

How the Specter of Communism Is Ruling Our World

Chapter Twelve: Sabotaging Education (Part I)

Table of Contents

Introduction

1. The Specter of Communism in Western Universities
 - a. The Severe Leftist Slant of University Faculties
 - b. Reshaping Traditional Academics With Communist Ideology
 - c. Using New Academic Fields for Ideological Infiltration
 - d. Promoting Leftist Radicalism
 - e. Denying America's Great Traditions
 - f. Struggling Against the Classics of Western Civilization
 - g. Monopolizing Textbooks and Liberal Arts
 - h. University 'Re-education': Brainwashing and Moral Corruption

References

Introduction

Education plays an important role in fostering individual well-being and self-fulfilment, maintaining social stability, and securing the future of a

nation. No great civilizations in the history of humanity took education lightly.

The object of education is to maintain humanity's moral standards and preserve its divinely bestowed culture. It is the means by which knowledge and craftsmanship are imparted, as well as how people are socialized.

Traditionally, the well-educated respect Heaven, believe in gods, and seek to follow the virtue of benevolence. They possess extensive knowledge of traditional culture as well as mastery over one or more trades. Dedicated to their vocations, they believe in treating others with kindness. They serve as the pillars of society, national elites, and the guardians of civilization. Their extraordinary character and behavior earn divine favor and blessings.

To destroy humanity, the communist specter aims to sever the connections between man and gods. Thus ruining traditional education is an indispensable step. Communism adopted different strategies to attack and undermine education in both the East and West.

In Eastern countries that are home to deeply seated cultural traditions, deception alone is insufficient to dupe an entire people. This necessitated the systematic slaughter of traditional elites so as to physically cut off the bearers of culture from imparting their heritage to the next generation, while at the same time bombarding the rest of the population with incessant propaganda.

The history and roots of Western culture are comparatively simple, giving communism fertile ground for covertly contaminating society by subverting and sabotaging Western education. In fact, the corruption of Western youth is much more severe when compared with those in China.

During the 2016 U.S. presidential election, the mainstream media's longstanding vilification of conservative candidates, coupled with misleading polls conducted prior to the vote, left many in shock—particularly young college students—once the actual result of the election was announced.

Following Donald Trump's victory, a ridiculous phenomenon appeared in universities around the United States. Some students felt such fear, exhaustion, or emotional trauma from the election that they demanded classes be canceled and exams be rescheduled. In order to relieve students of their stress and anxiety, some prominent schools organized various therapeutic activities. These included playing with Play-Doh or building blocks, coloring, and blowing bubbles. Some even provided pet cats and dogs for students to console themselves with. Many universities provided students with psychological counseling, organized help groups, and established services such as “post-election recovery” or “post-election resources and support.” [1]

The absurdity of how a normal democratic process became more terrifying than a natural disaster or terrorist attack demonstrates the utter failure of the American education system. College students, who should be mature and rational, became intolerant and infantile when confronted with change and adversity.

The complete breakdown of American education is one of the most distressing things to have happened to the country in the last few decades. It signals the success of communism's mission to infiltrate and corrupt Western society.

This chapter focuses mainly on the United States as an example to show how education in free societies is sabotaged by communism. Readers may apply the same logic to infer how education is being undermined in other countries along similar lines.

The communist infiltration of American education manifests in at least five areas.

Directly Promoting Communist Ideology Among the Young. Communist ideology gradually took over Western academia by infiltrating important traditional fields of study, as well as fabricating new sciences beholden to its ideological influence. Literature, history, philosophy, social science, anthropology, law study, multimedia, and other concentrations were inundated with various derivatives of Marxist theory. "Political correctness" became the guideline for censoring free thought on campuses.

Reducing the Young Generation's Exposure to Traditional Culture. Traditional culture, orthodox thought, genuine history, and classical literature are slandered and marginalized in many different ways.

Lowering Academic Standards Starting in Kindergarten and Elementary School. Because instruction has been progressively dumbed down,

students of the new generation are becoming less literate and mathematically capable. They possess less knowledge, and their ability to think critically is stunted. It is hard for these students to handle key questions concerning life and society in a logical and forthright manner, and even harder for them to see through communism's deceptions.

Indoctrinating Young Students With Deviated Notions. As these children grow older, the concepts instilled in them become so strong that they are nearly impossible to identify and correct.

Feeding Students' Selfishness, Greed, and Indulgence. This includes conditioning them to oppose authority and tradition, inflating their egos and sense of entitlement, reducing their ability to understand and tolerate different opinions, and neglecting their psychological growth.

Communism has achieved its objectives in nearly all of the five areas. Leftist ideology is the leading trend in American universities. Scholars with different ideas have been either marginalized in their teaching positions or barred from voicing their traditional views.

Four years of intensive indoctrination leave college graduates with a predisposition for liberalism and progressivism. They are likely to accept atheism, the theory of evolution, and materialism without a second thought. They become narrow-minded "snowflakes" who lack common sense and pursue hedonistic lifestyles without taking responsibility for their actions. They lack knowledge, have a narrow worldview, know very little or nothing about the history of America or the world, and have become the main target for communist deception.

In the eyes of the world, the United States is still a major country in education. For over a century, the United States has been a political, economic, and military superpower. The funds it spends on education far exceed that of most countries. After World War II, American democracy and affluence attracted talented people from around the world. Its STEM graduate programs and professional schools are second to none.

However, a crisis is unfolding within. The proportion of foreign students in graduate STEM programs far exceeds that of American students, and the gap is increasing with each year. [2] This reflects the erosion of elementary, secondary, and post-secondary education across the United States. Students are purposefully being dumbed down and ruined. The consequences are unfolding before our eyes, and there is more yet to come.

KGB defector Yuri Bezmenov, introduced in Chapter Five, described in the early 1980s how communist ideological infiltration in America was nearing completion: “Even if you start right now, here this minute, you start educating [a] new generation of Americans, it will still take you fifteen to twenty years to turn the tide of ideological perception of reality back to normalcy. ...” [3]

A third of a century has passed since Bezmenov gave his interview. During this period, even as we witnessed the downfall of the Soviet Union and other socialist regimes in Eastern Europe, communism’s infiltration and subversion in the West didn’t stop in the least. Communist elements in the West set their sights on education as a primary target. They took over the institution at all tiers, spread their

influence in family education, and promoted their own twisted theories on education and pedagogy.

