

# **HATE THERAPY**

Sensitivity Training For “Planned Change”

*by*

**Gary Allen**

These reprints of "Hate Therapy: Sensitivity Training For 'Planned Change'," by Gary Allen, will be sent postpaid to any address in the United States, at the following prices: One to 99 copies, seven for one dollar; 100-999 copies, twelve cents each; 1,000 or more copies, ten cents each.

This article first appeared in the January, 1968, issue of *American Opinion*, an informal monthly review edited by Robert Welch. The subscription rate to the magazine is ten dollars per year, to any address in the United States; twelve dollars to other countries. For either reprints or subscriptions address:

AMERICAN OPINION  
Belmont, Massachusetts 02178

# HATE THERAPY

## Sensitivity Training For "Planned Change"

*Gary Allen, a graduate of Stanford University and one of the nation's top authorities on civil turmoil and the New Left, is author of Communist Revolution in the Streets—a highly praised and definitive new volume on revolutionary tactics and strategies, published by Western Islands. Mr. Allen is active in anti-Communist and other humanitarian causes and is President of the Foundation for Economic and Social Progress. A film writer and journalist, he is a Contributing Editor to AMERICAN OPINION. Gary Allen lectures widely.*

■ EVEN AS I review my notes I am aware that what is to follow will read like dialogue from an insane asylum. Unfortunately it is not. It is far too real. It happened, and it is continuing to happen daily all across the country. What I am about to relate is but a tiny segment from a marathon group confession, a Sensitivity Training session of the type now being promoted throughout the country by the usual forces of the conspiratorial Left. Despite the fact that I was well prepared for what was coming, I found it one of the most incredible experiences I have ever endured. Here is the way it was.

It is three A.M. on a Sunday morning. We are in the smoke-clouded living-room of a Beverly Hills stockbroker, high in the Hollywood hills overlooking the San Fernando Valley. There are fifteen of us here, sitting in a circle. In addition to the stockbroker and his "wife," there is a teacher, a writer, an artist, a nurse, a social worker, a librarian, a pathetic hunchback with a Chi-

nese pigtail who smells as if he has not bathed since spring, and assorted students and hippies. All eyes are riveted on a handsome red-haired college student, except for those of poor Quasimodo mercifully snoring in the corner, and a well-built young Negro and his sensuous yet wholesome-looking Caucasian girlfriend, who are on the floor petting lewdly. (She wears a mini-skirt without underwear, but seems oblivious to the discomfort her exhibitionism is forcing on the other guests.) My tape-recorder is whirring away, catching all but the sights.

"I can't stand rules — any rules. Rules cause wars and war is ugly, and we must have peace and love," rambles a neatly dressed student. "I'm up tight with all these rules and it's all a game. I call the game 'distraction'; it's just like playing pool. . . . I have to do something to help my mother. She doesn't understand my problems . . .," he continues, staring glassily at the wall.

"Chuck," interjects the broker's foul-tongued "wife," "Don't bull\*hit me now. Are you on a trip?"

Chuck's eyes drop. "No, honest, I'm not high on anything or on a trip. At the party they called the cops, but I was cool. I talked them out of it. I think they may become heads now themselves. . . ." He mutters semi-coherently.

"Bull\*hit!" screams the broker's "wife," "I've dropped acid plenty of times and you are on a trip. Why won't you cop out?"

"Okay, so I smoked a little grass earlier tonight, but that's all." And then Chuck begins mumbling again about

peace and love and his mother and drugs.

The group's "leader" is Fred, a husky forty-one. He is a writer-teacher with milk-white skin and a deep rumbling voice which belies his effeminate appearance. Fred is apparently trying to look like Benjamin Franklin, with his head bald back to the middle and thereafter draped with long reddish hair which nearly reaches his shoulders. He spearheads the verbal assaults on those assembled, but keeps interjecting that he doesn't have to be there — that he has a novel to write, and a beautiful home, gorgeous wife, and new baby he could be with.

"We are all sick. Everyone is sick. Every self-respecting, self-righteous, bill-paying, homeowning, self-centered, patriotic American is sick," Fred shouts at Sherry, a strikingly attractive young nurse wearing a loose boyish sweater and trousers.

Sherry, who had begun screaming and crying almost hysterically earlier in the evening, starts in again: "I want Alice (the broker's "wife") to touch me. I feel so attracted to her. But I also feel strongly drawn to Julie; she is so feminine and delicate." Sherry points to Julie, a tall, dark haired, stylishly "mod" Twiggy-type with the classic features of a fashion model. (Julie had earlier confessed her concern that she was being drawn into a love affair with her female roommate.)

Fred now tries to "reassure" Sherry by telling her that gender is not important when selecting a sex partner; it's only love that counts. We should not hesitate in expressing whatever emotions we feel. All are equally valid. Sherry continues: "Oh, God! I wish you would all step on me and mutilate me. . . . I don't want to be a lesbian, but everybody tells me how groovy it is to be bisexual. I think I am drawn to Alice because a friend told me she had had love affairs with several other girls."

