



Orwell's "Newspeak"; McGrath's "Politically Correct Crypt"; Sensitivity Training for Oldthinkers; Principles of Mind Control; *The Manchurian Candidate*

Orwell, George. "Principles of Newspeak." App. In *Animal Farm and 1984*. (Harcourt, 2003), 373-74, 378-79:

Newspeak was the official language of Oceania \ŏ' shē-an' ē-a\ and had been devised to meet the ideological needs of Ingsoc, or English Socialism. In the year 1984 there was not as yet anyone who used Newspeak as his sole means of communication, either in speech or writing. It was expected that Newspeak would have finally superceded Oldspeak (or Standard English) by about the year 2050. (p. 373)

The purpose of Newspeak was not only to provide a medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc, but to make all other modes of thought impossible. It was intended that when Newspeak had been adopted once and for all and Oldspeak forgotten, a heretical thought—that is, a thought diverging from the principles of Ingsoc—should be literally unthinkable, at least so far as thought is dependent on words. Its vocabulary was so constructed as to give exact and often very subtle expression to every meaning that a Party member could properly wish to express, while excluding all other meanings and also the possibility of arriving at them by indirect methods. This was done partly by the invention of new words, but chiefly by eliminating undesirable words, and by stripping such words as remained of unorthodox meanings, and so far as possible of all secondary meanings whatever. To give a single example. The word *free* still existed in Newspeak, but it could only be used in such statements as "This dog is free from lice" or "This field is free from weeds." It could not be used in its old sense of "politically free" or "intellectually free" since political and intellectual freedom no longer existed even as concepts, and were therefore of necessity nameless. Quite apart from the suppression of definitely heretical words, reduction of vocabulary was regarded as an end in itself, and no word that could be dispensed with was allowed to survive. Newspeak was designed not to extend but to *diminish* the range of thought, and this purpose was indirectly assisted by cutting the choice of words down to a minimum. (pp. 373-74)

As we have already seen in the case of the word *free*, words which had once borne a heretical meaning were sometimes retained for the sake of convenience, but only with the undesirable meanings purged out of them. Countless other words such as *honor*, *justice*, *morality*, *internationalism*, *democracy*, *science*, and *religion* had simply ceased to exist. A few blanket words covered them, and, in covering them, abolished them. All words grouping themselves round the concepts of liberty and equality, for instance, were contained in the single word *crimethink*, while all words grouping themselves round the concepts of objectivity and rationalism were contained in the single word *oldthink*. Greater precision would have been dangerous. What was required in a party member was an outlook similar to that of the ancient Hebrew who knew, without knowing much else, that all nations other than his own worshiped "false Gods." He did not need to know that these gods were called Baal, Osiris \ŏ-sī' ris\, Moloch, Ashtaroth, and the like; probably the less he knew about them the better for his orthodoxy.

He knew Jehovah and the commandments of Jehovah; he knew, therefore, that all gods with other names or other attributes were false gods. In somewhat the same way, the party member knew what constituted right conduct, and in exceedingly vague, generalized terms he knew what kinds of departure from it were possible. (pp. 378-79)

McGrath, Roger D. "Tales from the Politically Correct Crypt." *Chronicles*, September 2002, 14-16:



Our nation is clearly in the midst of a culture war. The most important battles are not being fought in Washington, D.C., but in our media, churches, schools, civic organizations, youth groups, and universities. Western civilization, as we have known it, and America, as we have known it, are losing. Few people seem willing to take a principled stand against the onslaught. Most Americans retreat before a shot is fired. They think, evidently, that they can escape—and they can, for a time—having to deal with the changes wrought by the globalists, the social engineers, the postmodernists, the deconstructionists, and the socialists. But that escape is, at best, a dereliction of duty, and, at worst, cowardice in the face of the enemy. The enemy, meanwhile, is emboldened, gains momentum, acquires fresh troops and new bases of supply, and launches new offensives. The battleground where people are least likely to dig in and fight is the university. (p. 14)

Looking back, it is easy to see the transformation that academe was undergoing during the 1970s and 1980s. At the time, though, what is now identified as “cultural Marxism” or “political correctness” was not so well understood. One day in the mid-80s, I had an epiphany: Political correctness is a religion—a secular religion. There can be no dissent, no difference of opinion. Heretics are burned or banished, executed or exiled. Until my moment of enlightenment, I had difficulty understanding why some professors went into a rage when anyone disagreed with them. I had not yet realized that the politically correct simply could not accept a difference of opinion. Once I understood that they were religious zealots, I realized how naïve and foolish I had been. Debate or even reasoned discussion was not an option.

This is why so many history departments have been cleansed of the politically *incorrect*. There is no diversity—of the intellectual and political variety—in these departments.

The cleansing begins whenever the cultural Marxists gain control of the various committees in the department. Often, their actions are subtle and, as a consequence, more insidious. The politically correct zealots might find that their more moderate or conservative colleagues have large enrollments in their classes, excellent student evaluations, and a solid list of publications. Unable to attack such professors directly, the zealots instead concentrate on controlling the hiring of new faculty or revising the course description in the college catalogue. A professor cannot be told what to say in his classroom, but he is required to teach a course according to its description in the catalogue.

