

suppression (for though I thought I had it all truly controlled, this was an illusion). I feel less sick, I feel human, I am grateful for her love which is so totally mine. All the beauty of it comes from this, that we are not just playing, we belong totally to each other's love (except for the vow that prevents the last complete surrender).'

By June, Merton's behavior was so out of control that it had come to the attention of his Trappist superiors. One of the monks had overheard a telephone conversation between Merton and M. and had reported him to Dom James Fox, Merton's abbot. Fox was understanding but demanded a "complete break." And Merton, like many religious at the time, was faced with the unenviable prospect of either repudiating his religious vows or cutting himself off from the woman he loved.

During the summer of 1966, at the end of the Second Vatican Council and the beginning of the sexual revolution, the world seemed alive to new sexual possibilities, especially for Catholic nuns and priests, many of whom confidently expected that the Catholic Church's discipline on celibacy was about to be lifted. Joining them in a chorus of mute anticipation were the Catholic laity, who were just as confident in their expectation that the ban on artificial birth control would be lifted soon as well. Pope Paul VI had appointed a layman-staffed advisory board, and it was assumed - correctly, it turns out - that they would vote to overturn the Church's long-standing ban on contraception, a ban which had been reaffirmed as recently as thirty years before in Pius XI's encyclical *Casti Connubii*. Because of Pope John XXIII, President John F. Kennedy, and the Vatican Council, Catholics had become the focus of so much media attention, they failed to see distortions in the mirror which the media, dominated by alumni of the OSS and other psychological warfare operations, held up to their collective face. They failed to understand how seriously malformed their opinions were becoming at the hands of people like Xavier Rhyne and Michael Novak and other media enthusiasts who felt to a man that the long reign of anti-Catholic bigotry in the United States had come to an end and that all the Church needed to do to create its own happy ending was join hands with the liberal Zeitgeist, as reported in places like *Time* and the *New Yorker*, drop a few medieval sexual prohibitions, and walk off into the sunset.

During the summer of 1966, right around the time that Merton was grappling with the competing claims which his religious vows and the young student nurse were making on him, the Immaculate Heart nuns of Los Angeles invited a New York psychiatrist to their retreat house in Montecito to conduct an encounter workshop. The nuns liked the workshops so much that a year later they invited a psychologist by the name of Carl Rogers and his associates to begin something they called the Education Innovation Project with the entire order and all of the schools it ran for the archdiocese of Los Angeles.

Rogers had become famous in 1961 with the publication of his book *On Becoming a Person*. He along with Abraham Maslow, whose book *Toward a Psychology of Being* came out one year later in 1962, had become the two leading proponents of what came to be known as humanistic or third-force psychology. The third force referred to a therapy that was based on both Freud and Watson but was more “client centered.” In Rogerian therapy, the client solved his own problems with minimal interference from his therapist guide, who gave little more than non-committal answers as a way of guiding the patient to truths that the client knew but chose not to see. Another name for this therapy was nondirective counseling, A creation of the early 1940s, it had been proposed, according to Rogers’s assistant W. R. Coulson “as a humane replacement for behaviorism in the laboratory and Freudian psychoanalysis in the clinic.”<sup>4</sup>

In 1965 Carl Rogers began circulating a paper entitled “The Process of the Basic Encounter Group” to some religious orders in the Los Angeles area. One group which found his ideas intriguing was the Sisters of the Immaculate Heart of Mary. This should not be surprising because the California-based IHM nuns had already established the reputation of being “innovative.” In the early ’60s, Sister Aloyse, the order’s superior, had brought in the Dutch psychologist-priest Adrian van Kaam for retreat exercises during which “all community rules were suspended.”<sup>5</sup> The results of this sort of innovation were predictable. After allowing the psychologists in, the nuns became aware of “how dictatorial superiors were and in turn how dependent, submissive and helpless nuns were when it came to working with the outside world.”<sup>6</sup> By the spring of 1965, James Francis Cardinal McIntyre, archbishop of the archdiocese of Los Angeles,

had become upset at the large number of Immaculate Heart nuns who had asked to be dispensed from their vows. Large, as time would show, was a relative term in this respect. Soon the number of nuns asking to be laicized would tum into a flood, and the sensitivity training which Carl Rogers would unleash on the order under the auspices of the Education Innovation Project would play a major role in their leaving. By the time the experiment was over, the order would cease to exist, leaving subsequent generations to puzzle over an incident which had become a classic instance of renewal gone wrong in the aftermath of Vatican II.

With the benefit of hindsight, anyone who read Rogers's paper should have been aware of this possibility from the beginning. In a version of that paper which appeared in the July 1969 issue of *Psychology Today*, entitled "Community: The Group Comes of Age," Rogers explained that

In mixed intensive workshops positive and warm, loving feelings frequently develop between members of the encounter group and, naturally enough, these feelings sometimes occur between men and women. Inevitably, some of these feelings have a sexual component and this can be a matter of great concern to the participants and... a profound threat to their spouses.

Or to their religious vows, Rogers might have added.

Right around the time that Rogers was circulating "Involvement in the Basic Encounter," a draft of a paper published two years later as "The Process of the Basic Encounter Group" among the Immaculate Heart nuns in 1965, the Vatican Council came to a close. A close reading of the pertinent documents would show they reaffirmed Catholic tradition. But at that time close readings had been eschewed in favor of readings in keeping with the spirit of Vatican II, which seemed eager to second whatever the secular *Zeitgeist* was proposing at the time. On September 2, 1966, Pope Paul VI implemented the earlier conciliar decree on religious life, *Perfectae Caritatis*, by issuing a *Motu Proprio* in which he urged all religious "to examine and renew their way of life and towards that end to engage in wide-ranging experimentation." The pope added the following caveat: "provided that the purpose, nature and character of the institute are safeguarded." In keeping with the spirit of the times, the caveat was all but

universally ignored. In fact, those most eager to experiment were those also most likely to ignore it. The IHM sisters were among the first to respond, and within six weeks, the pontiff's letter had been circulated among the 560 members of the community. A number of commissions were appointed to study carefully all aspects of their religious commitment.

Religious orders like the Immaculate Heart Nuns, already bigger than they had ever been in the history of their existence, now seemed on the verge of even greater accomplishments as they renewed themselves by getting rid of outmoded forms of dress and behavior. Now the same baby boom which their schools had educated was providing nuns to staff the order. A generation of demographic increase was beginning to pay off. One member of that generation who had decided to become an Immaculate Heart nun was Jeanne Cordova. Cordova graduated from high school in the spring of 1966, and on a sunny September 6, 1966 she and four of her nine brothers and sisters drove up to the novitiate in Santa Barbara where she was to begin her life as a nun.

On January 1, 1967, Jean Cordova was called into the mother's superior's office and told that she and her fellow novices were being sent to live in the "real world," which in this instance meant a building surrounded by chainlink fence and barbed wire in downtown Los Angeles near skid row, where Cordova would lie awake at night watching the pulsing red light on top of Los Angeles city hall and wonder what had happened to her and the convent she had chosen in lieu of this "real world." Cordova arrived at the novitiate expecting something different from what she eventually got. Her bitterness at what amounted to bait and switch tactics (even if perpetrated inadvertently) was still palpable twenty years later.

They promised me monastic robes, glorious Latin liturgy, the protection of the three sacred vows, the peace of saints in a quiet cell, the sisterhood of a holy family. But I entered religious life the year John XXIII [sic] was taking it apart: 1966. The fathers of the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church were sitting at the Vatican Council destroying in the name of CHANGE, my dreams. Delete Latin ritual. Dump the habit. Damn holy obedience. Send nuns and priests out into the REAL world. If I had wanted the real world. I'd have stayed in it.'

As part of her entry into the real world, Cordova was enrolled at Immaculate Heart College, the flagship school of the order, where she was subjected to the Education Innovation Project first-hand through sensitivity training and second-hand through the teachers who had also taken the sensitivity training. Perhaps no one epitomized the new nun better than “famous people like Sister Corita [Kent]” an artist nun who was famous for her graffiti-inspired paintings which illustrated passages from the Bible like the Beatitudes in updated language, i.e., “Happy the poor in spirit,” instead of the more traditional term “Blessed.” Cordova remembers one art course in which she and other nuns were required to run across the tops of desks while dabbing paint onto canvases. She remembers being told that in doing this she and the other nuns were “expressing ourselves.” She also remembers taking a course with Sister Richard, “a great brain in philosophy,” who “tied the sacrament of baptism in with the order of the cosmos.”

Similarly, nothing epitomized the new spirituality better than sensitivity training. One of Sister Richard’s colleagues in the English department wrote that as a result of the sensitivity training she had received as part of the Education Innovation Project, she had redesigned all of her courses. “My classroom behavior,” she wrote, “is radically different now. I have been able to confess anxiety to my classes and consequently feel more comfortable in the classroom than ever before. I invited the girls to call me by my first name, and after a couple of weeks they are doing so. This allows for a lot of free exchange. I am not giving grades and I am not even giving exams. They are writing their own questions, the ones that are meaningful to them. Then they are discussing them.”

In their enthusiasm for Rogers’s encounter groups, the older sisters seem to have missed the fact that students like Jean Cordova found the whole experience more troubling than exhilarating. “A lot of times,” wrote one of Cordova’s fellow students, “I’ve heard that faculty felt they were being forced ... to say things they didn’t want to say; I myself feel very uncomfortable about being shut in with people who break down and say things I feel I shouldn’t have heard. I think it creates a kind of embarrassment, which would seem to be a hindrance in relationships rather than a help. Still I do feel that I’ve gained a lot of insight into other

peoples' behavior." Another student was even more troubled. "I felt at a loss today in that encounter group: very naked, as though everyone knows too much about me."