"That's true," Alice interjects in a

tender voice. Later, while her stockbroker "husband" debates with Fred about who is jealous of whom as a group leader, Sherry and Alice sit on a couch with their arms entwined about each other, holding hands in the region of Sherry's thigh. Occasionally Alice, who had begun the evening revealing to us her thrilling sex life with her "husband," kisses Sherry — and then Fred and Sherry, who also had been very affectionate all evening except when she was wrapped up with Alice, disappear into an automobile parked out front.

Monstrous?

Yes, it is. And even more so when you understand that what I have recorded here is but an honest sample of the Left's latest little psywar scheme, a process known as Sensitivity Training — a program now being internationally promoted by psychiatrists, psychologists, and politicians using phrases that would sound good in church.

If Sensitivity Training were merely a cult, a hobby for the warped, we would hardly take space for it in *AMERICAN OPINION*. It is, sadly, much more than that. You may never have heard of Sensitivity Training by that name, or any of its two-dozen pseudonyms, but you certainly will in the future. It is being energetically pushed by the federal government,\* the National Education Association, the War on Poverty, private businesses, colleges, the Y.M.C.A., the military, and the churches. "Civil Rights" leaders are now successfully promoting it for the police, teachers, and welfare departments. Collectively they intend to provide the "benefits" of Sensitivity Training for millions of Americans, often on a mandatory basis.

A recent United Press release by Robert Strand reveals that 100,000 Cali-

---

\*According to *Time* of September 29, 1967, "350 members of the State Department, including ambassadors, have taken sensitivity classes at Washington's NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science."



fornians have already participated in Sensitivity Training and Group Dynamics, and that the problem is not by any means unique to the Westcoast. Strand's article confirms our own experience with the bizarre effects which so often accompany these training sessions:

*Imagine the hefty mayor of a middle-size city leaping in the air around the room like a ballet dancer. Or a nun describing her daily wrestling with sexual desires. Or a business executive who dissolves in tears. Or a church member group of 15 men and women in a circle who touch hands and close their eyes. Soon they begin to sway and the movements get basic. Bodies writhe against each other, hands explore the roughness of jeans, the softness of the female, the coarseness of the masculine face. The senses are bombarded with body odors and the sound of deep human breathing.*

*In a half-hour, the group collapses in a remorseful heap.*

*Kooks? Perhaps, but this group included a college professor, two lawyers, an architect, an engineer, a psychiatrist and their wives.*

*Nobody quite agreed when questioned by UPI on what they got out of this experience, but all were sure that whatever it was, it was exhilarating, joyful, renewing — and religious in nature.*

How do the behavioral scientists expect to entice participation in these bizarre and potentially dangerous sessions? Simple: By maintaining (with a straight face, of course) that Sensitivity Training is the miracle worker of the age, the most significant psychological development since Freud found his mother or Pavlov discovered how to make a schizoid out of Snoopy. The Leftist

mind-meddlers are disguising their intrigues by claiming that Sensitivity Training produces love, trust, openness of communication, greater sensitivity to the feelings of others, and that it builds leadership and individual responsibility. As we shall see, the results are usually the opposite of those advertised.

## I

SENSITIVITY TRAINING is a concept in which Leftist behavioral scientists are "merging science and democracy" with the stated purpose of bringing about a change in "the total system" through interpersonal Group Dynamics in small sessions involving ten to fifteen people. It is, in short, brainwashing. The significant factor that separates Sensitivity Training from other forms of Group Dynamics is that it is based upon *self-criticism* and *group-criticism*. Before delving further, let us review the use and effects of these within their historical context.

As early as the twelfth anniversary of the Russian Revolution, the Communist Party included among its slogans: "Through Bolshevik Self-Criticism we will enforce the dictatorship of the proletariat."\* In their book, *The Iron Curtain*, Leftist authors Harry and Bonaro Overstreet reveal how authorities in the U.S.S.R. use group-criticism and self-criticism to make their tyranny almost self-enforcing:

*It is "perfect" because the individual has no real life outside the several collectives to which he belongs; and within any one of these, he can at any time, without warning, have his future put in jeopardy — by having some fellow member accuse him of some deviation from the approved norm of behavior. . . . What is at issue, now, is not the offense itself, but, rather, the manner of his response to group criticism . . . he is on the spot . . . alone. He cannot*

\*See William Fairburn's *Russia — The Utopia in Chains*, 1931, Page 257.

expect his friends to rally to his support; for each of them is endangered by his offense. . . . Thus, there is set going one of the strangest and potentially most destructive rituals ever devised.