For example, the politically correct find a professor teaching the American West—the westward march of American pioneers across the continent, carving a civilization out of the wilderness and establishing democratic institutions—particularly odious. However, by every measure, the professor is highly rated. What to do? Change the catalogue course description. The course now becomes a study of issues concerning the interaction of different races and cultures, genocidal wars, American imperialism, the oppression of women and people of color, and environmental devastation.

The professor must now restructure his entire course to fit a politically correct agenda and ignore or treat with a jaundiced eye the Boones, Crocketts, and Jacksons crossing the Appalachians; the buckskin-clad mountain men planting their traps in the beaver streams of the Rockies and Far West; gold-fevered prospectors exploring every nook and cranny from California to Colorado and from Mexico to Alaska; pioneers struggling across deserts and mountains to the Pacific Coast; cattle barons grazing their beeves on the High Plains and declaring themselves masters of all they survey; the Pony Express racing through mountain blizzards, scorching deserts, and hostile Indians; teamsters cursing their way over the Santa Fe Trail; construction crews laying gleaming rails across the continent; gunfighters dueling in the streets of boom towns; highwaymen calling out to stagecoach drivers, “Throw down the box!”; and the 7th Cavalry riding out to battle with the regimental band playing “Garry Owen.” All such topics would have to be ignored or discussed only in relation to a politically correct agenda. (p. 15)

That, of course, is the point. The cultural Marxists believe there should be no time to discuss such Americans and such events for their own sake. Those frontiersmen and those epic events are too romantic, too heroic, too inspiring. It is now the duty of the university to teach students to hate America and to teach white males to hate themselves. Meanwhile, we Americans are financing these perversions with our tax dollars and our donations. We are financing our own destruction. (pp. 15-16)



Standard operating procedure for lower-division survey courses calls for the professor to lecture to the entire class two or three times weekly in a large lecture hall and for individual T.A.'s (Teaching Assistants) to meet with smaller groups of students once a week in "sections." Problems began within a few weeks. One of the T.A.'s—I shall call him "Don"—confided in me that three of the T.A.'s were attempting to convince the others to file a complaint against me over my lectures. I expressed surprise because they had not said anything to me—and I had always encouraged discussion. "They don't work that way," replied Don. "They're all members of the RCP." The reference left me nonplussed. "What's the RCP?" I asked. Don looked at me incredulously and, then, realizing that I was not kidding, said, "The Revolutionary Communist Party." That explained what "RCP" stood for, but I was still at a loss concerning the organization. "It's the Maoist branch of the communists," declared Don, looking at me as if I had just fallen off the turnip truck.

My purportedly RCP teaching assistants did everything they could to undermine my lectures in their sections. They had one major problem, though—the facts. They were unable to challenge anything I said. In one of their conspiratorial meetings with the other T.A.'s, Don asked them if they could refute any of my facts. They grew frustrated, and, finally, one of them screamed, "There are some facts students just shouldn't know." Facts do have a rather inconvenient way of interfering with the imposition of Marxist models upon history. The screaming T.A. was Sheri. By now, she was convinced that I was a fascist pig.

By the time I got to World War II, the activists were nearly hysterical. The politically correct proclaim that Japan was forced to go to war against the racist and imperialistic United States to defend her "unique culture." I took my students back to the Japanese sneak attack on Port Arthur and the Russo-Japanese War, the Japanese annexation of Korea, the Japanese participation in World War I to gain islands in the Pacific, the fortification of those islands against the League of Nations mandate, the invasion of Manchuria \man-chur' ē-a\ and the creation of the puppet state of Manchoukuo \man' chu' kwo\, the bombing of the *Panay* \pa-nī\, the Rape of Nanking \nan' jin\. I described the Japanese atrocities in China in gruesome detail. At the end of the lecture, a Chinese girl came up to me in tears and said, "Thank you, thank you, Professor McGrath. In all my years in school no one has ever dared to tell the story of Nanking."

For purposes of evaluating teaching assistants, a professor is required to attend each of his T.A.'s sections at least once. While at one of the sections, I listened to a student ask the T.A. why we dropped the bomb on Japan and not on Germany. Without blinking, the T.A. immediately responded, "Another example of racist America." Later, in a private conference with the T.A., I asked if he might want to rethink his response. He stared blankly at me. The following dialogue then took place.

McGrath: "When did Germany surrender?"
 T.A.: "I don't know exactly."
 McGrath: "7 May 1945."
 T.A.: "Oh."
 McGrath: "Do you know when we first test-exploded the bomb?"
 T.A.: "Not exactly."
 McGrath: "16 July 1945."
 T.A.: "Oh."

The T.A. looked at me nonplussed. I was stunned. He either did not realize the incredible mistake he had made when responding to the student's question, or he didn't care. I explained to him that the bomb was not ready for actual use until more than two weeks after the first test explosion. Should we then have dropped it on Germany, I asked, three months after she had surrendered unconditionally? Again, no reaction. Wouldn't most of us be horribly embarrassed by such an ignorant error? I further noted that the Manhattan Project was about producing a bomb for use against Germany, not Japan, and that we killed far more German civilians in the firebombings of German cities than we did in the atomic bombings of Hiroshima \hē-rō-shē' ma\ and Nagasaki \na-ga-sa' kē\. It meant nothing to him.