It should be emphasized that more or less all people in the world, especially those who went to college after the 1960s, received exposure to communist influences. The humanities and social sciences are the worst affected. Most people in these fields were unknowingly indoctrinated, and only a few individuals set out to intentionally promote communist ideology. Here we expose communist aims, so people can identify them and distance themselves.

1. The Specter of Communism in Western Universities

a. The Severe Leftist Slant of University Faculties

One of the most important causes of students embracing socialist or communist ideology, or being influenced by radical ideologies such as feminism and environmentalism (to be discussed later in this book), is the fact that a large proportion of staff in American universities leans to the left.

In a 2007 study titled “The Social and Political Views of American Professors,” among the 1,417 full-time college faculty members surveyed, 44.1 percent considered themselves liberal, 46.1 percent moderate, and only 9.2 percent conservative. Among them, the proportion of conservatives in community colleges was slightly higher (19 percent), and that of liberals was slightly lower (37.1 percent). In art colleges, 61 percent of faculty were liberal, while conservatives made up just 3.9 percent. The study also noted that faculty members

near retirement were more staunchly leftist than new faculty members. In the 50–64 age group, 17.2 percent proclaimed themselves to be leftist activists. The study also stated that most university faculty supported homosexuality and abortion rights. [4]

Studies after 2007 also confirm the leftist trend among professors in four-year universities in the United States. A study published in *Econ Journal Watch* in 2016 surveyed the voter registration status of professors in the departments of history and social sciences in forty leading U.S. universities. Among 7,243 professors surveyed, there were 3,623 Democrats and 314 Republicans, or a ratio of 11.5-to-1. Among the five departments surveyed, the department of history was the most uneven, with a 35-1 ratio. Contrast this with a similar survey from 1968: Among history professors at the time, the ratio of Democrats to Republicans was 2.7-to-1. [5]

Another survey for four-year university faculty in 2016 found that the political inclination of the faculty was uneven, especially in New England. Based on 2014 data, the survey found that the ratio of liberal and conservative professors in colleges and universities nationwide was 6-to-1. In New England, this ratio was 28-to-1. [6] A 2016 study by the Pew Research Center found that 31 percent of the people who had studied in graduate schools held liberal views, 23 percent tended to be liberal, only 10 percent held conservative views, and 17 percent tended to be conservative. The study found that since 1994, the people who had received graduate-level education had increased significantly in holding liberal views. [7]

Scholars who attended a seminar at the American Enterprise Institute in 2016 said that about 18 percent of social scientists in the United States considered themselves Marxists, and only 5 percent considered themselves conservative. [8]

Senator Ted Cruz once commented on the law school of a prestigious school he had attended. “There were more self-declared Communists [in the faculty] than there were Republicans,” he said. “If you asked [them] to vote on whether this nation should become a socialist nation, 80 percent of the faculty would vote yes, and 10 percent would think that was too conservative.” [9]

Communism began its penetration of American education from the time it took root in the United States. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, many American intellectuals have accepted communist ideas or the Fabian socialist variant. [10]

The 1960s counterculture movement produced a large number of young anti-traditional students. In these people’s formative years, they were influenced greatly by cultural Marxism and Frankfurt School theory. In 1973, after President Nixon withdrew American troops from the Vietnam War, student groups associated with the anti-war movement began to fade into obscurity, as the main reason for protest was gone. But the radicalism brewed by these large-scale student movements did not disappear.

Radical students went on to pursue graduate studies in the social and cultural fields — in journalism, literature, philosophy, sociology, education, cultural studies, and the like. Having received their degrees,

they began careers in the institutions with the most influence over society and culture, such as universities, news media, government agencies, and non-governmental organizations. What guided them at that time was mainly the theory of “the long march through the institutions” proposed by Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. This “long march” aimed to alter the most important traditions of Western civilization.

The Frankfurt School philosopher Herbert Marcuse was regarded as a “spiritual godfather” by rebellious Western students. In 1974, he asserted that the New Left did not die, “and it will resurrect in the universities.” [11] In fact, the New Left had not only managed to survive: Its long march through the institutions was massively successful. As one radical professor wrote:

“After the Vietnam War, a lot of us didn’t just crawl back into our literary cubicles; we stepped into academic positions. With the war over, our visibility was lost, and it seemed for a while—to the unobservant—that we had disappeared. Now we have tenure, and the work of reshaping the universities has begun in earnest.” [12]

The term “tenured radicals” was coined by Roger Kimball in his book of the same name, published in 1989. The term referred to the radical students who had been active in the anti-war, civil rights, or feminist movements of the 1960s and later entered universities to teach and obtained tenure in the 1980s. From there, they inculcated students with their system of political values and created a new generation of radicals. Some of these new radicals became department heads and deans. The purpose of their scholarly work is not to explore the truth,

but to use academia as a tool for undermining Western civilization and traditions. They aim to subvert mainstream society and the political system by producing more revolutionaries like themselves.

Once tenured, professors can participate in various committees and have considerable say in recruiting new faculty members, setting academic standards, selecting topics for graduate theses, and determining the direction of research. They have ample opportunity to use their power to exclude candidates who do not conform to their ideology. For this reason, more traditionally minded individuals who teach and do research according to traditional concepts are being steadily marginalized. As professors of the older generation retire, those who replace them are mostly leftist scholars who have been indoctrinated with communist ideas.

Gramsci, who coined “the long march through the institutions,” divided intellectuals into two camps: traditional intellectuals and organic intellectuals. The former are the backbone of maintaining traditional culture and social order, while the organic intellectuals, belonging to the newly emerging classes or groups, play a creative role in the process of fighting for hegemony in their classes or groups. [13] The “proletariat” uses organic intellectuals on its path to seizing cultural and eventually political hegemony.