Before long, many of the nuns started to feel naked as well, mainly because as a result of the loosening of controls in the order in the name of California-style openness, they were taking off their clothes and having sex with other nuns. Instead of doing a close reading of Rogers's paper on groups, especially the passage about how encounter groups often led to "feelings which have a sexual component" and acting according to procedures consonant with the vow of chastity, the Immaculate Heart nuns, in the name of openness and innovation, decided that they had to learn the same lesson about human passion in the expensive school of experience. In the name of openness, religious asceticism vanished from convent life. Cordova stopped going to Mass at 6:30 in the morning because nuns weren't "required" to go to Mass anymore. As religious practice evaporated from their lives, the nuns turned to each other for support. Particular friendships flourished, and in the atmosphere of the times, some of these friendships inevitably turned sexual.

This, of course, meant that life in the convent became both mean-spirited and chaotic. During the spring of 1967, Cordova noticed that many of the nuns weren't going to Mass anymore. This meant the beginning of

lots of particular friendships, a whole sub-culture of in-group and out-group, who they were and how they did it and how you could just lie your way out of anything. To a lonely postulant in a miserable friendless world, it was an absurd outrage. I fell out of love with Jesus and the IHMs, who betrayed and mocked my innocence. ... I was sinking in the quagmire of broken dreams.... All I have ever wanted to be was a nun. Now I was, and it was hell.

Jeanne Cordova found that she couldn't talk to her parents about the changes, probably because her parents were as bewildered by the unprecedented sequence of events as she was. "Mom was a sheltered, upper class convent raised Irish Catholic from Queens, Long Island, who probably first read about birth control in the LA Times between her ninth and tenth kid." In the bewildering atmosphere of the up-dated chaotic

convent, where the IHM nuns were told to be open to their feelings in the encounter groups they were attending, Cordova found solace in sexual contact, with one of the other nuns. Both embittered and sexualized by her experience in the convent, Cordova converted to lesbian activism with the same fervor which she offered to the pre-conciliar Church.

I harnessed my anger into love for gays as an oppressed people. My bitterness demands the straight world to move over and accept our rights. I have learned that my anger takes me where others are afraid to go and that outrage is good in the eyes of whatever Higher Power gives us righteous, if misguided, anger to protect us.<sup>11</sup>

Other IHM nuns had similar experiences. Sister Mary Benjamin, like Jean Cordova, was driven to the IHM novitiate by her large Catholic family, who piled out of the station wagon “like a baseball team” when they arrived there in 1962. Like Jean Cordova, Sister Mary Benjamin was enrolled as a student at Immaculate Heart College, where four years later, during the summer of 1966, she was “introduced to sensitivity training, the order’s first venture into the human potential movement.”<sup>12</sup> In her encounter group, Sister Mary met Eva, “a heavy, dark-skinned woman with deep brown eyes and black hair.” Given the spirit of the times, the alchemy of this relationship was just as predictable as that which seduced Jean Cordova: “The order no longer prohibited particular friendships,” Sister Mary recounted matter of factly, “so the contact turned sexual.”<sup>13</sup> Sister Mary sought counsel from a priest, but apparently he had been infected by the spirit of the times as well and “refused to pass judgment on my actions. He said it was up to me to decide if they were right or wrong. He opened a door, and I walked through, realizing I was on my own.” When Sister Mary told Eva that she was “worried that I had a terrible crush on her,” Eva responded by saying, “Great! Enjoy it!”<sup>14</sup>

Sister Mary’s relationship with Eva turned out to be less than enjoyable, however. After the friendship became sexualized, a painful breakup ensued, which in turn precipitated a break with the Catholic Church. Sister Mary, like most lesbians, was then cast adrift on a sea of transient relationships, and one relationship which proved just as transient was her relationship with the Catholic Church. “In loving Eva,” she wrote, “I was growing in a direction at odds with convent goals of obedience and service

to the Church. I began to make decisions, not out of guilt, but according to the voice of my intuition and the wisdom of my body. I began to see the Church more objectively. It was run by men, not God. My allegiance to the Church was no longer fate but choice.”<sup>1</sup>

Actually, if Sister Mary had been reading Wilhelm Reich, she would have realized that once she started acting on her illicit sexual impulses, her break with the Church was more fate than choice. Once she began acting out her lesbian impulses, her break with the Church was inevitable. Because she was subsequently dragooned into feminism, Sister Mary simply lacked the intellectual categories to understand what had happened to her. Everything was now a question of “liberation” from oppression, and since the culture she embraced had hundreds of years of experience in portraying convent life as a form of oppression, it is not surprising that she would see matters that way too. If there were sinister forces at work in precipitating Sister Mary’s departure from the convent and the Catholic faith, the lesbianism which replaced her Catholicism as the religious center of her life precluded any clear understanding of them. The categories of lesbian politics took control of her mind and precluded any other explanation of what had happened to her.

Like Jean Cordova, Jean O’Leary entered the convent in 1966. Like Jean Cordova, she was immediately plunged into the regimen of the “renewed” religious order, which meant “we were together constantly, talking endlessly and intensely in sensitivity and encounter groups about love and hope and philosophy.”<sup>16</sup> As with the two previous examples, all this “intensely emotional talk” about “great thinkers and modern psychology” inevitably led to sexual feelings, which inevitably led to sexual activity, which inevitably led to a religious crisis when it became apparent that the nuns were acting in ways which were incompatible with the vows they had taken. At this point, the nuns had to make a choice, either to conform their lives to their principles or their principles to their lives. For those who persisted in their sexual activity, the result was a foregone conclusion. As Reich had predicted in the *Mass Psychology of Fascism*, illicit sexual activity has loss of faith as one of its inevitable sequelae. Like Sister Mary, Jean O’Leary turned to a priest for guidance, but as in the previous instance, the priest was himself a psychologist who

had been brought into the order to facilitate the very encounter groups which were the catalyst for the sexual activity which was causing the problem. Unsurprisingly, no spiritual help was forthcoming from this corner, and

Jean O'Leary began another affair, this time with the novice mistress, before eventually drifting out of the community and into political lesbianism as its surrogate.

At around the same time that Jean O'Leary was acting out her sexual impulses, Abe Maslow, one of the creators of the psychology which enabled her and other nuns to act on their newly discovered sexual impulses, was having second thoughts about the whole encounter-group phenomenon. "I've been in continuous conflict," he wrote in his diary, "for a long time over this, over Esalen-type, orgiastic, Dionysian type education." Maslow had not always had conflicts of this sort. Writing in the *Journal of Psychology* in 1949, Maslow said confidently that "I can report empirically the healthiest persons in our culture . . . are most (not least) pagan, most (not least) instinctive, most (not least) accepting of their animal nature."

Three years before Carl Rogers's paper on encounter groups circulated among the nuns in Los Angeles, on April 17, 1962, Abraham Maslow gave a lecture to a group of nuns at Sacred Heart, a Catholic women's college in Massachusetts. Maslow noted in a diary entry of the same date that the talk had been very "successful," but he found that very fact troubling. "They shouldn't applaud me," he wrote, "they should attack. If they were fully aware of what I was doing, they would [attack]."<sup>17</sup>

Just why the nuns should have attacked him becomes evident from a reading of other journal entries written around the same time. Maslow was aware that encounter groups were toxic for Catholics in general and especially toxic for Catholic religious. Anyone who promoted encounter groups among Catholics was promoting ipso facto their demise as Catholics, even if he did so in the name of liberation and with that as his intent. For the liberal Jew or Protestant, the nun was the textbook case of someone in need of "liberation" and in the context of Catholic religious life and the vows upon which it was based, liberation could only mean

annihilation. On February 25, 1967, Maslow wrote in his diary, "Maybe morons need rules, dogmas, ceremonies, etc." He then made a note to order a book entitled *Life among the Lowbrows* for the Brandeis library. He may have ordered it because the author of that book noted in it that "feeble-minded clients behaved much better and felt better being Catholic and following all the rules." Since the nuns weren't feeble-minded, this meant that bringing "self-actualization" to the nuns meant destroying their commitment to their vows and the Catholic Church. Perhaps this is why Maslow felt they shouldn't have applauded his talk in 1962. Maslow, who had spent time at the National Training Laboratories' headquarters in Bethel, Maine, where encounter groups, with the help of subsidies from the Office of Naval Research, had been created, knew that they were funded as a form of psychological warfare, and he had an inkling of the effect they would have on nuns, but it was up to his colleague Carl Rogers to do the actual experiment.

"I guess what I'm trying to say here," Maslow wrote in his journal in 1965, the same year that Carl Rogers began circulating his paper on the psychology of small-group encounters among the IHM nuns and around the same time that the nuns started to leave the convent, "is that these interpersonal therapeutic growth-fostering relationships of all kinds which rest on intimacy, on honesty, on self-disclosure, on becoming sensitively aware of one's self - and thereby of responsibility for feeding back one's impression of others, etc. - that these are profoundly revolutionary devices, in the strict sense of the word - that is, of shifting the whole direction of a society in a more preferred direction. As a matter of fact, it might be revolutionary in another sense if something like this were done very widely. I think the whole culture would change within a decade and everything in it."<sup>18</sup>

What was true for the culture was a fortiori true of religious orders in the Catholic Church. The whole culture did change, as a matter of fact, after implementation of encounter groups became widespread, but nowhere was the change as dramatic as in the Catholic Church, where it literally destroyed the orders which tried to experiment with it. After making contact with their inner selves, the nuns all wanted to leave their orders and have sex, although not always in that order. "A sign of this potency,"

Rogers's assistant W. R. Coulson wrote some thirty years later, "was the conversions that followed Rogers's workshops. A Catholic priest took part in a five-day workshop in the 1960s, then left the priesthood to study psychology with Rogers, who had been his group facilitator. It happened repeatedly. Of the workshop that converted him, the priest wrote that he began somewhat skeptically, but "by Wednesday. . . something new and intriguing and intoxicating as well as frightening has become real all around me ... . [It] seemed like a beautiful birth to a new existence.... I had not known how unaware I was of my deepest feelings nor how valuable they might be to other people .... Never in my life before that group experience had I experienced 'me' so intensely."<sup>19</sup>