Once accused, a person must not defend himself, "his only proper recourse is to self-criticism. It is up to him to admit the rightness of the group's criticism. . . . If his self-abasement is up to the group specifications, he may get by with nothing worse than censure." The individual has no rights and is at the mercy and whim of the group. The Overstreets explain:

*To the non-Communist mind, this ritual of collectivized coercion can scarcely seem other than incredible. Why do decent human beings take part in it? Why do they not make the whole design unworkable by defending the accused? . . . In collective after collective, day after day, throughout . . . the U.S.S.R. the rituals of control are enacted . . . every member of every group knowing that, sooner or later, he will be cast in this role of fearful isolation. It is thus that every segment of the populace is gradually conditioned to fit the Party concept of the "new man."*

The group and self-criticism technique — Sensitivity Training — is used today in every Communist country in the world. Their thought-control people have learned from experience that it is an effective weapon not only for producing "mass man" or "group man," but also for locating "reactionary individualists" who may become opposition leaders. As Mao Tse-tung put it:

*We have the Marxist-Leninist weapon of criticism and self-criticism. . . . Conscientious practice of self-*

*criticism is still another hallmark distinguishing our Party from all other political parties. . . . To check up regularly on our work and in the process develop a democratic style of work, to fear neither criticism nor self-criticism, and to apply such good popular Chinese maxims as, "Say all you know and say it without reserve." . . . This is the only effective way to prevent all kinds of political dust and germs from contaminating the minds of our comrades and the body of our Party. [Quotations from Chairman Mao Tse-tung, Foreign Language Press, Peking, 1966, pp. 258-259.]*

The Sensitivity Training concept, using group and self-criticism based on the studies of Pavlov, was, of course, implemented in Korea among American prisoners of war as a method of group control through "brainwashing." In his book, *In Every War But One*, author Eugene Kinkead delves into the disturbing behavior of American prisoners of war held by the Chinese in Korea. The Communists' success, he notes, was not based on torture tactics, *but on the use of group and self-criticism*. Again — Sensitivity Training!

Prisoners were put into criticism groups soon after their capture and those with strong convictions, the "reactionaries" who did not buy the Reds' "new morality," were quickly removed from the group lest their strength contaminate the others. The factor valued most by the Communists was *participation* in the group confession by each prisoner. No prisoner group would be allowed to eat until every member had participated in confessing something and criticizing someone. Thus the pressure came from the group and not the group leader.

Edward V. Hunter, the acknowledged expert in the field who coined the word *brainwashing*, describes the process:

*A prisoner could prove that he had accepted Communism only by self-criticism, that is, by confession. And it didn't matter what he confessed, no matter how trivial, as long as he did. One man, honestly unable to think of anything, finally confessed that he had failed to brush his teeth that morning. The group "leader" was content. For the man, by the act of confessing, had submitted to the system. He had in effect said, "I submit, you're the boss."*

What were the effects of such Sensitivity Training sessions on the prisoners in Korea? Kinkead graphically describes the results: "Self-criticism and mutual criticism encourage criticism outside the group. When you are used to criticizing yourself it is easier to criticize others. This creates informers, stool pigeons, sometimes called 'canaries' (because they sing so well). It takes teamwork and secrecy to dig a tunnel, lay plans, etc. But the canaries, sometimes numbering three out of every four Army P.W.'s, always sang to the group leader." So effective was the Communists' Sensitivity Training program that not one prisoner escaped from a Communist P.O.W. camp.

Major William E. Mayer, the chief neuro-psychiatrist of the U.S. Army in charge of rehabilitating returned American P.O.W.s from Korea, stressed the importance to the Communists of building mutual distrust among those who should have trusted each other more. Thanks to Chinese-style Sensitivity Training, fellow prisoners became the enemy, and the captors the ones to be trusted. As Mayer put it: "... once you abandon this concept of the individual and visualize him as does the Marxist as a fragment of a class in that greatest of all realities, the struggle between the classes, then of course informing becomes not a miserable, mean, nasty renunciation of individual loyalties, it be-

comes an exercise in social responsibility which is exactly the way it was encouraged and exactly the way it grew even among Americans."

Collaborating with Hunter in his definitive book, *Brainwashing*, was Dr. Leon Freedom, an eminent Baltimore neuro-psychiatrist who explains why the Sensitivity group confession process was so incredibly effective for the Communists:

*... confession is analogous to a psychological catharsis — a mental purge. This explained the Reds' stress on what they called self-criticism and mutual criticism, always within the group structure. Out of this came what psychiatrists term resistances, transferences, and counter-transferences. The entire process is similar to the familiar clinical practice known as free association. By it, the individual's defenses are removed, his resistance overcome.*

What Dr. Freedom is talking about is nothing more than the Sensitivity Training now being promoted in the United States under about twenty different pseudonyms, most of them as misleading as possible. Titles under which Sensitivity Training is being given include: Group Dynamics, Group Confession, Group Discussion, Marathon Interpersonal Competence, Nude Marathon, Interpersonal Relations, Self-Evaluation, T-Group Training, Auto-Criticism, Operant Conditioning, Self-Honest Sessions, Human Potential Workshops, Human Relations Lab, Prayer Therapy, Class In-Group Counseling, Synanon Games Clubs, and Basic Encounter Group.

This name game, which is used to disguise group and self-confession, will now undoubtedly be expanded even further as informed persons begin exposing Sensitivity Training as the dangerous scheme it is.



## II

PARALLEL TO the Communist success with it in Korea, Sensitivity Training was first experimented with in this country in the Fifties by social psychologist Kurt Lewin. Dr. Lewin was involved in the founding of The National Training Laboratories in Group Development, but died soon after and his work has been carried on by colleagues in Washington, D. C., and Bethel, Maine. The name was shortened in 1954 to National Training Laboratories (N.T.L.), and it is, curiously, a subsidiary of the Left's powerful National Education Association (N.E.A.).