Many tenured radicals defined themselves as “organic intellectuals” who oppose the current system. Like Gramsci, they follow the Marxian axiom: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it.” [14]

In this way, education for the Left is not about imparting the essence of knowledge and human civilization, but for priming students for radical politics, social activism, and “social justice.” After graduation and upon joining society, they vent their dissatisfactions with the current system by rebelling against traditional culture and calling for destructive revolution.

b. Reshaping Traditional Academics With Communist Ideology

Marxism-Leninism is the guiding ideology for every subject in communist countries, while in the West, academic freedom is a core focus. Aside from ubiquitous moral standards and academic norms, there shouldn't be any bias in favor of particular intellectual trends. But since the 1930s, socialism, communism, Marxism, and the Frankfurt School have entered American colleges in force, severely altering the humanities and social sciences.

Revolutionary Discourse Occupies the Humanities in America

In his book *The Victims' Revolution: The Rise of Identity Studies and the Closing of the Liberal Mind*, Bruce Bawer asked Alan Charles Kors, a historian at the University of Pennsylvania, about the three people he thought to have the deepest influence on the humanities in the United States. With hardly a pause, Kors named three books: Antonio Gramsci's *Prison Notebooks*, Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, and Frantz Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*. [15]

Gramsci, the Italian Marxist, needs no further introduction as his work has been described in preceding chapters. Freire, a Brazilian

educational theorist, adored Lenin, Mao, Castro, and Che Guevara. His *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, published in 1968 and reprinted in English two years later, has become part of the mandatory reading for academic institutes in the United States.

Bawer quoted the educator Sol Stern, who said that *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* doesn't concern itself with any specific educational problems, but is rather "a utopian political tract calling for the overthrow of capitalist hegemony and the creation of classless societies." [16] Freire's work does no more than repeat a certain point of view, which is that there are only two kinds of people in the world: the oppressor and the oppressed. The oppressed should, then, reject their education, be awakened to their miserable circumstances, and aroused to rebellion.

Fanon was born on Martinique Island in the Caribbean Sea and joined the Algerian war against French colonial rule. His work, *The Wretched of the Earth*, was published in 1961, with a preface by French existentialist and communist Jean-Paul Sartre. Sartre summarized his theory as such: Western colonizers are the embodiment of evil; whereas non-Westerners are inherently noble by virtue of their being colonized and exploited.

Fanon called on people in the colonies to revolt against the colonial ruling class, using violence as their rallying point. He said that at the level of individuals, violence is a cleansing force. "It frees the native from his inferiority complex and from his despair and inaction; it makes him fearless and restores his self-respect." [17]

Embracing Fanon's ideas, Sartre wrote in the preface: "For in the first days of the revolt you must kill: to shoot down a European is to kill two birds with one stone, to destroy an oppressor and the man he oppresses at the same time: there remain a dead man, and a free man; the survivor, for the first time, feels a national soil under his foot." [18]

The ideas of Gramsci, Freire, and Fanon are deceptive narratives that entice people to regard history and society through the lens of class struggle. Once the spark of class hatred enters their hearts, students learn to resent and oppose the normal structure and workings of society, for which the inevitable solution is rebellion and revolution.

Which particular theorist or school of thought has had the greatest influence on humanities and social sciences in American colleges is a matter of debate. What's clear, however, is that Marxism, the Frankfurt School, Freudian theory, and postmodernism (which worked alongside communism in destroying culture and morality) have come to dominate the field.

Communist Theory Permeates Academia

Since the 1960s, the discipline of literary research in the United States has experienced a fundamental paradigm shift across its various subfields, such as English, French, and comparative literature. Traditionally, literary critics appreciated the moral and aesthetic values of classic works, considering literature an important resource for broadening the readers' horizons, developing their moral character, and cultivating their intellectual taste. As a matter of principle,

academic literary theory is secondary to the literature itself, serving as an aid to its comprehension and interpretation.

Infused with the popular trends in philosophy, psychology, and culture, various types of new literary theories emerged in the academic community during the height of the counterculture movement in the 1960s. The relationship between theory and literature was thrown in reverse as the actual works were reduced to material for validating modern interpretative approaches. [19]

What is the substance of these theories? Taken together, they make a mess of the traditional academic disciplines, such as philosophy, psychology, sociology, and psychoanalysis, in their slanted depiction of society and culture. As literary theorist Jonathan Culler put it: “Theory is often a pugnacious critique of common-sense notions, and further, an attempt to show that what we take for granted as ‘common sense’ is, in fact, a historical construction, a particular theory that has come to seem so natural to us that we don’t even see it as a theory.” [20]

In other words, modern academic theories belittle, reverse, and destroy the understandings of right and wrong, good and evil, beauty and ugliness that come from the traditional family, religious faith, and ethics, while replacing them with a sinister system devoid of positive values.

Peeling off their labyrinthine academic packaging, these so-called theories are no more than a jumbling together of classical and neo-Marxism, the Frankfurt School, psychoanalysis, deconstructionism, post-structuralism, and postmodernism. Together they form an axis

that aims to destroy the foundations of human civilization and serves as a camouflage for communism to steal into Western academia. Since the 1960s, communism has made rapid breakthroughs in areas such as literature, history, and philosophy, establishing its dominance in the humanities and social sciences.

“Theory” as has been discussed is more or less the same thing as “critical theory.” Its permutations include the newly emerged critical studies of law, race, gender, society, science, medicine, and the like. Its pervasiveness is a manifestation of communism’s successful expansion to the academic and educational fields, corrupting youth with deviated thought and laying a path for the eventual destruction of humankind.

The Politicization of Literary Research

From the perspective of a Marxist literary critic, the significance of a literary text lies not in its intrinsic value, but rather in how it reflects that the ideology of the ruling class—for example in terms of gender or race—became the dominant class. From this perspective, the classics are said to have no intrinsic value at all. A prominent American Marxist literary theorist outright declared that the “political perspective” constitutes “the absolute horizon of all reading and all interpretation.” [21] That is to say, all literary works should be treated as political allegories, and only when the deeper meanings of class, race, gender, or sexual oppression are uncovered can one’s understanding be considered profound or qualified.