The priest may not have noticed it, but both Maslow and Rogers were involved in the sexual engineering of behavior. Catholic religious, who were expected to lead ascetic lives while at the same time being told that love was the reason for their asceticism, were now experiencing the "love" they had always talked about in previously abstract and rarefied terms, and they were for the most part unhinged by the experience. The effectiveness of the encounter group was based on the deliberate violation of the sexual inhibitions which made everyday life possible. When the inhibitions dropped, the emotion which flooded in to fill the vacuum seemed a lot like the love which Christians were supposed to practice on their neighbors, when in point of fact it was more akin to unfettered libido, which could now be used by the facilitator as the energy which brought about the social engineering they desired. Maslow was never shy in proposing sexual activity as a form of social engineering. In a passage which appeared in his book *Eupsychian Management*

(but was subsequently deleted by the editors who reissued it in 1998 as *Maslow on Management*), Maslow said:

it always struck me as a very wise kind of thing that the lower-class Negroes did, as reported in one study, in Cleveland, Ohio. Among those Negroes the sexual life began at puberty. It was the custom for an older brother to get a friend in his own age grade to break in his little sister sexually when she came of a suitable age. And the same thing was done on the girl's side. A girl who had a younger brother coming into puberty would seek among her own girl friends for one who would take on the job

of initiating the young boy into sex in a nice way. This seems extremely sensible and wise and could also serve highly therapeutic purposes in various other ways as well. I remember talking with Alfred Adler about this in a kind of joking way, but then we both got quite serious about it, and Adler thought that his sexual therapy at various ages was certainly a very fine thing. As we both played with the thought we envisaged a kind of social worker in both sexes, who was very well trained for this sort of thing, sexually but primarily as a psychotherapist in giving therapy literally on the couch, that is for mixing in the beautiful and gentle sexual initiation with all the goals of psychotherapy.

Maslow's use of the Negro as a paradigm of sexual liberation was part of a long tradition of race-based sexual engineering which surfaced in the 1920s with the Harlem Renaissance and reached its culmination the civil-rights movement of the '60s. So was his idea of the psychotherapist "giving therapy literally on the couch." Both tactics would be waged against Catholics in the Kulturkampf of the 1960s as a way of changing their outmoded attitudes and moving them in a direction more congenial to the progressive facilitators.

By the late '60s, which is to say, shortly before his death, Maslow was confronted not with the theory of encounter groups and third-force humanistic psychology, but with its ever-increasing and more widespread practice, and what he saw appalled him. The reverence for learning which he associated with Jews had all but dried up at Brandeis, where he was teaching and could measure the effect of his theories on students first-hand.

One trouble with liberals, humanists, psychology 3 [humanistic psychology], McGregor, Esalen, Rogers, et al. is in their giving up of evil, or at least their total confusion about it. As if there were no sons of bitches or paranoids or psychopaths or true believers in the world to crap things up, even in a Utopian environment. My class has lost the traditional Jewish respect for knowledge, learning and teachers.<sup>20</sup> I don't want it<sup>21</sup>

By 1967, Maslow was referring to the self-actualization which encounter groups were supposed to bring about as "S. A. stuff," which had become in turn, just part of the "Esalen-Dionysian" enterprise. One year before

his death, he could now detect in all of these activities the odor of “insanity and death.”<sup>22</sup>

The misgivings expressed by the creators of humanistic psychology

T

were not shared by their more enthusiastic epigone, who were more bent on “giving therapy literally on the couch,” especially among the nuns, than in expressing the misgivings about the consequences for higher things which flowed from this sort of behavior. In *Hollywood Priest*, his memoir of his years as a TV producer and Paulist Priest, Rev. Elwood “Bud” Kieser describes meeting a nun he identifies only as “Genevieve” at the 1HM retreat house in Santa Barbara in 1964.<sup>23</sup> (Kieser’s story has uncanny similarities with the story of James F. T. Bugental, one of Rogers’s followers who had a practice in Los Angeles and ended up marrying former IHM nun Elizabeth Keebler.)<sup>14</sup> During the fall of 1965, Kieser was in Rome covering the end of the Vatican Council. When he returned at the end of the year, he realized that he had fallen deeply in love with Sister “Genevieve,” who announced when they met again at the retreat house that she was going to begin psychotherapy. Kieser was taken aback by the announcement, but claims that he “admired her courage in facing the situation and trying to do something about it.” Kieser never gets around to explaining just what “the situation” was or why it required treatment in 1966, but a large part of the reason was the encounter groups the nuns were involved in. According to the tenets of encounter psychology, you had to be crazy to repress your libido. Since all nuns repressed their libidos, they were all ipso facto crazy and therefore candidates for therapy, although only the bravest had the guts to descend into their unconscious to prove the point.

Not surprisingly, Genevieve found therapy painful. As a result, she turned to Father Kieser for guidance, wondering whether she should continue because she was not sure she could trust her therapist. Kieser, who had read a book the therapist had written, assured her that she could trust Harry, the pseudonym Kieser applied to the therapist. It was advice that Kieser would live to regret. To begin with, the prime result of Genevieve’s therapy was convincing her that her decision to enter the convent had been based on “repression rather than the sublimation of her sexual drives.” And now,

in the midst of the sexual revolution of the '60s, when Genevieve was in her late thirties, "those mechanisms of repression seemed to be coming apart."

Just why those mechanisms were coming apart becomes apparent when Kieser describes the type of therapy to which Sister Genevieve was being subjected:

Very early in her therapy, her therapist - let's call him Hairy - had suggested a degree of sex play to help her with her repressions. Almost all therapists would today consider this a serious breach of professional ethics. But in the 1960s such procedures were not uncommon. She went along. When she told me, I was furious. She decided to stop. But she was vulnerable. So was he. Once started this kind of thing is difficult to keep in check. It became a problem that plagued her therapy.<sup>26</sup>

By the summer of 1967, the problem became so serious that Harry arranged another therapist for "Genevieve." But by the fall, they started seeing each other outside therapy, and the sexual relationship only intensified, something which "Genevieve" shared with Father Kieser, who was now consumed with both "pure masculine jealousy" and justifiable indignation at a flagrant abuse of the doctor-patient relationship.

Harry the Therapist was, of course, married to another woman at the time, a woman whom he would eventually abandon to marry Sister Genevieve. Father Kieser, for his part however, has a difficult time deciding whether his feelings are motivated by moral outrage or by simple jealousy. He is so upset that he contemplates killing Harry the Therapist, but for all that, he never really understands what is happening, even though he mentions the fact that the sexual revolution of the '60s might have something to do with it:

We were both caught up in the cultural revolution that characterized American society and the Catholic Church during the 1960s. The consensus that characterized both society and Church was beginning to come undone. On every side authority, creed, and institutions were being challenged. Dogmas were suspect, certainties rejoiced, absolutes called into question, values rigorously scrutinized, and rules routinely broken.

The sexual revolution was in full swing, and its initial message seemed to be: If it feels good, go with it.

Kieser was not only caught up in the cultural revolution of the 1960s, he was witnessing the engine which drove it first-hand, and yet he remained blind to what was right in front of his eyes. Wilhelm Reich could have explained it to him. Adultery and religious vows don't mix. People involved in both have to choose eventually one or the other. Since sex of this sort is highly addictive, the choice often goes against the vows religious made to serve the Church. Sex was the best way of "liberating" nuns from the their convents. As Leo Pfeffer would say in 1976, the cultural revolution of the '60s was a battle between the Enlightenment (as espoused by liberal Protestants and Jews) and the Catholic Church. Sex was simply the most effective weapon the Enlightenment would bring to bear in this battle. Reich had explicated the use of sex as a way of destroying religious faith, especially among the clergy, in his magnum opus of sexual politics, *The Mass Psychology of Fascism*, which was undergoing a revival around the same time that Kieser was puzzling over Sister Genevieve's behavior. But Kieser hadn't read Reich, and even if he had he was probably incapable of understanding it. The reason is simple enough. Kieser has so adopted the psychological categories of his oppressors, he couldn't understand what was happening right in front of his eyes to Sister Genevieve and her order. Because of his closeness to Sister Genevieve, Kieser in fact became the chief enabler of her demise as a nun, something which he perceived dimly - "I felt somehow responsible. If

29

I had decided differently, would she be deciding differently?" - but only after it was too late.

Kieser tried valiantly to understand what is going on, but failed each time, thwarted by the categories the culture had given him. Who could argue with liberation after all? Even if it meant the repudiation of vows. In each instance, Kieser's attempt to understand what is happening to his nun friend was thwarted by the categories of the plumbing psychology which allowed him to get her in trouble in the first place. "Were her faith difficulties connected to her sexual ones?" Kieser wonders, making a wild

stab and hitting the bull's eye at the same time.<sup>30</sup> But even when he comes up with correct answer, he can't pursue it because of the psychological categories he has imbibed from California culture. "I do not know, but I know that when you repress any one facet of your humanity, you do violence to every other facet. Sexual repression not only inhibits your ability to relate to someone of the opposite sex. It also inhibits your ability to relate to God."<sup>31</sup> So in order to remedy her inability to relate to God, should Sister Genevieve engage in sexual activity with her therapist because that breaks down repression? Kieser seems incapable of doing anything other than pouring more gasoline on the fire. In order to get a better grip on what is going on, Father Kieser decided to attend "one of the marathon therapy sessions then in vogue" which Sister Genevieve had been attending. The encounter lasted twenty-two hours, but by the end of it, Kieser still can't understand the connection between encounter groups and Sister Genevieve's loss of faith and subsequent sexual bondage. In fact, not only did Kieser not see the encounter as part of the problem, he came away from it "exhilarated." Kieser himself had been sucked into the mechanism that was destroying the IHM order, and he wasn't even aware of what happened to him. "Her therapy continued to be painful," continued the ever-clueless Father Kieser. "Sometimes it seemed that she was caught in a whirlpool that was sucking her down and down into extinction."<sup>32</sup>

At Thanksgiving of 1967, Genevieve informed Father Kieser that Harry the Therapist had left his wife and was filing for divorce. Sister Genevieve was now living with her therapist until the divorce became Final, whereupon they planned to marry. One more IHM nun was headed out the door, and encounter-group therapy was what enabled her to leave. Kieser described himself as shattered by the revelation "because this marked her definitive breach with the Church and seemingly with those values - love, fidelity, self-sacrifice, respect for the rights of others, honesty - that the church had nurtured in us, and which I had always thought we had in common." Genevieve didn't seem too happy either, admitting to Kieser that "she would feel guilt for what she was doing to his wife for the rest of her life."