This T.A. may very well be in a history department at a university today, lecturing to a new generation of students. Universities are turning out hundreds like him, believers in the secular religion of political correctness, facts be damned—if they are known. But, then, according to deconstructionists and deconstructionism, there are no facts. Facts are nothing more than artificial constructs of a particular culture, perspective, language, and consciousness. Please tell me that the deconstructionists dropped too much acid in the 60s, and their synapses have misfired ever since. In the meantime, I will stick to the facts. (p. 16)

(Roger D. McGrath is the author of Gunfighters, Highwaymen, and Vigilantes.)

- 66) Newspeak may be defined as euphemism, circumlocution, and the inversion of customary meanings. Violate the Code of the Progressives and you will bring down upon yourself the modern-day equivalent of Communist propaganda.
- 67) The politically correct euphemism for “struggle meetings” is “sensitivity training” where you are indoctrinated to either buy into the party line or be excommunicated, fired, or banished from membership in the human race.
- 68) But to quote Solomon, “There is nothing new under the sun.” The techniques of propaganda and brainwashing were developed in the Garden of Eden. The con-job Lucifer engineered against Ishah in Genesis 3:1-6 was the original use of propaganda which resulted in the woman choosing to be brainwashed.
- 69) Sensitivity Training is currently being employed without question or protest by the self-anointed intelligentsia of our country. It is nothing more than classic Communist propaganda and brainwashing techniques.
- 70) This is orchestrated by ambassador demons with the intent of destroying the divine institutions in our society. It is an example of the age-old technique invented by Lucifer in the garden to influence those negative to truth to accept human viewpoint thinking so they can then be manipulated by his cosmic system.
- 71) In order to defend your soul against this current edition of satanic propaganda called political correctness here are some principles of propaganda and brainwashing:
 1. Propaganda is a system used to change your beliefs, attitudes, and standards. It is a process designed to change the way you think.
 2. Propaganda uses slogans, half-truths, music, drama, and of course words to change the way you think.

Frankenheimer, John (director). *The Manchurian Candidate*. Frank Sinatra, Laurence Harvey, Angela Lansbury, et al. (Metro Goldwyn Mayer: The Frank Sinatra Trust #10, 1962), DVD: liner n.; sc. 10:

The Manchurian Candidate is a suspenseful political thriller. Ask Major Bennett Marco (Frank Sinatra) and he'll say that Sergeant Raymond Shaw (Laurence Harvey) is a hero worthy of the Medal of Honor. But despite what he says, Marco suspects otherwise. A bizarre, recurring nightmare gave him the uneasy feeling that Shaw is something far less heroic and far more insidious. Is it possible that Shaw is a traitor? Can Marco convince the Army of his suspicions? How does Shaw's powerful mother (Angela Lansbury) figure into all this? (liner n.)

In one particular scene we get an excellent description of the tragic results of buying the lie. In it we are provided great insight into the process by Dr. Yen Lo (Khigh Dhiegh), Director of the Pavlov Institute. He is analyzing the results of the institute's efforts on American Sergeant Raymond Shaw:



Yen Lo: "A normally conditioned American has been trained to kill and then have no memory of having killed. Without memory of his deed he cannot possibly feel guilt. Nor would he have, of course, any fear of being caught. Having been relieved of those uniquely American symptoms—guilt and fear—he cannot possibly give himself away. Raymond will remain an outwardly normal, productive, and sober, respected member of the community. And I should say if properly used he is police-proof." (Sc. 10)

3. Propaganda may use shame, humiliation, guilt, embarrassment, threats, and character assassination to encourage you to accept these new standards.
4. Brainwashing is the result of propaganda.
5. Brainwashing is only possible among those who have no integrity. If you have no integrity you have no honor and therefore your thinking can be changed under pressure.
6. The Word of God teaches the concept of absolutes which are principles that do not change or alter regardless of the time, place, era, or circumstance.
7. God is immutable. God's word is the same yesterday, today, and forever. Therefore, truth is absolute and immutable.
8. Anything that varies from the truth is a lie.
9. The origin of truth is the essence of God. He has shared His truth with us so that He can give us His best as a reward if we believe and apply His truth in our lives.
10. Those who have truth in their souls have integrity and understand that no matter how appealing the lie may be, truth is the only road to freedom.
11. Lies eventually enslave those who believe them.
12. If you possess truth in your soul and remain loyal to that truth under pressure you will always reject the lie.
13. Those who possess truth, namely Bible doctrine circulating in their streams of consciousness, have integrity of soul and when they remain loyal to this truth under pressure their integrity is expressed outwardly as honor.
14. Such an individual cannot be brainwashed.
15. Nevertheless, in order to change the way you think, evil people use the following system:

Objective: Get you to believe the lie.

Means: Give you false information called propaganda.

End: A change in the way you think.

Result: *You* choose to be brainwashed.
16. Propaganda is what they do to you
17. Brainwashing is what you do to yourself.