People from communist countries are familiar with this kind of dogmatic literary criticism. Chinese communist leader Mao Zedong

evaluated *A Dream of Red Mansions*, one of the four great Chinese classics, as the following: “Four families, fierce class struggle, and a few dozens of human lives.”

In communist countries, literary discourse is not always confined to civilized and sophisticated debates of the ivory tower. It can sometimes morph into the impetus for bloody struggle.

In response to Mao Zedong’s call to learn from the honest and upright Ming Dynasty official Hai Rui, historian Wu Han penned the stage drama *Hai Rui Dismissed From Office*. On November 10, 1965, Shanghai’s *Wenhui News* published a critical review of the play. The review was authored by Yao Wenyuan and jointly planned by Mao’s fourth wife, Jiang Qing, and radical theorist Zhang Chunqiao. It claimed that *Hai Rui Dismissed From Office* was an allusion to Peng Dehuai, a People’s Liberation Army general who was purged for his opposition to the “Three Red Flags”—the Communist Party’s three policies of the General Line for Socialist Construction, the Great Leap Forward, and the People’s Communes. (These three policies led to the Great Chinese Famine.) The criticism of *Hai Rui Dismissed From Office* became the fuse that set off the decade-long brutality of the Cultural Revolution.

The Chinese communists’ crude approach to interpreting all literary works in terms of class struggle can be contrasted with the much subtler literary criticism found in Western colleges over the last few decades.

Western neo-Marxist literary criticism is like a virus that becomes stronger and more deadly through endless mutation. It adapts other

theories to become its weapons, dragging the great works of human culture—from the classics of Greece and Rome to Dante, Shakespeare, and Victorian novels—onto the literary operating table to be dismembered and reconfigured. Though this type of commentary makes use of arcane jargon to create the veneer of sophistication, the main arguments typically boil down to accusations of prejudice against disenfranchised classes, women, or ethnic minorities.

Modern critiques label these works as belonging to the superstructure of the ruling class, and describe them as having the effect of numbing the masses to their oppressive conditions and preventing them from achieving revolutionary class consciousness. As English scholar Roger Scruton said, “The methods of the new literary theorist are really weapons of subversion: an attempt to destroy humane education from within, to rupture the chain of sympathy that binds us to our culture.” [22]

The Marxist Theory of Ideology

“Ideology” is a core concept in the Marxist-influenced humanities. Marx viewed morality, religion, and metaphysics collectively as ideology. He believed that the dominant ideology in a class-based society was the ideology of the ruling class, and that its values did not reflect reality as it existed, but rather its inverse. [23]

Twentieth-century neo-Marxism has made the destruction of culture a necessary stage of revolution and makes extensive reference to ideology in its literature. The Hungarian Marxist Georg Lukács defined ideology as the “false consciousness” as opposed to the real “class

consciousness.” French Marxist Louis Althusser proposed the concept of the “ideological state apparatuses,” which include religion, education, family, law, politics, trade unions, communication, culture, and so forth, that would work in conjunction with a brutal state apparatus.

Cunning sophistry can be found within the concept of ideology. Every society or system has its shortcomings that should be articulated and corrected. However, Althusser and other Marxists do not concern themselves with specific problems. Instead, they reject the system in its entirety on the grounds that the system is a structure set up and maintained by the ruling class to safeguard its interests.

Poisoning the well is an important aspect of the Marxist fixation on ideology, and can be seen in Althusser’s complicated ideological critique. Instead of examining the factual merits of an argument, the ideological approach relies on accusing opponents of harboring ulterior motives or being of the wrong background. Just as no one can drink water from a poisoned well, subjecting a person to rumors or other forms of character assassination makes his opinion unacceptable to the public—no matter how reasonable or logical.

Althusser’s all-inclusive concept of “ideological state apparatuses” reflects communism’s extreme contempt for human society—nothing is acceptable, short of complete rejection and destruction. This is a manifestation of communism’s aim to eradicate human culture.

The Marxist concept of ideology rests on abstract, generalized, and superfluous false propositions that aim at purging traditional moral

values. While masking their real intentions by expressing ostensible moral indignation, Marxists have deceived and influenced vast numbers of people.

Postmodern Marxism

In the wake of the 1960s, a group of French philosophers created what soon became the most powerful ideological weapon for Marxism and communism in the American academic community. Representative among them are Jacques Derrida and Michel Foucault, and recent data provides some picture of their influence today. In 2007, Foucault was the most-cited author in the humanities, with 2,521 citations. Derrida ranked third, having been cited 1,874 times. [24] There have been eye-opening observations made about the relationship between postmodernism and Marxism. [25] We find it apt to refer to them collectively as postmodern Marxism.

The fact that language possesses ambiguous and multifaceted layers of meaning, and that a text may have different interpretations, has been common knowledge since at least the time of the ancient Greeks and pre-imperial China.

Derrida's theory of deconstruction is an elaborate deception that combines atheism and relativism and works by exaggerating the ambiguity of language to break down texts even in which the meaning is clear and well-defined.

Unlike conventional atheism, Derrida expressed his views in the language of philosophers. As a result, his viewpoints are not only

destructive to the idea of God, but also to the concepts of rationality, authority, and meaning as associated with traditional beliefs, as theorists aligned with Derrida carry out their deconstruction of these terms. Having deceived many people with its veneer of intellectual depth, deconstructionist theory went rampant throughout the humanities and took its place as one of communism's most potent tools for destroying faith, tradition, and culture.

Michel Foucault once joined the French Communist Party. The essence of his theory revolves around the notion that there is no truth, only power. Since power monopolizes the right to interpret truth, anything that purports truth is hypocritical and untrustworthy. In his book *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault asked the following question: "Is it surprising that prisons resemble factories, schools, barracks, hospitals, which all resemble prisons?" [26] In equating the indispensable institutions of society with prisons and calling on people to overthrow these "prisons," Foucault lays bare the antisocial nature of his theory.

Armed with the weapons of deconstruction, Foucault's theory, and other critical theories, scholars have stigmatized tradition and morality by relativizing everything. They thrive on axioms like "all interpretation is misinterpretation," "there is no truth, only interpretations," or "there are no facts, only interpretations." They have relativized the understanding of basic concepts such as truth, kindness, beauty, justice, and so on, and then discarded them as trash.