The flagship of the Immaculate Heart order, Immaculate Heart College, was located right in the middle of the therapy and psychology which would

find in California the best exemplar of the lifestyle it promoted. Los Angeles was, more or less, halfway between Esalen in Big Sur just south of San Francisco, and it was just north of La Jolla, where Carl Rogers was located at the Western Behavioral Sciences Institute. It was also in the immediate vicinity of a number of therapists, some of whom were associates of Rogers, who would play a major role in the Education Innovation Project. According to W. R. Coulson, Rogers's assistant in the EIP, "the Team from WBSI was on the Immaculate Heart campus to teach and exemplify what would soon begin to be called their 'quiet revolution' in education." According to Coulson, "WBSI wasn't the only alien presence. Other consultants arrived, having heard that the nuns were ripe for psychological experimentation."<sup>34</sup>

If the implication of "psychological experimentation" sounds sinister, it should be added that the nuns were eager to become guinea pigs. The nuns had reached the pinnacle of their power as an organization at the same time that Catholics were enjoying the unprecedented political acceptance of which the election of John F. Kennedy to the White House was the most obvious example. The Immaculate Heart order had 560 nuns at an early point in the project and ran a system of 60 schools. Like nuns across the United States, which numbered 186,000 at the time, the Immaculate Heart Order had reached the apogee of its size and influence in the twenty years since the end of World War II.

Since both the Immaculate Heart Nuns and Carl Rogers reached the height of their influence at around the same time and around the same place, it was inevitable that they would come into contact. Born in 1902, the same year as Paul Blanshard, Rogers, like Blanshard, was drawn early in life to the ministry, but also like Blanshard, he abandoned the ministry - after two years at Union Theological Seminary - in lieu of studies at Columbia University. Unlike Blanshard, Rogers did not study with Dewey directly, but he imbibed his spirit from Dewey's disciples, one of whom, William H. Kilpatrick, ran his classes on the philosophy of education in ways similar to later encounter groups. For both men, science at Columbia University (for Blanshard, sociology; for Rogers, psychology) became the vehicle which would achieve what the liberal Protestant pulpit promised but could not deliver. During the 1930s, Rogers was working as a guidance counselor

in Rochester, New York, when, almost by accident, he discovered a technique which would help neurotics move forward with their lives. Leading them by subtly manipulative questioning to the issues that had stalled them. Rogers called his key insight “the clarifying response.” “The main aim of the counselor,” he wrote in his 1942 book, *Counseling and Psychotherapy: Newer Concepts in Practice*.

is to assist the client to drop any defensiveness, any feeling that attitudes should not be brought into the open, any concerns that the counselor may criticize or suggest or order. If this aim can be accomplished then the client is freed to look at the situation in its reality without having to justify or protect himself.<sup>35</sup>

In 1965 Rogers wrote that his first involvement with encounter groups was “an intensive post-doctoral workshop in psychotherapy in 1950.” In *Carl Rogers on Encounter Groups*, he moved the date back to when the encounter group was first conceived in the aftermath of World War II. During the years 1946 and '47, Rogers and his associates at the Counseling Center of the University of Chicago were involved in training counselors for the Veterans Administration, when he was asked to come up with a psychological-training mechanism which would help these counselors reintegrate soldiers returning from the war into civilian life. Rogers soon discovered that intensive group experiences were more effective in changing behavior than cognitive training. Rogers goes on to say that the Chicago group did nothing to expand this approach. Even granting that, however, it is clear that other people were pursuing the same ideas at the same time and that gradually over a period of twenty years, all of these elements came together in the encounter group of the 1960s.

By 1966, when Carl Rogers began experimenting with the Immaculate Heart nuns and the effect that encounter groups had on them, the encounter group or sensitivity training or the T-group had been in existence for about twenty years and had been modified by those who made use of it. Rogers describes the mix as “Lewinian thinking and Gestalt psychology on the one hand, and client-centered therapy on the other.”<sup>36</sup> Rogers’s “clarifying response” had become one of the standard tools for encounter groups. According to Rogers, Sensitivity Training was:

relatively unstructured, providing a climate of maximum freedom for personal expression, exploration of feelings and interpersonal communication. Emphasis is upon the interactions among the group members, in an atmosphere which encourages each to drop his defenses and his facades and thus enables him to relate directly and openly to other members of the group - the basic encounter/

By the 1960s, Rogers was using encounter “therapy” not on neurotics, as in the ' 30s in Rochester, and not on returning GIs, whose disorientation at civilian life may have resembled neurosis, but on “normal” people. In fact, in terms of their orientation toward other people and the altruism of their motivation, the IHM nuns were clearly above normal. That being the case, the desire to have a client “drop his defenses” takes on meaning that at the very least needs clarification or at worst begins to sound slightly sinister, in the same sense that Maslow mentioned its revolutionary capacities in regard to the nuns he met a few years earlier. The value judgments Rogers makes -mask vs. real person, etc., - become more questionable, the more normal his

“clients” become. If the criterion in dealing with “clients” is not health, what are we to make of the value judgments scattered throughout the following passage?

[I]t becomes increasingly evident that what they have first presented are facades, masks. Only cautiously do the real feelings and real persons emerge. The contrast between the outer shell and the inner person becomes more and more apparent as the hours go by. Little by little, a sense of genuine communication builds up, and the person who has been thoroughly walled off from others comes out with some small segment of his actual feelings.<sup>38</sup>

Were the Immaculate Heart nuns “real persons”? Or were they hiding behind “facades”? How was Carl Rogers supposed to decide, since the nuns were not suffering from mental illness? The only sense in which these questions have therapeutic value is if the person is suffering from some sort of mental disorder. If that is not the case, then the vocabulary all points in the direction of social engineering. Carl Rogers may very well have thought that the nuns were mentally ill simply by the fact that they

were nuns, but in this instance, therapy has clearly entered the realm of politics (or religion). Rogers is involved, in this instance, not in trying to heal them but to change them into something he feels is better than a nun. Even if he decides to change them into “better” nuns, he can only act on that premise in light of what he considers good and bad politically and not psychologically, since the nuns were not ill, nor was Rogers claiming that they were. All of the value judgments in Rogers’s description of encounter groups need a context before they can be properly understood. If the client is neurotic, the context is health. If the clients are healthy - which was presumably the case with the IHM nuns - the context is politics, and what goes by the name of therapy is really social engineering, no matter how “nondirective” the therapist/facilitator claims to be. Rogers’s own testimony makes it clear that he saw encounter groups in precisely this political light, which is another way of saying that he saw them as social engineering and not therapy.

By 1968, which is to say two years into the Education Innovation Project, Rogers and Coulson got the sense that something was wrong. By that point in the program over three hundred nuns had asked to be laicized, and the order had been split into two mutually antagonistic groups who were fighting over the order’s financial assets. The progressive faction was also waging a publicity campaign against Cardinal McIntyre. The only way in which the project could be looked upon as a success was by adopting the public-relations jargon that was currently being used to describe the war in Vietnam. Like the U.S. troops over there, Rogers had to destroy the order in order to save it. The only way the Education Innovation Project could be termed a success if its intent was to destroy the order in the first place.

Eventually, Coulson would go on to apologize publicly for his efforts.

and become a vocal opponent of the very thing he promoted in the '60s. Instead of apologizing, however, Rogers got defensive. By the time he wrote his book on encounter groups in 1969-70, Rogers would claim his enemies were all right-wing nuts. The incongruity of the non-directive Dr. Rogers attacking his political opponents so intemperately gives some indication that there was a political agenda at work in the encounter groups from the very beginning. But if that were the case, it was an agenda that

was all but invisible to the untrained eye. In this Rogers was a typical example of the English ideology, which claimed like Newton, that it “framed no hypotheses” and then worked out an intricate system of control behind that facade. “Putting it in my own words,” Rogers wrote, “encounter groups lead to more personal independence, fewer hidden feelings, more willingness to innovate, more opposition to institutional rigidities.”<sup>39</sup> Just how Rogers is to say an institution is rigid, in the absence of medical criteria, never gets explained. What does come out in the subsequent discussion is a clear profile of his political enemies, who at the time he was working with the IHM nuns were accusing him of “brainwashing.” “All types of intensive group experience,” he opines, “have come under the most virulent attack from right-wing and reactionary groups. It is, to them, a form of ‘brainwashing’ and ‘thought control.’” Turning the tables on his critics, Rogers accused them of orchestrating a right-wing takeover of the country, showing that his “therapy” had a political component after all. It seems that Dr. Rogers framed some hypotheses after all, and they had a very distinct political tinge to them:

CuiTently, the possibility of a takeover by the extreme right seems more likely in this country than a takeover by the extreme left. But the encounter group movement would be led out of existence in either case, because rigid control, not freedom, would be the central element. One cannot imagine an encounter group in present-day Russia or even Czechoslovakia, though there is ample evidence that many individuals in those countries yearn for just the kind of freedom of expression it encourages.... If there is a dictatorial takeover in this country - and it becomes frighteningly clearer than it might happen here - then the whole trend toward the intensive group experience would be one of the first developments to be crushed and obliterated.<sup>41</sup>

Rogers then gives some indication that his political categories were formed in the immediate aftermath of World War II by claiming that his right-wing adversaries were examples of the “authoritarian personality,” which Theodor Wiesengrund Adorno had described in a book which had been funded by CIA money right around the same time that Paul Blanshard’s book came out, and could be seen as another indication of the desire among the thinkers who had been funded by foundations to link

Catholicism and fascism. According to Rogers:

James Harmon, in a carefully documented study, concludes that there is ample evidence that the right wing has a large proportion of authoritarian personalities. They tend to believe that man is by nature, basically evil. Surrounded as all of us are by the bigness of impersonal forces which seem beyond our power to control, they look for “the enemy,” so that they can hate him. At different times in history “the enemy” has been the witch, the demon, the Communist (remember Joe McCarthy?), and now sex education, sensitivity training, “nonreligious humanism,” and other current demons.