The interest of the behavioral scientists at the National Training Laboratories lay in promoting "human change." In 1956, N.T.L. began holding workshops for industrial administrators and national church executives, and in 1958 it sponsored its first laboratory for educational administrators and key executives of volunteer service organizations. The workshops have continued to train leaders to carry the gospel of Sensitivity Training back to their organizations where they act as "change agents."

In order to acquire professional "trainers," or group "leaders," the National Education Association — through N.T.L. — has obtained assistance from the National Institute of Mental Health in a program funded by foundations, government agencies, and private donors. N.E.A. wants Sensitivity Training adopted by local schools and has acquired the full cooperation of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in working toward the accomplishment of this goal.

With the involvement of H.E.W., Sensitivity Training obtained an entre into a multitude of fields including the War on Poverty, where the Office of Economic Opportunity has now instituted Sensitivity Training. As fate would have it, the definitive textbook on

the matter of the new "social change," *Self Renewal: The Individual and the Innovative Society*, was written by John Gardner, Director of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. And, Title III of the Elementary-Secondary Education Act of 1965 provides the funds for bringing "planned change" programs into the local schools.

The U.S. Office of Education is now financing a joint program sponsored by the National Training Laboratory of the N.E.A. Known as Co-Operation Project for Educational Development (C.O.P.E.D.), the program seeks "the exploratory development of models of planned change in education." C.O.P.E.D. is the link joining the behavioral scientists and school system "change agents teams." Other federal funds for the "planned change" Sensitivity-Training programs are coming, incredibly enough, from the National Defense Education Act (Title V, Part A) as interpreted by the U.S. Office of Education.

One of the first school systems to be blessed by this new program is that of Garden Grove, California. According to the *Santa Ana Register* of March 27, 1967, a \$78,000 Sensitivity Program, nearly half financed by the U.S. Office of Education, had been proposed for that city to provide Sensitivity Training for teachers and counselors and to "embrace 7,550 students in grades seven and eight."\*

Sensitivity Training is recognized by the Left as so important a revolutionary tool that since the exposure of Civilian Review Boards as a threat to law enforcement, and their defeat at the polls in several major American cities, "Civil Rights" agitators have in many cases switched their demands from the Re-

\*Because of the prompt exposure of Sensitivity Training by State Senator John Schmitz and California journalist Ed Dieckmann, the school system may back down. The trial balloon appears to have exploded.



view Boards to the establishment of mandatory Sensitivity Training for all police officers. Their feeling seems to be that if they can apply the same techniques so successful in Korea to the nation's law enforcement officers, they won't need Civilian Review Boards. Dr. Al Cannon, for example, a Negro "Civil Rights" activist who is a psychiatrist at U.C.L.A., fancies integrated "marathon groups," lasting up to thirty hours, to "improve race relations."

Sensitivity Training, alas, is being forced on police departments all over the country, either under that name or as part of human relations courses. A semantic gamesmanship is, as usual, most effective. On August 17, 1966, then-Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach discussed the "Law Enforcement Assistance Act" under which grants totaling one million dollars would be made available to large cities for planning and development of "Community Relations" programs — in this case a cover for Sensitivity Training.

Writing on the Los Angeles Police Department in *Atlantic* for December of 1966, Paul Jacobs (a "former" member of the Young Communist League and Trotskyite Communist who now claims that he is merely a "radical") expressed his satisfaction that "the police commission has approved a training program designed to increase the officers' sensitivity to minority problems."\* Again — Sensitivity Training. On August 18, 1967, the *Los Angeles Times* reported that the Los Angeles

Police Department was adopting "a new 'sensitivity training' tactic which will be employed in the interest of better community relations."† It is partially financed by federal funds. What is more, confessional Sensitivity Training is already *mandatory* for parole officers in the California Department of Corrections and in California's Department of Mental Hygiene. The Parole Departments of Michigan, Utah, and Oregon are expected to introduce the program soon.

A focal point for the spreading of Sensitivity Training is the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute at La Jolla, California, which operates on an annual \$500,000 budget provided by foundations and federal grants. Psychologists there have been developing techniques to harness the pressure of opinion in newly formed small groups, especially among young people, to force on them a new system of values. "It is such groups," says Jack Gibb of the Behavioral Institute, "that can provide the framework for a better world." The Institute, currently conducting Sensitivity sessions using O.E.O. tax funds, has already determined that "over-protective parents" are a hindrance to "group communications." As a spokesman for the Institute put it: "Their value systems, *centering around a stern morality*, tend to be a greater problem than racial differences."

Now, here's the key: the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute is involved in projects to pinpoint elements in human behavior that, its staff members say, "create the tensions underlying war." But, the often-cited purpose of Dr. Gibb, explaining the object of all of this high-sounding experimentation, boils down to this: "*World human nature must be changed to fit world government.*"

The Institute concentrates on the application of Sensitivity Training in the fields of education, organizational func-

\* Jacobs is on the staff of the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, an energetic promoter of Sensitivity Training. Other staff members teach at the avowedly Marxist New Left School in Los Angeles. The "Center," which also spawned the New Politics movement, is according to one highly placed infiltrator of the New Left, "the 'brain factory' of the revolution." The only disagreement they have is over whether they want the Russian or Chinese version of Communism.