Young students entering the faculties of liberal arts dare not question the authority of their instructors. Staying clear-minded under the sustained ideological bombardment that follows is harder still. Once

geared to the study of postmodern Marxist theory, it is difficult to get them to think in any other way. This is a major means by which communist ideology has been able to run amuck in the humanities and social sciences.

c. Using New Academic Fields for Ideological Infiltration

In a healthy society, women's studies or research of different races reflects the prosperity of the academic community, but following the 1960s counterculture movement, some radicals made use of these new academic disciplines to spread their left-leaning ideas to universities and research institutes. For example, some scholars believe that the establishment of departments dedicated to African-American studies is not so much because of inherent demand for such an academic division, but rather the result of political blackmail. [27]

In 1968, a student strike forced San Francisco State College to shut down. Under pressure from the Black Student Union, the college established the Africana Studies Department, the first of its kind in the United States. The department was envisioned primarily as a means of encouraging black students, and with it arose a unique African-American science. The achievements of black scientists were brought to the forefront, and class materials were transformed to make them include greater mention of African-Americans. Mathematics, literature, history, philosophy, and other subjects underwent similar modifications.

In October 1968, twenty members of the Black Student Union caused another campus shut down at the University of California–Santa

Barbara when they occupied the school's computer center. A year later, the school established the Department of Black Studies and the Black Research Center.

In April 1969, more than one hundred black students at Cornell University occupied the school's administrative building while waving shotguns and ammo packs to demand the establishment of a black research department staffed solely by blacks. When a teacher came forward to stop them, a student leader threatened that Cornell University "had three hours to live." Cornell University eventually conceded to the black students and established the third black research department in the United States. [28]

Shelby Steele, who later became a senior researcher at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, was once a proponent for the establishment of black research departments at universities. He said that university leaders had such a strong sense of "white guilt" that they would agree to any request from the representatives of black student unions. [29] At the same time, women's studies, Latin American studies, gay studies, and so forth were introduced to American universities and are now ubiquitous.

The basic premise of women's studies is that sex differences result not from biological differences but instead are social constructs. Due to the alleged long-term suppression of women by men and patriarchy, the mission of women's studies is to trigger female social consciousness, bringing overall social change and revolution, according to this perspective.

A feminist professor at the University of California–Santa Cruz grew up in a famous communist family. She proudly displayed her credentials as a communist and a lesbian activist. Since the 1980s, she had been teaching feminism and regarded her sexual orientation as a kind of lifestyle to arouse political consciousness. Her inspiration for becoming a professor was because a fellow communist had told her it was her mission to do so. In a public statement, she said that “teaching became a form of political activism for me.” She founded the Department of Feminist Studies at the University of California–Santa Cruz. [30] In one of her syllabi, she wrote that female homosexuality is “the highest form of feminism.” [31]

The University of Missouri has designed its courses to prime students to see the issues of feminism, literature, gender, and peace from the position of the Left. For example, a course called Outlaw Gender sees the sexes as “artificial categories produced by a particular culture,” rather than being naturally produced. Only one viewpoint was instilled in students—the narrative of gender-based oppression and discrimination against multiple-gender identities. [32]

As discussed in Chapter Five, the anti-war movement in the Western world following World War II was heavily influenced by communist infiltrators. In recent decades, a new subject, Peace Studies, has emerged in American universities. Scholars David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin studied over 250 organizations that had some connection to the new academic field. They concluded that these organizations were political, not academic, in nature, and their aim was to recruit students to the anti-war Left. [33]

Citing the popular textbook *Peace and Conflict Studies*, Horowitz and Laksin laid out the ideological motivations of the field. The textbook used Marxist arguments to explain the problems of poverty and starvation. The author condemned landowners and agricultural merchants, claiming that their greed led to the starvation of hundreds of millions of people. Though the point is ostensibly against violence, there is one form of violence that the author does not oppose, and in fact praises—violence committed in the course of proletarian revolution.

A passage from *Peace and Conflict Studies* says the following: “While Cuba is far from an earthly paradise, and certain individual rights and civil liberties are not yet widely practiced, the case of Cuba indicates that violent revolutions can sometimes result in generally improved living conditions for many people.” The book makes no mention of Fidel Castro’s dictatorship or the catastrophic results of the Cuban Revolution.

Since it was written after 9/11, *Peace and Conflict Studies* also touched on problems of terrorism. Surprisingly, its authors seemed to have so much sympathy for the terrorists that the term “terrorist” was put in quotation marks. They defended their stance by saying: “Placing ‘terrorist’ in quotation marks may be jarring for some readers, who consider the designation self-evident. We do so, however, not to minimize the horror of such acts but to emphasize the value of qualifying righteous indignation by the recognition that often one person’s ‘terrorist’ is another’s ‘freedom fighter.’” [34]

Academia should be objective and avoid harboring political agendas. These new academic fields have adopted an ideological stand: Professors of women's studies must embrace feminism, while professors involved in studies of blacks must believe that the political, economic, and cultural hardships of African-Americans result from discrimination by whites. Their existence is not to explore the truth, but to promote an ideological narrative.

These new subjects are byproducts of the American cultural revolution. Having been established in universities, they have expanded by demanding more budgets and recruiting more students, who further strengthen these subjects. These new fields are already deeply ingrained in academia.

These new academic fields were created by people of ill intent acting under the influence of communist ideology. Their aim is to foment and expand conflict among different groups and to incite hatred in preparation for violent revolution. They have little relation to the people (African-Americans, women, or others) they claim to stand for.

d. Promoting Leftist Radicalism

In their book *One-Party Classroom: How Radical Professors at America's Top Colleges Indoctrinate Students and Undermine Our Democracy*, David Horowitz and Jacob Laksin listed about 150 leftist courses offered at 12 universities. These courses mask their political intent with scholarly language, but some of them neglect even basic academic principles, making them resemble closely the political courses that are mandatory in communist countries.