As a way of countering the suspicions of his critics that sensitivity training was some conspiracy to brainwash the unsuspecting masses, Rogers claims that the movement just grew like Topsy:

One factor which makes the rapidity of the spread even more remarkable is its complete and unorganized spontaneity. Contrary to the shrill voices of the right wing (whom I will mention below), this has not been a “conspiracy.” Quite the contrary. No group or organization has been pushing the development of encounter groups.... There has been no financing of such a spread, either from foundations or governments<sup>41</sup>

Rogers is not being honest here. First of all he knew that, although the IHM nuns contributed something toward funding of the Education Innovation Project, it was being paid for in part by the Merrill Foundation and the Mary Reynolds Babcock Foundation, which was based on the R.J. Reynolds tobacco fortune. Rogers in addition must have known that he had veteran psychological warriors on his staff because the EIP team cited his credentials in the proposals they wrote up to obtain funding for an early version of the project. Rogers’s associate in the IHM Education Innovation Project, Jack Gibb, wrote on the grant proposal that while attending the University of Chicago in 1949, he had “developed an intensive program of laboratory and field research into the nature and determiners of defense levels in small groups. This research was supported by the Office of Naval Research between 1953 and 1962.” It was the Office of Naval Research, along with the notorious Carnegie Foundation, which funded the original National Training Laboratories project from 1947 to 1950. Not only had

encounter groups, contrary to what Rogers said, been subsidized by both government and foundations, they had been subsidized by them specifically as a form of psychological warfare.

Encounter groups, as Rogers himself indicates by his oblique reference to Kurt Lewin in describing the sources of sensitivity training, were a creation of the CIA's psychological warfare campaign. Like Wilhelm Reich, Kurt Lewin was a German Jew who left Germany in 1933 when Hitler came to power. Like Rogers, Lewin had been influenced by both Freud and Watson. According to Kleiner, Lewin "believed with the Freudians that subconscious echoes of past traumas drive our deepest feelings, and he also believed with the behaviorists, that people could be programmed to respond predictably to stimuli."<sup>44</sup> Unlike both Watson and Freud, Lewin felt that "many other forces could affect a person's ability to decide."<sup>45</sup> Unlike both Freud and Watson, Lewin felt that a number of forces, a whole "forcefield," in fact, composed of "the person's marriage and family relationships, fears and hopes, neuroses and physical health, work situation and network of friends'"<sup>46</sup> controlled the decisions he made.

Perhaps because of all the psychic forces which got brought to bear on an individual, Lewin felt that social groups were the most effective means to influence behavior. In the '40s, he and his assistant Ron Lippitt set out to prove this by experimenting on YMCA groups in Iowa City. Once the war broke out, isolated social scientists like Lewin and Lippitt were gradually drawn into the orbit of research on psychological warfare. "The war," according to Kleiner, "was generally an immense catalyst for social science in American (and England), because it pulled university researchers from their isolated posts. They worked together on real-world problems such as keeping up military morale, developing psychological warfare techniques, and studying foreign cultures."<sup>47</sup> Also drawn into the psychological warfare orbit was Lewin's assistant Ken Benne, who, like Blanshard, had studied under John Dewey at Columbia. Gradually, a consensus emerged among the psychological warriors that, in Kleiner's words, "social change had to be managed intelligently - not through force, manipulation, or greedy exploitation."<sup>48</sup> Encounter groups were simply the most effective instrument science had yet devised to manage social change through the manipulation of peer pressure. How that instrument got used

would depend on the social priorities of the class of people who had invented it, and after the successful conclusion of World War II, those people shifted their concerns from fascism to the “Catholic problem,” most specifically the demographic threat which Catholic sexual teaching posed to continued WASP hegemony in the United States.

The second main source of Encounter Groups was Gestalt Therapy, a creation of Fritz Peris and Paul Goodman which was just as antithetical to Catholic sexual morality as the psychological warfare of the WASP elite. Gestalt Therapy was based to a large extent on the psychological ideas of Wilhelm Reich, who saw unfettered sexual activity as the best way to wean people away from their belief in God. Peris was resident guru at Esalen, a few hours’ drive north of Los Angeles, by the time Carl Rogers became involved with the Immaculate Heart nuns. His techniques were well known throughout California, spread by contact through Peris at Esalen and by Reich’s student Alexander Lowen, whose Bioenergetics were based on the Reichian idea of breaking down a person’s “body armor” and thereby helping him with the battle against sexual repression and its transcendent counterpart, belief in God. Michael Weber in his book *Psychotechniken: Die Neuen Verfihrer* sees the rise of encounter-group techniques in German seminary training as a Trojan Horse whose purpose was the deliberate destruction of religious vocation, the weakening of the both the Protestant and Catholic Churches in Germany, and the subsequent triumph of the secular point of view. Weber also traces the rise of this attack on German religious life to the National Training Laboratories. “In September 1963,” according to Weber, “in Schliersee in Oberbayem, 30 German teachers were subjected to a three-week long workshop run by the National Training Laboratories. The purpose of the T-group was to ‘influence’ their authoritarian teaching style.” vWeber also thinks that the Immaculate Heart nuns’ Education Innovation Project was part of the same campaign to lame religious life. Thirty years later the T-group had become an essential part of German religious training. Weber sees the heart of encounter as a form of sexual manipulation. “Sexuality,” he writes, plays a crucial role in the group dynamic-based continuing education of priests, aerogram which involves the sexualization of the person who gets trained.”<sup>5</sup> Sexualization, according to Reich was “the mortal foe of religion.” That means that “only through the destruction of sexual

repression and the alienation of the child from its relationship with his parents” can political liberation of the sort that Reich believed in succeed. This is a fortiori the case for religious, and Weber sees in the massive spread of encounter groups in seminary training the introduction into religious orders of a strategy whose purpose is truly Reichian, namely, sexualization as a prelude to annihilation.

In spite of Rogers’ s protest to the contrary, Kleiner shows that encounter groups were associated not only with psychological warfare but with brainwashing. “As it happened,” Kleiner wrote,

there was an expert on brainwashing within the NTL community, a young psychologist named Edgar Schein, who came to McGregor’s department at MIT in the late 1950s, had gone to Inchon at the end of the Korean War to help repatriate American prisoners of war. Schein learned from his research in Korea that the Chinese social control had taken place without drugs, hypnosis, Pavlovian conditioning or even torture; all that was used was peer pressure. Just as in a T-Group, the Communists had put the POWs in a cultural island, cut them off from all contact with outsiders ,and surrounded them with friendly Chinese “big brothers" (who had been promised a reward for reforming their Western cellmates.)'

Schein promptly applied what he learned in Korea to the development of encounter groups for the benefit of the NTL. Schein saw few similarities between POW camps and civilian life in America, until, that is, he looked more closely at the most influential management training centers in the United States, places like GE’s Crotonville and IBM’s Sands Point. Since the constraints of corporate life constituted an effective form of the milieu control essential to making encounter techniques work, Schein thought T-groups would work in the corporate world. Schein didn’t mention it, but a related conclusion was even more obvious. Convents created even more “milieu control” than big corporations, and so were the ideal setting for brainwashing via encounter groups.

Eventually Robert Blake, another NTL alumnus, would put Schein’s theory into practice when he held the first corporate sensitivity training session at the Bayway refinery of Standard Oil of New Jersey, then known as Esso. Blake had spent a year and a half at Tavistock, which was the

British psychological warfare operation. Tavistock staged encounters on a much more extensive basis than what was being offered at the National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine. Unlike their American counterparts, Tavistock was more interested in control than “peak experiences.” Perhaps because of this orientation, Blake, in Kleiner’s words, realized that in all T-groups, “no matter how nondirective the facilitator tried to be, he or she was still subtly dictatorial, even more dictatorial (because of its subtlety) than the harshest CEO, because all of that control was hidden.”<sup>52</sup> The links between Eric Trist of Tavistock, Douglas McGregor of MIT, Kurt Lewin, the founder of NTL and Robert Blake give some idea of how closely connected the psychological warriors were with each other and with the creation of encounter groups and how intimately encounter groups were linked with interests of the Anglophile intelligence establishment which created it.