† So far this program has concentrated on bleeding-heart lectures and has not begun group confession.

tioning, and international relations. It has now concluded that its brand of group therapy is so productive that it can be universally used even by leaderless groups. As the Institute's Dr. Carl Rogers put it: "If it is good for people in trouble, then it is bound to be as good or even better for people who function well. They get more out of it, and quicker." And, if a lobotomy is good for a man who is hopelessly and violently insane, it ought to be even better for those who might oppose the "planned change"—right, Dr. Rogers?

As a strong individualist who had endured months of Sensitivity Training told us: "That is the whole idea of this thing: make well minds sick. They want people interdependent on others so they will not be able to think or make decisions for themselves. And these people plan to make this mandatory."

Dr. Rogers himself confirms that Sensitivity Training will, if he has his way, become mandatory. And he says: "Many of our most astute behavioral scientists are agreed that this process of conditioning, of 'shaping up' the individual's behavior, will not much longer be left to chance, but will be planned." Pavlov rides again: And Dr. Rogers, as fate would have it, is a member of the California Council for Public Responsibility, a sort of local Institute for American Democracy which is dedicated to fighting Rightwing Extremism. When he has his way, no doubt, the behavior of such wicked Americans "will not much longer be left to chance," but to the planning of such behavioral scientists as Dr. Rogers.

In addition to N.T.L. and the Behavioral Institute, one of the most ac-

tive centers for preparing Sensitivity Training "change agents" is the Esalen Institute, located in an old resort at Big Sur, thirty-five miles south of Carmel, California. It is headed by Michael Murphy, thirty-seven, a psychology graduate of Stanford who charges seventy dollars a weekend to "turn-on" at Esalen. Dr. Abraham M. Maslow, President of the American Psychological Association, calls Esalen "potentially the most important education institution in the world." Some of those attracted there as speakers include Arnold Toynbee, Bishop James A. Pike, and S. I. Hayakawa.

Now five years old, Esalen's appeal is so broad, according to *Time* magazine, that a Jesuit moral theologian from Loyola University of Los Angeles and a curriculum expert for the State University of New York are among its twenty-one resident fellows, who pay \$3,000 for nine months of study. *Time* reports: "Also intrigued by the institute is the Ford Foundation's Fund for the Advancement of Education, which recently gave Esalen a \$21,000 grant to train five public school teachers, who will then try some of its techniques in their home classrooms."

All the more interesting is the fact that Big Sur has also become a large hippy center, and the Flower Children talk freely about the "plastic hippies in three-button suits" at Esalen. One recently told a Big Sur visitor that teachers, priests, ministers, attorneys, bankers, and businessmen from all over the San Francisco Bay area are conducting weekend pilgrimages to Esalen Institute and "dropping acid" — "turning on with Sensitivity Training, and getting their 'high' from LSD." If that is true, it is no wonder people are leaping through the air like ballet dancers.\*

### III

SENSITIVITY TRAINING is offered throughout the country in a variety of

\*Other regional centers for preparing Sensitivity Trainers include Boston University, Temple University, George Washington University, University of Texas, University of Chicago, Rocky Mountain Laboratory, Intermountain Laboratory (University of Utah), University of California (several branches), and University of Washington.

ways. In colleges it is most often given once or twice a week as a "lab"; in police departments and other Civil Service jobs, classes may be given weekly or semi-weekly; and, many private groups meet once a week in a home. Some lab designs call for starting at a weekend retreat—then meeting weekly for a specific time, and concluding with a marathon session (the loss of sleep aids suggestibility).

To produce the optimum condition for applying the brainwash it is best to totally remove the subjects from normal surroundings and get them away for a retreat in a rural area where the full environment can be controlled. There "marathon sessions" in which persons are subjected to twenty-four to forty-eight hours of gruelling "sensitizing," without sleep and with little food, *à la* Korea, are most effective. Though, certainly, such marathons can take place in a home or at a motel.

The session generally begins with an introductory talk from the group's "leader" or "trainer." At one of the introductory sessions which I attended the group "leader," a Professor from U.C.L.A., addressed us for about forty-five minutes using jargon right out of a textbook in introductory psychology, the assorted clichés no doubt included to impress us with how scientific it was all going to be. This, of course, gives the whole experiment an aura of being clinical.

We were told again and again that we were going to be in on something very new that is destined to reshape the world.

The "leader" informed us that Sensitivity Training was based on the newest concepts of psychology: He said that while in the past it had been believed that man was totally shaped by his environment, now scientists had discovered that there was "a sliver of freedom" in our lives. We were told we could use this "sliver of freedom" to escape

total environmental determinism and "change" our lives. Well, you must admit, that does sound impressive.

The Professor's key word was "*change*." The world must be changed and Sensitivity Training, he said, is the key to "changing human nature and producing a new societal or democratic man." Does that have a familiar ring? The same "Liberals" who foisted on us the fraud of environmental determinism now find it expedient to allow for "a sliver of freedom," as a rationalization for speeding collectivism.