The University of California–Santa Cruz offers a seminar course called The Theory and Practice of Resistance and Social Movements. The course description is as follows: “The goal of this seminar is to learn how to organize a revolution. We will learn what communities past and present have done and are doing to resist, challenge, and overcome systems of power including (but not limited to) global capitalism, state oppression, and racism.” [35]

Bill Ayers, with the title of Distinguished Professor at the University of Illinois at Chicago, is a 1960s-era radical and the leader of the Weather Underground, originally called Weatherman, which was a faction of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). In 1969, the Weatherman went underground and became the first domestic terrorist organization in the United States. It dedicated its efforts to organizing radical students, who took part in terrorist activities designed to inflame racial conflict.

The Weatherman group perpetrated bombings against the Capitol, the New York City Police Headquarters, the Pentagon, and offices of the National Guard. As a well-known quote from Ayers goes: “Kill all the rich people. Break up their cars and apartments. Bring the revolution home, kill your parents.” [36] Ayers’s academic publications are consistent with his resumé. In his writings he argues that we must overcome our “prejudices” concerning violent juvenile offenders. [37]

A web of left-wing progressives successfully prevented the FBI from arresting Ayers. He re-emerged in 1980 and circumvented the law to avoid criminal justice. He became a faculty member at the University of

Illinois–Chicago, where he studies early childhood education. His political views were unchanged, and he has shown no remorse for his terrorist attacks. Ayers successively became associate professor, professor, and eventually reached his current standing of Distinguished Professor. He also received the title of Senior University Scholar, the institution’s highest honor.

Each title Ayer received was the result of a joint decision on the part of his colleagues in the department. This itself reflects the university’s tacit acknowledgment and support for his terrorist past.

e. Denying America’s Great Traditions

A group of politically engaged students on the campus of Texas Tech University conducted a survey on campus in 2014 asking three questions: “Who won the Civil War?” “Who is our vice president?” and “Who did we gain our independence from?” Many students had no idea what the answers were, though they should be common knowledge. While ignorant of these basic facts about their country’s politics and history, students were well-acquainted with the details of movie stars and their love affairs. [38]

In 2008, the Intercollegiate Studies Institute (ISI) did a random survey of 2,508 Americans and found that only half could name all three branches of government. [39] Answering 33 straightforward civics questions, 71 percent of the respondents received an average score of 49 percent, a failing mark. [40]

Learning American history is not just the process of understanding how the nation was established, but it is also a process of understanding what kind of values the nation was built on and what it takes to preserve these traditions. Only then will its people cherish what they have today, protect the national legacy, and pass it to the next generation.

Forgetting history is the same as destroying tradition. People not knowing their civic duties makes it possible for a totalitarian government to form. One can't help but wonder, what happened to American history and civics education? The answers lie in the textbooks the students use and in their teachers.

The Marxist Howard Zinn is the author of a popular history book titled *A People's History of the United States*. This book revolves around the premise that all the heroic deeds and inspiring episodes from American history are shameless lies, and that the true history of the United States is a dark journey of suppression, deprivation, and genocide. [41]

An economics professor at a university in Boston believes that the terrorists who are enemies of the United States are the real freedom fighters, and that the United States is the genuine evil. In an article published in 2004, he equated the terrorists who carried out the 9/11 attacks with the American rebels who, in 1775, fired the first shots in Lexington and started the War for Independence. [42]

f. Struggling Against the Classics of Western Civilization

In 1988, radical students and teachers at Stanford University protested against the university's course called Western Civilization. They chanted, "Hey, hey, ho, ho! Western Civilization has got to go!" Stanford conceded to the protestors' demands and replaced Western Civilization with a course called Cultures, Ideas, Values (CIV), with obvious multicultural characteristics. While the new class did not remove some of the Western cultural classics such as Homer, Plato, Saint Augustine, Dante Alighieri, or Shakespeare, it did require that each semester, the course must include works from several women, minority groups, and other groups of people deemed to have been subject to oppression.

Then-U.S. Secretary of Education William Bennett condemned the change as curriculum by intimidation. Despite this, many prominent universities did the same, and lesser colleges followed suit so as not to be left behind. In a few years, liberal arts education in American universities experienced a great transformation.

In his book *Illiberal Education*, conservative thinker Dinesh D'Souza used the book *I, Rigoberta, Menchu: An Indian Woman in Guatemala* to explain the ideological direction of Stanford University's new CIV course. This book delves into the life experiences of a young American Indian woman, Menchu Rigoberta, from Guatemala. After the senseless murder of her parents in a massacre, she determined to set on the path of revolt, in the course of which she became increasingly radicalized.

Rigoberta came to identify with the American Indian movement in South America to fight for their right of self-determination while

opposing the Europeanized Latino culture. She first became a feminist, then a socialist, and in the end became a Marxist. Near the end of her book, she started to participate in the assembly of the Popular Front in Paris to discuss topics such as bourgeois teenagers and Molotov cocktails. One chapter of the book is titled “Rigoberta Renounces Marriage and Motherhood.” [43]

The politically correct drive to expel the classics from American universities has led to various deleterious results, some of which we describe below:

First, writing of low quality with shallow content that contains revolutionary narratives or can pass as victim’s literature displaces classic works and their everlasting profundity.

Second, making comparisons between these types of literature and the classics seemingly gives them a place among the classics and greatly increases their influence on students’ minds. Placing the classics on the same level as these average works trivializes and relativizes the classics.

Third, the guiding themes behind the classics are now interpreted using critical theory, cultural studies, identity politics, and political correctness. Scholars enthusiastically research the hidden racism and sexism in Shakespeare’s plays, the homosexual trends among the characters, and so on, distorting and insulting classic works.

Fourth, students inculcated with this kind of mental attitude find the noble characters, great accomplishments, and moral lessons depicted

in the classics hard to believe, and instead develop the instinct of seeing them in a negative and cynical light.

In traditional literary education, the main themes conveyed in the classics are mostly about universal love, justice, loyalty, courage, the spirit of self-sacrifice, and other moral values. Historical education revolves around major events concerning the establishment and development of the nation and its fundamental values.

