vice-president of the Chicago firm of Marsh and McLellan)--Aspen board member (149).

Byron White (president of the Social Science Foundation at Denver University; Deputy U. S. Attorney General; justice of the **U. S. Supreme Court**)--Aspen trustee (149).

Admiral Ellis Zacharias (former head of U. S. Navel Intelligence in the Pacific theater "during the post-Pearl Harbor years" of WWII)--Served as Moderator and/or Special Guest at Aspen (149).

*Other individuals who participated in Aspen's Executive Seminars during its first decade included but by no means limited to:

Charles Bohlen--then former U. S. Ambassador to the Soviet Union and future Ambassador of France (150).

William Brennan--U. S. Supreme Court Justice (150).

John Burchard--dean of humanities and social sciences at MIT (150).

Cass Canfield--publisher of Harper & Brothers (150). Harper & Brothers published some of Kurt Lewin's work after his death in the late forties.

Sir Pierson Dixon--Great Britain's Ambassador to France (150).

Lester B. Granger--executive director of the National Urban League (150).

Najeeb Halaby--head of the Federal Aeronautics Administration (150).

O. A. Knight--president of the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers Union (150).

Bayless Manning--Yale University Law School (150).

Major General Glen Martin--deputy director of Plan in the U. S. Air Force (150).

Sterling McMurrin--U. S. Commissioner of Education (150).

Carey McWilliams--editor of The Nation (150).

Dr. Sammuel Miller--dean of Harvard Divinity School (150).

Jacob Potosky--general president of Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America (150).

C. L. Sulzberger--New York Times (150).

Leonard Woodcock--vice-president of the United Auto Workers (150).

“Major representatives of the American scientific community” (many were emigrants) of which Aspen initially brought the “business leaders” into “face-to-face discussions” in the Executive Seminars included: (151)

Hans Bethe

Harrison Brown

Enrico Fermi

Donald Hughes

George Kistiakovsky

Gerard Kuiper

Hermann Muller

Leo Szilard

WORKS CITED

- Adler, Mortimer. Haves Without Have-Nots. Macmillan Publishing Co., New York, 1991.
- Durant, Will. The Story of Philosophy. Simon & Schuster, Inc. 1926, 1977 Edition.
- Educational Planning in the USSR. UNESCO: International Institute for Educational Planning, 1968.
- Fermi, Laura. Illustrious Immigrants. University of Chicago Press, 1968.
- Gramsci, Antonio. Selections from the Prison Notebooks, edited and translated by Geoffrey Smith and Quintin Hoare. International Publishers, 1995 Edition.
- Goals for Americans: The Report of the President's Commission on National Goals. Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1960.
- Gunnell, John G. The Descent of Political Theory. University of Chicago Press, 1993.
- Hayman, Ronald. Thomas Mann. Bloomsbury, 1995.
- Heilbroner, Robert. Marxism: For and Against. W. W. Norton & Co., New York-London, 1980.
- Hill, Paul T. and David Hornbeck, The Business Roundtable Participation Guide: A Primer for Business on Education, Second Edition, 1991.
- Hyman, Sidney. The Aspen Idea. University of Oklahoma Press, 1975.
- Hyman, Sidney. The Lives of William Benton. University of Chicago Press, 1969.
- Isaacson, Walter and Evan Thomas. The Wise Men: Six Friends and the World They Made. Touchtone, 1986.
- Jay, Martin. The Dialectical Imagination. Little, Brown and Company, 1973.

Koch, Stephen. Double Lives: Spies And Writers In The Secret Soviet War of Ideas Against the West. Free Press, 1994.

Kohler, Lotte and Hans Saner, editors. Correspondence: Hannah Arendt--Karl Jaspers, 1926-1969. Translated from the German by Robert and Rita Kimber. Harcourt Brace Jovanovich Publishers, 1992.

Lively, Scott and Kevin Abrams. The Pink Swastika: Homosexuality in the Nazi Party. Founders Publishing Corporation, 1995.

Murphy, Bruce Allen. The Brandeis/Frankfurter Connection: The Secret Political Activities of Two Supreme Court Justices. Anchor Press/Doubleday Company, Inc., 1983.

Scholtes, Peter (and other contributors). The TEAM Handbook: How to Use Teams to Improve Quality. Joiner Associates, Inc., 1988.

Trotsky, Leon. Lenin. Blue Ribbon Books, Inc., 1925.

Vazsonyi, Balint. America's 30 Years War: Who Is Winning? Regnery Publishing, Inc., 1998.

Permission for Discernment Ministries to reproduce this report, "The Aspen Institute and Marxist Praxis," in its entirety given by Judy McLemore (author) and Dean Gotcher (publisher). This paper is Vol. 1 of A Series of Research Papers entitled *The Architects of Total Quality Management, General Systems Theory and Marxist Theory-Praxis*.

Vol. 2 "New School for Social Research and the University in Exile/Graduate Faculty"

Vol. 3 "Critical Theory Marxism Dialectical Method and Total Quality Management"

Vol. 4 "The Marxist Theory & Practice Behind Total Quality Management"

This Aspen report is available for a gift of \$10 to the Institution for Authority Research, Dean Gotcher, Box 233, Herndon, KS 67739. iardeangotcher@yahoo.com. \$25 for the complete Vol. 1-4.