Frankly described, the object of the "leader" is to emotionally shred the group. Though, they don't tell it that way. It is peddled with such vaseline as this lubricant from *West Magazine*, a supplement of the *Los Angeles Times*, for January 8, 1967:

*Hopefully, the group moves from mistrust to trust, from polite acceptance to honest critique, from "peeping-tomism" to participation and a giving of one's self, from dependency on the group leader to more autonomy, from autocracy to democracy... layer by layer, masks, roles, false images, pretenses and pretensions will peel away like the sections of an artichoke. Many believe that what is left when the difficult trial-by-intimacy is over is an astounding revelation of one's self and of others.*

The "leader" keeps the discussion oriented around personal feelings. Telling the naked truth about how one feels about one's self and others is the cardinal virtue. "Feeling" and expressing emotion are what is expected; "intellectualizing" is an unpardonable sin. The "trainer's" job is to manipulate the exposed feelings of the group. He probes for raw nerves and then starts drilling. With practice he develops the faculty for discovering the weak points of each member of the group, and then



attacks viciously. Any problem in human relations, real or imagined, becomes the subject of group concern and the property of the group. The more personal, the better. Great emphasis is put on saying and doing whatever one feels like with the exception, of course, of actually punching the "trainer" in the nose.

Abusive and gutter language — remember Alice? — is prized as "an honest expression of true feelings," and a sign that participants are really "taking off their social masks, stop playing games and start interacting truthfully, authentically and transparently." Participants are told to "pierce the veneer," of their companions, to "search out their Achilles heel," and "find the chink in their personal armor." Every personal secret, every fear, every worry, every repressed desire, every act for which one is ashamed must be trotted out to be handled and pawed by the group.

As each speaks, emotion fills the room and participants blurt out thoughts they never told even their spouses. "The surprise is that the roof doesn't fall in," they say. Unfortunately, the roof often does fall in. For grown men and women to break down and cry during these sessions is common, but some crack-up, and run from the session, barricade themselves in a room, or go into a virtual state of shock and nervous breakdown, or are unable to return in succeeding weeks to face the group.

According to the Leftist behavioral scientists promoting Sensitivity Training, you can't make an omelette without breaking eggs.\* Dr. Michael J. Singer, a Long Beach, California, psychiatrist doesn't see it that way. He says: "There is danger of serious psychological damage rather than benefit from this type of group . . . meetings, particularly if an emotionally disturbed person in this group is not being treated by a fully qualified and trained psychotherapist."

Usually, a first step is the breaking down of inhibitions. Thus, in an extreme example, the Westcoast's influential dance teacher, Ann Halprin, has had a Sensitivity-Trained class appear in public to take off its clothes, put them on, take them off again and put them on, before continuing a dance improvisation.

Why would anyone participate in this degrading mental-immolation? Primarily because they have been convinced by the Leftists promoting this scheme that self-improvement and the ability to be sensitive to others come only through conflict. This concept, that all progress comes through conflict which leads to synthesis, is known as "dialectical materialism" in the nightmare-theory books of the Communists. Also, there is a sick fascination involved in Sensitivity Training which brings sadism or masochism. Sensitivity Training attracts sadistic personalities and they tend to assume leadership because of their strength and ruthlessness. Verbal voyeurs are attracted by the prospects of vicariously running through everyone else's sex life. The process brings out the worst in everybody.

Many former trainees told me they could not later understand why they had themselves "ganged up" on a member of the group, criticizing the feelings of one person for hours. Why hurt one so deeply? It seemed, they agreed, a way to get involved in the discussion. Group pressure, they explained, gives way to pent-up feelings and takes a form of revenge, sadism, or masochism.

The marathon session I described at the beginning of this article featured participants who obviously needed psychiatric help, help which they were not getting. But most of these groups are composed of ordinary middle-class people who have no more problems than those faced by everyone else. A highly intelligent woman whose job required her to go through the better part of a



year in a once-a-week Sensitivity Training session described her experience for me this way:

*Our leader fascinated us with his descriptions of the teaching in the Pavlovian theory he had experienced in human relations workshops. . . . In order to get started, someone would be asked to give his perceptions about another participant, sometimes this meant giving a first impression of a stranger. As time progressed, we got to know each other better and moved on to more intense exchanges.*

*Our feedback system [others' criticisms of you] operated quickly making for "hot" sessions. Negativism would flow and somehow we didn't approach the love and trust Sensitivity Training is supposed to create. We did accomplish the openness and honesty promised, but to what ends? Deep emotional sobbing, separations of long-time friendships, and mental withdrawal were not rare.*

The system of emotions-in-the-raw confession actually stimulates one to magnify his problems, admitting to things he has not really done or felt because anything else will not satisfy the group "leader" or the other members. If what you say about yourself is not degrading, you are accused of "kidding yourself" or maintaining your "false mask." After such an experience, what can one conclude but that everyone is sick and immoral and perverted — so why fight it?

A pretty coed who got involved in a Sensitivity Training program disguised as a speech course (Speech 132: Elements of Group Discussion) described how she was constantly attacked by the group "leader" and the rest of the class because she rejected the so-called "new morality." The "leader," of course, refused to accept her feelings as authentic.