On November 28, 1953, Dr. Frank Olson, a U.S. Army scientist, was found dead on the sidewalk outside the Statler Hotel in New York City. A few days later, his death was ruled a suicide. Twenty-two years later, the Rockefeller Commission, set up by President Ford to look into the CIA’s illegal domestic intelligence operations, announced that Olson had been the subject of a CIA experiment, during which he was administered a dose of LSD. The Rockefeller Commission claimed that Olson jumped out of the hotel window in the midst of an LSD-induced psychosis, but Olson’s son Eric thinks he was murdered because he was appalled by the human experimentation that was going on and prepared to blow the whistle on it. “The use of hallucinogens, hypnosis, electroshock and other procedures in an attempt to control the way people behave was,” according to Eric Olson, “the CIA’s equivalent of the Manhattan [atom bomb] Project.”<sup>53</sup> According to the authors, who are British,

The long-term aim of these experiments with mind-altering drugs is thought by those who have studied the MK-Ultra programme to have been to ensure the dominance of Anglo-American civilization in what eugenicists call the “war of all against all - the key to evolutionary success.” Brainwashing would be used not only to defeat the enemy but to ensure the compliance and loyalty of one’s own population.<sup>54</sup>

The link between encounter groups and the Anglophile intelligence

establishment also gives some indication of how the techniques of psychological warfare would get used after the war. Christopher Simpson in his book *The Science of Coercion*, lists the Office of Naval Research as one of the major conduits of government money into academe for the funding of psychological warfare.<sup>15</sup> He goes on to call the people interested in psychological warfare a “reference group” rather than a “conspiracy,” but the distinction is largely semantic. At the heart of psychological warfare studies was a group of men, largely alumni of the wartime OSS and Ivy League secret societies like Skull and Bones at Yale who had migrated into the mainstream media and the large foundations. This group shared the concerns of the anglophile elite about the “Catholic problem,” as articulated by Paul Blanshard, and were in a position to do something about it. John T. McGreevy has shown convincingly that Paul Blanshard, in spite of his reputation elsewhere as an anti-Catholic bigot, enjoyed the all-but-universal support of this influential class of people at the heart of the WASP ruling-class elite. John Dewey praised Blanshard’s “exemplary scholarship, good judgment and tact.”<sup>56</sup> In a symposium sponsored by the American Unitarian Association convention on May 25, 1950, McGeorge Bundy, the quintessential establishment figure of the ’50s and ’60s, praised Blanshard’s book as “a very useful thing.”<sup>7</sup> The same people who were concerned about the “Catholic problem” were also heavily involved in communications theory, which included things like encounter groups, which was in turn a front for psychological warfare. “The evidence thus far shows,” according to Simpson,

a very substantial fraction of the funding for academic U.S. research into social psychology and into many aspect of mass communication behavior during the first fifteen years of the cold war was directly controlled or strongly influenced by a small group of men who had enthusiastically supported elite psychological operations as an instrument of foreign and domestic policy since World War II. They exercised power through a seies of interlocking committees and commissions that linked the world of mainstream academe with that of the U.S. military and intelligence communities. Their networks were for the most part closed to outsiders’ their records and decision-making processes were often classified; and in some instances the very existence of the coordinating bodies was a state secret [my emphasis]<sup>5</sup>

The connection between the people concerned about the “Catholic problem” and the people involved in psychological warfare becomes all but inescapable when we learn that the two most important sources for funding for psychological warfare during the cold-war years were the Russell Sage Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation. The Russell Sage Foundation was the publisher of Kurt Back’s book on encounter groups, *Beyond Words*. The head of the social science division of the Rockefeller Foundation was Leland DeVinney, who co-authored the American Soldier Series with Samuel Stouffer, a well-known psychological warrior. In addition to using its own money to promote psychological warfare, the Rockefeller Foundation was a conduit for CIA money, channeling at least \$1 million in CIA funds to Hadley Cantril’s Institute for International Social Research. “Nelson Rockefeller,” according to Simpson, “was himself among the most prominent promoters of psychological operations, serving as Eisenhower’s principal adviser and strategist on the subject during 1954-55.”<sup>39</sup>

Once again the Rockefeller family becomes the crucial nexus in understanding not only the identity of the class (or ethnic group) which was instrumental in the creation of psychological warfare by why it was created and against whom it would be used. The Rockefeller family, perhaps more than any other wealthy family in America, assumed the leadership of the WASP class in this country. The Rockefellers’ concerns became their concerns and vice versa. According to Thomas Mahl,

These were the people sociologist C. Wright Mills later identified in his book *The Power Elite* (1956). The United States, wrote Mills, was controlled not by the mass of its citizens as described by democratic theory, but by a wealthy Anglo-Saxon Protestant elite from Ivy League schools.

In a flurry of caustic reviews, critics, often Cold War liberals, heatedly denied that there was such an elite.<sup>60</sup>

When Robert Stephenson, the British secret agent known as Intrepid, was sent to the United States to set up the British Security Coordination, the intelligence operation that was created to bring America into the war on the side of England, he did so knowing that he had the tacit if not overt

support of a very influential class of people. Lord Robert Cecil said in 1917 that “though the American people are very largely foreign, both in origin and in modes of thought, their rulers are almost exclusively Anglo-Saxons, and share our political ideals.”<sup>61</sup> It was this ethnic group which supported Planned Parenthood and psychological warfare, and since this class looked to the Rockefeller family for leadership it was natural that Stephenson should turn to the Rockefellers for support and that they would respond generously. Stephenson’s concerns were the Rockefellers’ concerns, and the Rockefellers’ concerns were the concerns of the country’s ruling elite. Hence, it should come as no surprise where Stephenson established his American headquarters. Shortly after arriving in the United States,

Stephenson took over the thirty-eighth floor of the International Building in Rockefeller Center, which the Rockefellers, anxious to help let for a penny rent. This was a convenient address. Several British agencies promoting intervention were also housed here. The British Press Service was located on the forty-fourth floor. The British intelligence front group Fight for Freedom located its operations on the twenty-second floor in the same building, also rent-free.

With the Rockefellers providing tacit leadership, the WASP ethnic ruling class was concerned, as Arthur W. Packard had said, about “differential fertility,” which is why they supported the eugenics movement and its propaganda arm, Planned Parenthood. Concern about differential fertility was just another way of saying concern about Catholics, since Catholics at this time

did not use contraception, and the Catholic Church at this time, backed by the big city political machines and spokesmen like Msgr. John Ryan, was the most formidable opponent to the decriminalization of contraception. Concern about eugenics, in other words, meant concern about “the Catholic problem.” Once the war against fascism was won, the WASP establishment turned its attention to its main demographic and political domestic opponent, namely the Catholic Church. If the WASP establishment which was instrumental in the creation and prosecution of psychological warfare was locked in a knock-down drag-out political struggle with the Catholic Church over sexual and demographic issues,

then it would stand to reason that they would use the former technique as a way of solving what they perceived as the latter problem. This meant dealing with Catholic education, which was the Church's most effective antidote to the "socialization" offered by the John Dewey-inspired public schools. That concern was manifested in a series of Supreme Court decisions beginning with Everson decision in the late '40s and culminating the Lemon decisions in the early '70s.

Paul Blanshard, it should be remembered, had some very pointed things to say about Catholic nuns and their relationship to Catholic education in his book *American Freedom and Catholic Power*. In thinking about Catholic education, the most important thing to keep in mind, according to Blanshard, is

the fact that the economic structure of Catholic schools is threatened with collapse by the growth of modern liberalism among young Catholic women. The Catholic school system is essentially an enterprise of nuns who work without salaries. If the supply of nuns should be cut off, the system would rapidly disintegrate.<sup>63</sup>

The key to destroying the Catholic school system and thereby crippling the influence the Catholic Church in American politics was to make sure that young Catholic women were "reared in the free and hearty atmosphere of modern America,"<sup>64</sup> which meant of course public schools and exposure to the sexual liberation that lay at the heart of Blanshard's conversion from a minister to a liberal activist. The key was to promote "emancipation" among young Catholic women because "if the present attitude of emancipated Catholic young women continues, the hierarchy may ultimately be forced by economic pressure to turn over a large part of its private-school system to democratic public control."<sup>65</sup>

In July of 1967, the forty-three nuns who had been elected to represent the various chapters of the Immaculate Heart order met at Montecito, where they authorized large-scale experimentation, citing as its justification the *motu proprio* which Paul VI had issued less than a year earlier. One month later, they issued a statement saying that as of June 1968, "no Sister of the Immaculate will be assigned to a teaching position who does not have certification."<sup>66</sup> On October 16, 1967, fresh from a trip

to Rome where she had conferred with Cardinal Suenens of Belgium, Sister Anita Caspary met with

Cardinal McIntyre and presented him with the order's resolutions. Cardinal McIntyre construed the statement on teacher certification as an ultimatum which imposed on him an arbitrary and mandatory deadline. Instead of capitulating to their pressure, McIntyre told Caspary that he would consider another date but if the nuns insisted on their condition, they were "perfectly free to withdraw from the archdiocese."<sup>67</sup> When Sister Anita said she would resubmit the proposed changes in the order to another vote, McIntyre made it clear that had no intention of having a religious order in his diocese "that did not have and practice a rule of life more rigid than that proposed."<sup>68</sup>

At this point the story appeared in the New York Times, which informed its readers that the IHM order would soon implement "liberal changes" in its rule. Caspary was quoted in a newspaper article which appeared on the same day she met with the cardinal as saying that "Sister Corita is the perfect example of what could be done in our Order."<sup>69</sup> Caspary went on to say that "we have many other sisters like her, and we hope to have even more diversity and freedom."<sup>70</sup> McIntyre, in other words, was learning about the nuns' intentions at the same time the readers of the New York Times were, a fact that caused relations between the cardinal and the nuns to go from bad to worse.