Because the classics of Western literature are nearly all written by white European men, leftists take up the banners of multiculturalism and feminism to insist that people read literature by women, people of color, and so on. As for the teaching of history, modern education favors describing a country's historical path as entirely dark, filled with slavery and exploitation of women and other minority groups. The object is no longer to recall the traditional legacy, but to instill a feeling of guilt toward women and minorities.

People have only a limited amount of time that they can reasonably use for reading. When education is purposely designed to emphasize politically correct works, the time people can spend on reading the classics is reduced. The result is that generations of students are detached from the origins of their culture, especially the value system that originates from religious faith and is passed down through culture. The culture of each and every race originates from the divine. It can be diverse, but must not be mixed. The mixing of a culture means the destruction of the links between the race to which the culture belongs and the divinities that created it.

g. Monopolizing Textbooks and Liberal Arts

Economist Paul Samuelson described the power of textbooks: “I don’t care who writes a nation’s laws — or crafts its advanced treaties — if I can write its economics textbooks.” [44] Textbooks, which have a large circulation and carry an authoritative voice, can exert a tremendous influence on students. Whoever writes the textbooks has the keys to shaping the impressionable minds of the young.

After radical scholars and professors received tenure and reputation, they gained control over the university publication offices and committees. They used their powers to load teaching materials with their ideologies and force-feed them to their students. In some academic fields, the textbooks and required reading chosen by the professors contain more works of Marxism than any other school of thought. The aforementioned *A People’s History of the United States* by Howard Zinn is required reading for many history, economics, literature, and women’s studies majors.

Once leftists enjoy strength in numbers, they can use the peer-review mechanism in the U.S. academic community to suppress people with different opinions. A paper that challenges left-wing ideologies is bound to be rejected by leftists and their colleagues.

Many journals in the humanities are guided by critical theory and filled with obscure technical jargon, while the main theme is to reject the divine, reject traditional culture, and incite revolutions to overturn the current social, political, and economic order. There is one category of scholarship that aims to prove that all traditional morals and standards,

including even the scientific process, are social constructs whose purpose is to safeguard the power of the ruling class by forcing their norms on the whole society.

In 1996, New York University physics professor Alan Sokal published a paper in *Social Text*, Duke University's cultural studies journal. His paper was titled *Transgressing the Boundaries: Towards a Transformative Hermeneutics of Quantum Gravity*. Citing 109 footnotes and referencing 219 sources, the paper argued that "quantum gravity" was made up by society and language. [45]

On the same day that the paper was published, Sokal published a declaration in another magazine, *Lingua Franca*, stating that his paper was a prank. He said that he had sent the paper to *Social Text* as a physicist's experiment regarding cultural studies. [46]

During an interview with the radio program *All Things Considered*, Sokal said he found inspiration in the 1994 book *Higher Superstition*. The book's author said that some publications in the humanities will publish anything so long as it contains "the proper leftist thought" and quotes well-known leftist thinkers. Sokal tested this by filling his paper with leftist ideologies, pointless citations, and complete nonsense. [47]

Sokal later wrote: "The results of my little experiment demonstrate, at the very least, that some fashionable sectors of the American academic Left have been getting intellectually lazy. The editors of *Social Text* liked my article because they liked its conclusion: that 'the content and methodology of postmodern science provide powerful intellectual support for the progressive political project.' They apparently felt no

need to analyze the quality of the evidence, the cogency of the arguments, or even the relevance of the arguments to the purported conclusion.” [48] Sokal’s satirical approach highlighted the dearth of academic principle or credibility in the fields of critical theory and cultural studies.

By looking at the journal titles at the annual meetings of large-scale U. S. academic associations, the last few decades of communist penetration into the social sciences is clear to see. The Modern Language Association is the largest of such societies, with twenty-five thousand members who consist mainly of professors and scholars in the fields of modern language research and education. More than ten thousand join the association’s annual conference.

A large portion of the papers listed on the association’s website utilize the ideological framework of Marxism, the Frankfurt school, deconstruction, post-structuralism, and other deviant theories. Others use feminism, gay research, identity politics, and other radical trends. Similar organizations, including the American Sociological Association, reflect much the same, though to varying extents.

American universities have a tradition of liberal arts education, and some humanities courses are required regardless of the students’ majors. Today, required courses are mostly taught by professors in the areas of literature, history, philosophy, and social sciences. American scholar Thomas Sowell has noted that, as the term implies, required courses leave students with no alternative to the professors who more often than not use their classrooms as opportunities to spread their leftist ideologies, even using grades as an incentive to have students

accept their views. Students who dare challenge a professor's views are punished with lower grades. [49] The Marxist views of these humanities and social science professors not only corrupt students in their academic fields, but affect almost the entire student body.

College students wish to be respected as adults, but both their knowledge and practical experienced is limited. In the relatively closed environment of the university, few of them suspect that their respected professors would take advantage of their innocence and trust to instill in them a set of completely wrong and damaging ideologies and values. Parents pay high tuition for their children to master the knowledge and skills they will use as a basis for finding their place in society. How could they imagine that their children are actually being robbed of their invaluable years, and instead being transformed into followers of radical ideologies that will affect them the rest of their lives?

Generation after generation of youth has entered this education system that has been heavily infiltrated by the specter of communism. They study textbooks penned by leftists and internalize their deviated theories, hastening the decline of culture, morals, and humanity.

h. University 'Re-education': Brainwashing and Moral Corruption

With the growth of Marxist ideology throughout universities, campus policy since the 1980s has increasingly focused on preventing "offensive" remarks, especially when it comes to offending women or ethnic minorities. According to American scholar Donald Alexander Downs, from 1987 to 1992, about three hundred U.S. universities

implemented policies for the regulation of speech, creating a paralegal system of prohibition forbidding language deemed offensive in regards to sensitive groups and topics. [50]

Those who support these prohibitions may mean well, but their actions lead to a ridiculous outcome as ever greater numbers of people claim the right not to be offended for any reason. In fact, no such right exists according to law, but the prominence of cultural Marxism has allowed anyone to claim association with oppressed groups, citing reasons such as culture, ancestry, skin color, gender, sexual orientation, and so on. Administrative staff at universities have consistently afforded privileged treatment to those who claim victimhood.