She was accused of compromising her integrity by not being honest about how she felt about pre-marital and extra-marital sexual experiences. You see, with Sensitivity Training the individual with high morals and integrity must be cut down to the level of the rest of the group. Instead of being respected for her strength of character, the young woman found herself being ridiculed — the ridicule being led by her Professor serving as the group "leader." A conservative point of view honestly held was just not acceptable, and the pressure was applied to grind down the student.

The coed accused those who challenged the way she felt of trying to take away the values she held, and trying to break down her defenses for the sake of breaking them down. If only the destruction of her principles would be a triumph for the group, for democracy, then to Hell with democracy. The young woman told her group that they had no higher values to offer and that they were offering *nothing* for everything she treasured.

Few people, particularly young people, have such strong convictions in these days when absolute moral and ethical relativism is being preached from lecturns, podiums, and pulpits throughout the land. During Sensitivity Training most will surrender their values since it is much easier to do this than to defend them against the vulgarity and rage of a dozen hostile people. Personal morality or conviction is always on the defense, and is often surrendered point by point until the least common denominator is reached. After hearing others confessing their wrong-doing, one is apt to feel that his own deeds weren't so bad after all, causing him to accept lower moral standards. After such brutal criticizing of one's home, family, friends, religion, attitudes, beliefs, and ideas, one is apt to doubt that he has any values, ideals, or beliefs worth keeping or defending. In short, Sensitivity

Training produces "change" by realigning loyalties away from family, home, church, and co-workers.

Of course, the "new morality" is no newer than the flesh pots of Babylon, the decadence of Sodom, or the orgies of Rome. The "new morality" is a step into the past, a leap toward the dismemberment of civilization; and, like its accomplice, the hoary concept of the omnipotence of the State, it is promoted as "modern" and "progressive" by the trumpeters of "planned change." Participants in Sensitivity Training are forced into making an awful choice: morality or moral disobedience. Group pressure forces them to choose between the "old and the new." A few are strong enough to run this psychological gauntlet, but even they are racked by scars of humiliation and hyperbolic self-doubt.

#### IV

AT FIRST GLANCE, what seems strangest about Sensitivity Training is the fact that so many people become sincerely and completely hooked on it. It seems logical that the results of *all* Sensitivity Training would be the same as in the enemy prison camps of the Korean War, with each person becoming an isolated island afraid to talk to, or trust, anyone else in the group. But Sensitivity Training carries the prison camp process one step further.

In the prison camp, group and self-criticism leads to isolation and alienation from the rest of the group; support comes only from the group "leader" and the society he represents, Communism. Thus the rapport is with the group "leader," not with one's fellow prisoners, making it very natural for one to confess that others are trying to escape. Sensitivity Training can operate this way where it works to the advantage of the planners, as for instance in a police department where the natural end product could be that the officer does not trust or have confidence

in other officers, or even his own partner. But most groups carry on where the prison camp technique concludes.

After one's pride, integrity, and self-esteem have been crushed through group and self-criticism, he naturally considers himself a miserable specimen of humanity of little worth to anyone. But now, the group that has mercilessly destroyed him picks him up. Many groups actually act this step out symbolically by having the individual lie on the floor while the others place one foot on his head, neck, or body displaying that all power comes from the group. Then they remove their feet and physically lift the individual up, telling him that they "love" him. He is now dependent on the group for approval and for esteem. His ego having been crushed and totally subjected to the group, he is welcomed as "mass man."

Many feel that they have actually been improved by Sensitivity Training. Any progress is illusory. The process has such a profound and Orwellian effect on many minds that it is similar to that of the college graduate who after use of L.S.D. felt that she had improved her status in life when she became a prostitute. Since one is taught that it is dishonest and hypocritical not to hurl your most blunt reactions and impressions at everyone you bump into, the victim of Sensitivity Training may find that he cannot communicate outside the group. Such trainees have not learned to communicate better, they have isolated themselves. But this is rationalized away by a feeling of superiority they are conditioned to assume by the "leader." A typical speech given by one "leader" at the conclusion of training goes like this: "In that outside world they are not on the same wave lengths you are. You have reached a wave length now that no one else has."

The young lady previously quoted described for me the false euphoria of her group:

*After being away for two years, I still wonder why I stood for being hurt so deeply and why I hurt others. How with such a positive goal as better communication could I fall for such negative, destructive methods? There seemed to prevail a false sense of well-being. Often, very often, we would say that others outside of the group didn't know what strides we were making. We thought we were a happy few; paradoxically, we were very unhappy.*

*We paid lip service to our progress, but we spoke double-talk and practiced double-think. We allowed pressures of rejection, status loss, desires to please, or fear of being the one on the "hot seat" to dictate our actions. We knew, in order to be really "in," each person would have to "change" if his behavior was not what the group thought to be correct. If the people of such a group do come to interdependence as individuals, they are no longer able to make their own decisions in important matters or during times of stress.*

This is the essence of Sensitivity Training — substituting the will and judgment of the group for that of the individual. You exchange your personal values, convictions, and morality for those of the group. You subjugate your intellect for their emotions. Group security is substituted for individual security. For example, in one session attended by the author, an artist described his married life for about ten minutes. It wasn't the world's happiest marriage, but it could have been a lot worse. Yet after only ten minutes the group collectively told the artist that he had to divorce his wife — that there was no alternative.