The New York Times article marked the beginning of the publicity campaign which the IHM nuns were to wage against the cardinal and Rome for the next two years. In it McIntyre was universally cast as the villain, while the nuns, whose order was undergoing psychological warfare which they themselves were at least in part funding, were portrayed just as universally as enlightened and progressive. Since the media were dominated by the same group which had promoted psychological warfare and Paul Blanshard's anti-Catholic campaign, the nuns were now being egged on in their confrontation with the cardinal archbishop of Los Angeles by people who saw the destruction of the order as a sign of progress. The New York Times's religion writer, John Cogley, who would soon defect from the Catholic faith, wrote articles which epitomized the flavor of an Enlightenment morality play, which characterized most press

accounts. The IHM nuns according to his account were “a liberal light shining in the ultra-conservative darkness of the Los Angeles archdiocese,” and McIntyre’s attempt to prevent the order from engaging in its own self-destruction were portrayed as “being as foolish as trying to hold back the dawn.”<sup>71</sup>

Thus fortified by the New York Times, and perhaps emboldened to a new openness by the encounter groups she had been attending, Sister Anita continued to pour out her soul to sympathetic reporters, who urged the order on toward self-destruction in the name of renewal. Shortly after appearing in the New York Times, Sister Anita granted an interview to John Dart of the Los Angeles Times, calling her row with the cardinal a “major breakthrough” for Roman Catholic nuns in America. She said the “renewal will be more profound than any thus far announced for any American religious society of Catholic women.”<sup>72</sup> While noting that “all the new measures are experimental in nature,” she saw “little reason to suppose that those innovations which prove beneficial will not then be made permanent.”<sup>73</sup> As for religious garb, Caspary said that no style would be adopted as normative, “but sisters engaged in varying occupations may wear varying habits suitable for their work.”<sup>74</sup> Noting that the Immaculate Heart Sisters have in mind nothing less than a profound redirection of their communal lifestyle, Commonweal labeled their proposals “landmarks.”

On October 23, 1967, Sister Anita informed McIntyre that the IHM leadership had “unanimously reaffirmed by secret ballot the content of the total document.”<sup>75</sup> Caspary then went on to inform his eminence that the new rule which the IHM nuns had just adopted was “deeply Christian and expressive of the kind of religious life in the community to which we are committed.”<sup>76</sup> McIntyre may have thought the nuns were committed, or he may have thought they ought to be committed, but his eminence was not impressed with the rule of life they were proposing, informing Sister Anita that he was not going to allow “our convents to become hotels or boarding houses for women.”<sup>7</sup> Caspary, as a result, had to return to the IHM nuns and inform them that the Cardinal’s reaction was “negative.” It was at this point that the nuns first started talking about being “fired,” a claim which quickly got picked up by the press. On November 15, the National Catholic Reporter, announced on page one: “McIntyre to oust 200 updating nuns”

when in fact McIntyre had told them that they were free to withdraw if they could not accept the conditions which he established for work in the archdiocese. Joining the fray on the side of the nuns, Andrew Greeley, who had visited the nuns at Immaculate Heart College in 1965 and was evidently taken with the order's lifestyle, announced that the rules they had submitted to McIntyre were "sensible and balanced, and represented] the path all religious are going to have to follow if they are to survive."<sup>7</sup>

Father Kieser soon found himself caught up in the battle as well. McIntyre's rejection of the proposed updated rule for the IHM order, fanned by sympathetic media attention, had precipitated a massive rebellion on the part of clergy in the archdiocese. Kieser had had the advantage of seeing first-hand the effects which both therapy and encounter groups were having on nuns like his friend "Genevieve," and yet was incapable of seeing what was going on as an assault against the order. Blinded by the categories which he adopted so uncritically from the media, Kieser joined the war against repression by becoming a member of what he termed "the underground church": "We brought in progressive speakers from other parts of the country, tried to embarrass the Cardinal into allowing a priests' senate, did everything we could to shore up the beleaguered Immaculate Hearts, and celebrated underground Masses."<sup>79</sup> Evidently learning nothing from what

happened to "Genevieve," Elwood Kieser checked in for a stay at Esalen to get in touch with his underground self. By then Gestalt guru Fritz Peris was nearing the end of his stay at Esalen. In 1970 he moved to Canada where he founded his own Gestalt Kibbutz on Lake Cowichan. After undergoing a serious operation, Peris grew tired of the intravenous needles in his arm and started to remove them. When a nurse entered the room and told him to leave them alone and lie down, Peris replied "Shut up, you aren't going to tell me what to do," whereupon he got up out of the bed and promptly fell over dead. Peris' s favored method for diagnosing sexual repression during his last days at Esalen was to place his tongue into the mouth of his clients, both male and female, for an extended session of French kissing. If he found an attractive young woman who seemed to be suffering from this malady, he would invite her to remove her clothes and join him in one of Esalen's hot springs.

Father Kieser doesn't tell us whether Peris diagnosed him for sexual repression; he also doesn't tell us how his stay at Esalen concluded. He mentions only that after he left Esalen, he

took sensitivity training at Carl Rogers's Institute of the Person [sic;

Kieser actually took the training at WBSI] in La Jolla. The communication in these sessions was sometimes deep and honest, and these groups frequently became close. At the end of each day, we would gather in the backyard of the Catholic chaplain's house at the university for the Eucharist. These Masses were intense and full of feeling. But the emotional highs could not last. <sup>u</sup>

By January of 1968, the archdiocese of Los Angeles was preparing for the departure of the IHM nuns from the school system. On January 8, Sister Anita attempted to draw the children's parents into the battle by stating her case in a letter which was sent to all of the pastors of parishes staffed by IHM nuns. When the Apostolic Delegate to the United States asked Caspary to refrain from discussing the matter publicly, Sister Anita responded by going on a lecture tour. That was followed by a letter-writing campaign which induced twenty-nine Jesuits to sign an open letter on their behalf. That in turn inspired an equal number of Jesuits from the same province to announce that they did not side with the IHM nuns. As a result of their efforts at communicating their case to the public, the IHM sisters, according to Msgr. Patrick Roche,

had "succeeded in creating an atmosphere of confusion and unhappiness

81

which baffles understanding."

On February 21, 1968, acting with unprecedented alacrity for a Roman curial office, the Sacred Congregation for Religious handed down its decision, announcing that the nuns had to adopt a uniform habit, that they had to attend Mass every day, that the point of their education efforts was "to labor for the salvation of souls" and - crudest cut of all - that they had to submit to the authority of the local bishop in this and other disputes. The reaction was swift in coming. On March 9, 1968, the Pasadena Independent Star an-

nounced that 525 of the 600 [sic] IHM nuns were planning to resign and form “a loose confederation of religious women.” The nuns tried to mount another publicity campaign to get Rome to change its decision, but the petition drive upon which it was based fizzled, failing to get the 5,000 signatures they hoped for. A separate petition garnered the signatures of 194 prominent American churchmen, including Harvey Cox, author of *The Secular City* and Arthur Lichtenberger, presiding Bishop of the Episcopal Church in the United States and presumably someone who had the best interests of the Catholic Church at heart when he signed.<sup>80</sup> The net result of the squabbling was that the nuns who did not leave broke into two opposed camps, “neither of which was open to compromise with the other.”<sup>81</sup> Eventually a legal settlement was reached, one which favored the liberal camp, which got most of the community property.

On July 29, 1968, just as the furor over the Immaculate Heart nuns was dying down, the Vatican issued *Humanae Vitae*, its encyclical reaffirming the Catholic Church’s traditional ban on contraception, and a new furor arose, orchestrated by Father Charles Curran, a moral theologian at Catholic University in Washington, D.C., which made the nuns’ story look like a tempest in a teapot by comparison. John D. Rockefeller, 3rd’s attempt to change the Catholic Church’s teaching on contraception had failed. His attempt to create an internal front in the Church, however, had succeeded. As a result of Rockefeller’s efforts at Notre Dame, *Humanae Vitae* opened up an internal division within the Catholic Church which would last into the next millennium. Orchestrating a media campaign that both followed and dwarfed the one launched by the Immaculate Heart nuns, Charles Curran succeeded in persuading a majority of Catholics in the United States that *Humanae Vitae* did not constitute infallible Church teaching and that American Catholics could in good conscience use contraception. The liberal clergy collaborated with the Rockefellers in arriving at a solution to “the Catholic problem” based on widespread acceptance of contraception among Catholic married couples. Contraception became, as a result, the solution to the “Catholic problem” in two ways: First of all, it drove down the Catholic birthrate, which had been troubling Paul Blanshard and those who supported him since the end of World War II. Once Catholics adopted the contraceptive practices of the WASP ruling class, they were no longer a demographic threat. Secondly,

the contraceptive divided Catholics into two groups: liberals who accepted it and conservatives who did not, and with this division Catholics lost the political clout they wielded in the days of Msgr. John Ryan.

During the summer of 1968, at some time between the time when the turmoil over the nuns was dying down and the turmoil over *Humanae Vitae* was just beginning, W. R. Coulson was team-teaching a graduate course with Carl Rogers when he noticed that Rogers stopped what he was doing and broke down and cried in front of the class. What brought the tears to Rogers's

eyes was the impending break-up of his daughter Natalie's marriage to Lawrence H. Fuchs, a professor of politics at Brandeis University. The full story wouldn't come out until 1980 when Natalie, taking back her maiden name, told the story of her "liberation" from her marriage and family in a memoir entitled *Emerging Woman*. Natalie had decided to take courses with her husband's colleague, Abraham Maslow, in 1958, the same man who had written that the most authentic people were the most instinctive in 1949 but by 1968 was having second thoughts over "Esalen-type, orgiastic, Dionysian type education." Apparently Natalie Fuchs latched onto the former Maslow and not the latter, for in her memoir she would describe not only leaving her family and husband, but also her sexual affairs with numerous men, including impromptu debates with their enraged wives, as well as her discovery of masturbation, as well as a long account of taking LSD under the guidance of Lois Bateson at Esalen. Lois was the wife of Gregory Bateson, former husband of Margaret Mead, and like his ex-wife a major player in the field of psychological warfare.