According to Marxist logic, the oppressed are morally correct in all circumstances, and many people do not dare to question the authenticity of their claims. This absurd logic is based on twisting the criteria for judging what is moral. As group identities and sentiments intensify (in Leninism and Stalinism, this is called a high level of class consciousness), people unconsciously abandon the traditional standards of good and evil, replacing them with groupthink. This was most markedly manifested in totalitarian communist states, where the “oppressed” proletariat were given justification to kill the landowning and capitalist “oppressors.”

The trend of making arbitrary claims of offensive or discriminatory language was started by cultural Marxist scholars who fabricated a series of new concepts for expanding the definition of discrimination. Among these are ideas like “microaggressions,” “trigger warnings,” “safe spaces,” and so on. University administrators introduced

corresponding policies and mandatory education, such as sensitivity training and diversity training.

Microaggression refers to an implicit non-verbal offense that one encounters in daily life, with the supposed offenders perhaps being completely unaware of its implications. This kind of unintentional offense or ignorance is labeled “insensitive” (Leninism or Stalinism would deem this to be low social consciousness). Sensitivity training has become a major aspect of acclimating incoming college freshmen. Students are told what can’t be said and which clothes can’t be worn, lest they commit a microaggression in violation of university regulation.

On some campuses, the phrase “welcome to America” cannot be said because it may constitute discrimination and is considered microaggression: It could offend ethnic groups that have historically suffered unfair treatment in the United States, such as Native Americans, Africans, Japanese, and Chinese. They might be reminded of the humiliating history suffered by their ancestors.

These are among a long list of statements deemed microaggressions by the University of California: “The United States is a melting pot” (racial discrimination), “The United States is a land full of opportunities,” and “Men and women have the same chance of success” (denying gender or ethnic inequality). [51] Microaggressions are cause for administrative discipline, as they prevent the establishment of “safe spaces.”

A typical microaggression occurred at the Indianapolis campus of Indiana University–Purdue University (IUPUI). A white student violated the Racial Harassment Ordinance because he read a book titled *Notre Dame vs. the Klan: How the Fighting Irish Defeated the Ku Klux Klan*. However, the photos of the KKK gathering on the cover of the book caused the student's colleague, who was also a resident assistant, to feel offended. The school's correction office believed that the student had violated racial discrimination rules. Later, after the student's resistance and help of other groups, IUPUI conceded that the student was innocent. [52]

Sensitivity training and diversity training are comparable in nature to the re-education programs that took place in the former Soviet Union and in China. The purpose of re-education is to strengthen class concepts: The "bourgeoisie" and "landlord class" (akin to white males) must recognize their original sin as members of the oppressive class, and the supposedly oppressed groups must have the "correct" understanding about "bourgeois" culture. Pressure is put on them to clear away their "internalized oppression" so that they can come to recognize their oppressive conditions. This is similar to how feminist education teaches women to see traditional femininity as a construct of the patriarchy.

Following the Marxist analysis of class, the personal is political: It is considered wrong to understand a problem from the standpoint of the designated oppressor. Therefore, to reform the worldview and completely follow the Marxist program, words and actions that deny the class oppression or class struggle are punished severely. Sensitivity training is held to fully reveal "social injustice," to reorient the

standpoint of “oppressed” groups (women, ethnic minorities, homosexuals, and so on).

For example, in 2013, Northwestern University required all students to complete a course on diversity before graduating. According to the school’s instructions, after the completion of the course, students would be able to “expand their ability to think critically” (learning to classify the class), “recognize their own position in an unfair system” (recognize their class component), and rethink their “own powers and privileges” (to put themselves in the shoes of the “oppressed” class). [53]

Another typical example is the ideological re-education program that began in 2007 at the University of Delaware. Referred to as “treatment” for incorrect attitudes and beliefs, this program was made mandatory for 7,000 students. Its stated aim was to make students accept set perspectives concerning issues such as politics, race, gender, and environmentalism.

Resident assistants at the university were required to go over one-on-one questionnaires with the students, and give students questionnaires on what races and genders they would date with the goal of getting students to be more open to dating outside their groups. When a resident assistant asked a female student when she had discovered her gender identity (as opposed to biological sex), the student said that it was none of the assistant’s business. The assistant reported her to the university administration. [54]

This mass political indoctrination not only mixed up the standards for discerning moral values, but it also greatly strengthened egoism and individualism. What the young students learn is that they can use the highly politicized feelings of a group (identity politics) to pursue their own individual desires. Simply by claiming oneself as belonging to a group supposedly suffering from oppression, one can accuse and threaten others or use this identity for personal benefit. When other people's opinions are not in line with one's own, they can constitute offense and be reported to the university, which will restrict those people's rights to speech. If one doesn't like the ideas being run in conservative student newspapers, some may even find it appropriate to have the publications burned.

Whether one is offended or not is a matter of subjective feeling, but today, even feelings pass for objective evidence. It has gotten to the point that university professors must constantly beat around the bush. Recently, students across many universities began to demand that before teaching certain content, professors must first issue "trigger warnings," as some discussion topics or reading material might cause negative emotional reactions. In the last few years, even works such as Shakespeare's *The Merchant of Venice* and ancient Roman poet Ovid's *Metamorphoses* ended up in the list of literature for which trigger warnings are required. Some universities even recommend that works deemed to trigger some students' emotions be avoided as much as possible. [55]

Many students growing up under this kind of atmosphere have easily hurt egos and try their utmost to avoid feeling offended. The group identity (that is, another version of the "class consciousness" preached

by communism) that is promoted on campuses leaves students ignorant of independent thought and personal responsibility. Like the radical students of the 1960s who are now their professors, these students are against tradition. They indulge in confused sexual promiscuity, alcohol addiction, and drug abuse. Their speech is full of expletives. Yet beneath their contempt for worldly conventions are fragile hearts and souls, unable to bear the slightest blow or setback, let alone take on real responsibility.

Traditional education fosters self-restraint, independent thinking, a sense of responsibility, and understanding for others. The specter of communism wants nothing less than to have the next generation completely abandon its moral bearings and become its minions for its rule over the world.