Since many schools, churches, and Y.M.C.A.s\* are pushing Sensitivity Training for young people, it is extremely important that they know what

they are dealing with. The young are particularly vulnerable since they are usually very naive, sincere, and impressionable. Few young people possess the sophistication to realize that many things can be the very opposite of how they are described; and they seldom question the motives of those who profess to be interested in "humanity." Just as most young people do not realize that those fostering the "peace" movement in America are the world's primary war makers, so they cannot believe that Sensitivity Training, which is supposed to make one a better communicator, or bring out leadership qualities, has just the exact opposite effect.

Virtually all young people share two common problems — anxiety and curiosity concerning sex, and difficulty in communicating with their parents, who are of course "old-fashioned." To facilitate the "planned change" they admit they are after, the behavioral scientists use the weapons of the "new morality" and parental misunderstanding to gain their aims. The natural strains that have always accompanied adolescence are magnified to the point where parents and children become totally alienated

---

\*In the *Long Beach Independent* of December 12, 1966, George Robeson quotes from a forty-two page "log" prepared by group "leaders" from a Los Altos Y.M.C.A. Sensitivity Training program among teenagers. It reads as follows: "Bob and Rick wondered why Marcia liked her parents. She became increasingly nervous, in motion, tapping her foot, wiggling her arms, squeezing her hands. . . . She is unhappy with her mother, for she works. Her brother bothers her for he drinks and smokes. Robbie, sitting next to Marcia, asked her to close her eyes and relax for five minutes. . . . Robbie put his hand on her knee to stop the motion of her foot, and while he did this he spoke softly and gently to her . . . gradually she started to relax. There was total silence. When she opened her eyes she said, 'Everything looks different.' She thought a piece of cement was crushing her and then it went away.

" . . . Mary Kay arrived, crying . . . she said, 'I'm glad I'm Burt's friend — this whole mess makes me sick.' . . . Martha got too involved. Robbie nudged her to be quiet. Rick told Mary Kay to shut her mouth. . . . Mary Kay said, 'I feel for him (Burt).' . . . she told Martha, 'I hate you.' . . ."



because, after all, you can't build a new Utopian society unless all reactionary vestiges are severed. A leader at a Sensitivity Training retreat attended by a Los Angeles reporter used this technique expertly with a group of teenage boys and girls: "How many have felt this hurt here in your gut during the last few days? [All raised their hands.] An emotional level hurt is not something easy to get out of your gut. *It is there because of the conflict with your parents.*"

Sensitivity Training is used by many to achieve a drug-like reaction. In his report for U.P.I. on the matter, Robert Strand revealed that "the concern of many Sensitivity Training participants is to 'turn-on' without narcotics. Some, who have tried L.S.D., claim to have had more exotic experiences than those inspired by the hallucinatory drugs. Similar emotional orgies are reported by persons who concentrate on a white panel until they have visions, or who stare into one another's eyes until something else happens." Robert Strand also quotes from a "conventional" Los Angeles woman, age forty-eight, who returned "from a 48 hour sensitivity marathon" to write the local underground hippie newspaper, *The Oracle*, telling of her experience. "Turning on," she said, is also being done by many who look and are just average 'nine-to-five' people who sense there is more to life than meets the eye." She describes how her "turn-on" was effected through "the unique painful sharing, tearing, giving, baiting, waiting, hoping, supporting, intuitive knowing, groping, giving, surrendering, choosing, holding back in trust, laughing, holding, kissing, hugging male to female, male to male, woman to woman. . . ."

## V

WHAT DO the brain benders have in mind for the future? In August of 1967, Dr. Stanley Less told the Inter-

national Congress of Psychiatry that society will become depersonalized and anyone who tries to be an individual "will be looked upon as odd, reactionary and antigroup." According to the Professor, "unanimity of thinking would be seen as the normal pattern." Sensitivity Training is an important part of this scheme.

It is true that when the Russian Communists were unable to persuade the people of that land to willingly follow their brutal leaders, the Comrades turned to Pavlov and his conditioning experiments in an attempt to change human nature. Our behavioral scientists are now trying to change human nature by subjecting the individual to an enforced conditioning process. It is also true that those pushing such training in schools, government, and our churches are invariably members of the Far Left. But if Russia had not turned to Pavlov, and those acting as "change agents" in our society were not almost universally Leftists — and even if Sensitivity Training were not a parallel of the Communist brainwashing tactics used in Korea — it should still be resisted by every individual who possesses any pride or self-esteem. Sensitivity Training should be resisted if only because it is emotionally and morally destructive.

A courageous survivor of "Sensitivity Training" put her feelings this way: "My involvement for nine months did teach me something. I know now that no one can choose what another should think and know. No one should take it upon himself to sit in judgment of others. We should be individuals — as different inside as we are on the outside. And the most important of all is, I will never allow any concept to deprive me of one iota of my independence, my right to think, choose, and do for myself."

That, we think, is a pretty good way of summing up our whole case. ■ ■