"The encouragement of Abe Maslow helped me gain courage to become a student,"<sup>84</sup> Natalie wrote in her memoir, and now Carl Rogers was faced with inescapable evidence of the sort of behavior his psychological techniques were creating. Encounter groups were beginning to give evidence that they were a lot like nuclear fission, which is to say a mixed blessing at best and something potentially toxic to anyone who came in close proximity to them at worst. Like Wilhelm Reich unsheathing a plug of radium at Rangeley in Maine, Carl Rogers was beginning to see the toxic contamination that encounters were wreaking on those exposed to their effects. Harold Lyon was an East Coast associate of Rogers assistant

in the late 1960s and early '70s and after attending an encounter group with him in New York City, Lyon began to take their message to heart. In 1977 Lyon wrote a book in which he attempted to document the effect of encounter on his spiritual life:

I have grown to the place where I now have what might be called “a religion of the self.” I believe that most of the answers are within myself and that learning to tap the love and beauty and strength within myself is really a worshipping of the inner self. In essence, I believe in God. God is within each of us . We are all God.... I now meditate to the god within my own

inner self, and each time I meditate, I discover new resources of boundless

85

love and beauty within myself.

Shortly after becoming God, Lyon, who was a federal education official at the time and the author of *Learning to Feel, Feeling to Learn:*

*Humanistic Education for the Whole Man*, was arrested for sexual offenses and soon thereafter got written up in a book on “sex addiction.” After his arrest made the front page of the *Washington Post* <sup>86</sup>Lyon lost his government job and went to jail, where he underwent a second conversion during which he decided that he wasn't a god after all and converted instead to Christianity. Now Lyon will not allow his psychology books in his house, fearing that they will contaminate someone else and cause still more damage.

James Kavanaugh enjoyed a brief moment of fame during the mid-'60s after writing an ephemeral best-seller called *A Modern Priest Looks at His Outdated Church*, in which he pleaded for, among other things, Catholic acceptance of contraception. Shortly after his book came out Kavanaugh stopped being a modern priest, leaving the priesthood and becoming a psychotherapist. Shortly thereafter, he stopped being a therapist as well when his license was suspended after he was charged with sexually molesting his patients.<sup>87</sup> In 1970, thirteen of Rogers's students and followers founded the (in retrospect, aptly named) Center for Feeling Therapy and after a short while were planning to export it to Europe when a

scandal intervened causing all thirteen founding members to appear before the California board of medical inquiry to face charges that some of them had engaged in the sexual molestation of their patients, forcing those who became pregnant to abort their children.<sup>88</sup>

There may have been other reasons for Carl Rogers's tears. At around the same time he learned of the collapse of his daughter's marriage, he also learned that sensitivity training courses were now becoming mandatory at universities across the country. The political takeover he fantasized had arrived, and it was being perpetrated not by the right-wing nuts Rogers had warned his readers about but by the touchy-feely left, using an instrument he himself had developed. That chain of events had convinced Rogers, in Coulson's words, that "compulsory sensitivity training would simply be wrong," but he could no more stop that chain of events than he could put his daughter's marriage back together. The encounter groups which he had been so instrumental in creating, had taken on a life of their own, and now in the hands of therapists less scrupulous than he, they were causing a good deal of psychic damage.

"My understanding," Rogers said, "had always been that people could choose this course or not, as they wished. To think that you are required to take this course and the encounter groups that go with it offends me very, very deeply,... right now, I'm involved in one of the major fights of my professional life to try to obtain freedom, real freedom, for a group that I happen to like. And that's why I was so weepy and upset when I was speaking about the value of freedom last week. And if you think that was some kind of act, that I was talking passionately about freedom and at the same time compelling you people to be here - you don't know me. Nobody is going to be in this course because they are compelled to be."<sup>89</sup>

Today, unfortunately, compulsory sensitivity training is common in academe and industry, as well as in government and church work, in spite of Rogers's objections. As long as Rogers remained in control of the encounter,

it remained within certain bounds of propriety, but Rogers could not be in charge of all encounters, nor could he prevent his less scrupulous colleagues from exploiting them for their own ends. All that Rogers could

say, according to Coulson, is “Well, I don’t do that.” To which his colleagues would say, “Well, of course you don’t do that, because you grew up in an earlier era, but we do and it’s marvelous. You have set us free to be ourselves.”

Rogers felt this way because he knew that the encounter was an intrinsically manipulative exercise. Since Rogers was familiar with the origins of the encounter group, he knew it got its start as part of the post-World War II psychological warfare project. He knew as well that associates like Jack Gibb had training in this area, and he knew that the situation could easily be exploited by people less scrupulous than he. The encounter group, he wrote in his book on that topic,

may all too easily fall more and more into the hands of the exploiters, those who have come onto the group scene primarily for their own personal benefit, financial or psychological. The faddists, the cultists, the nudists, the manipulators, those whose needs are for power or recognition, may come to dominate the encounter group horizon. In this case I feel it is headed for disaster. It will gradually be seen by the public for what it would then be: a somewhat fraudulent game operation not primarily for growth, health and constructive change, but for the benefit of its leaders.<sup>90</sup>

Rogers knew that T-groups were intrinsically manipulative because the group members were telling him this themselves:

In a recent workshop, when one man started to express the concern he felt about an impasse he was experiencing with his wife, another member stopped him, saying essentially, “Are you sure you want to go on with this, or are you being seduced by the group into going further than you want to go? How do you know the group can be trusted? How will you feel about it when you go home and tell your wife what you have revealed, or when you decide to keep it from her? It just isn’t safe to go further.” It seemed quite clear that in his warning this second member was also expressing his own fear of revealing himself, and his lack of trust in the group.

Carl Rogers clearly felt that the group could be trusted, but his belief was based more on “faith” of some sort than on an empirical judgment he had

arrived at after a careful examination of the facts. Rogers, like his intellectual forebear Ralph Waldo Emerson, was an ex-Congregationalist in whom the concept of original sin had simply evaporated. That was his religion and, once he stopped counseling people who were demonstrably ill, that was the regimen he imposed under the guise of indirection upon the people with more traditional Augustinian views who ended up in his encounter groups. Arnold Green had raised the whole idea of encounter groups as a form of social control in an article entitled "Social Values and Psychotherapy which

had appeared in the *Journal of Personality* in 1946. "Rogers claims," Green wrote, "that the therapist must possess no moralistic or judgmental goals whatsoever. Yet it is interesting that in every single case he describes as successful the client always attaches himself to goals that would meet the hearty approval of any Methodist minister."<sup>92</sup>

Rogers was stung by the criticism and responded directly in his book *Client-Centered Therapy*, which appeared five years later. "Neither in practice nor in theory can we go along with the comment by Green that client-centered counseling is simply a subtle way of getting across to the client the cues which indicate approval of cultural values. His hypothesis could be partially maintained in some of the early client-centered cases, but it does not appear to be supported at all in the present handling by experienced counselors. As client-centered therapy has developed, it becomes more and more clear that it cannot be explained on such a basis."<sup>93</sup>

Rogers made the same point in a 1962 debate with B. F. Skinner, who claimed that therapy, no matter how non-directive it claimed to be, was still "operant conditioning." Just how subtly manipulative Rogers can be comes across in this account of the forty-four-year-old woman "who has been dominated all her life by her mother."<sup>94</sup> Since the woman is "too terrified to tell her mother of spending an evening with a male friend (George) whom she loves,"<sup>95</sup> Rogers sets out to liberate her from her mother, in probably the same subtle fashion in which he set out to liberate the nuns from their convent by reinforcing all of the choices which favor eliminating either responsibility or family bonds in favor of those values which promote "independence." When the woman finally shunts her mother, who is in her late seventies at the time, off to an apartment to live

by herself, Rogers applauds her actions using terms which bespeak the values he wants to promote: "She has at last cut the umbilical cord and managed to say (not without some difficulty I am sure), 'I am a separate person from you.' She is now truly celebrating her Independence Day, her Fourth of July"<sup>96</sup> If this passage isn't an example of providing "cues which indicate approval of cultural values," then what is it?

If abandoning her mother also means abandoning the moral order in sexual matters, then this is a price which Carl Rogers clearly thinks she ought to pay. Did the encounter group, Rogers wonders, "change her attitudes, toward man-woman relationships, moving her away from orthodox morality? Did it make her emotionally unstable? Without any doubt, the answer to all of these questions is a resounding yes! It proved terribly unsettling; it caused deep unhappiness and depression; it changed her relationship with her mother in such a way as to drive her mother into hysterics; it brought wild fluctuations in her emotional reactions; it caused her to be more acceptant of her loving feelings toward a married man."<sup>97</sup>

If it did all those things, Rogers still thinks it was a small price to pay if it enabled her to divest herself of another shackle, in this case, her aged mother. And what does freedom look like? It looks a lot like rootless consumerism. The woman now lives alone, leading "her independent life in her apartment," where she has "been furnishing it, enjoy collecting art. . . and . . . beginning to do a little creative cooking and a small bit of entertaining."<sup>98</sup> Even if he was unaware of what he was doing, Rogers was acting as an agent of socialization for the rootless suburbanites of consumer culture, who felt that consumption was more important than family ties. Even Kurt Back, who is positively disposed toward encounter groups, sees them as based on a value system which fosters rootlessness and consumption over family ties and self-restraint. According to Back, the areas where encounter groups flourished most were

the new suburbs and the West, especially California ... pointing up the direct connection between mobility and sensitivity training. Encounter groups have become a respectable "lonely hearts club" for newcomers or those without roots in a community. The new norms of immediacy and letting oneself go to a strong emotional experience are conducive to

rapid integration into a new setting as well as departure without emotional damage?’<sup>9</sup>

Rogers was hardly being non-directive when he persuaded the forty-four-year-old woman to get rid of her mother and have an affair with a married man; he was subtly manipulating her by manipulating her passions. His therapy was based on a whole set of cultural values, ones which coincided hand-in-glove with the consumer culture of the times, but which were at the same time a set of values whose existence he could never admit to himself. Rogers’s values were based not on long-term relationships and moral commitment but rather “possibilities for the rapid development of closeness between and among persons, a closeness which is not artificial, but is real and deep, and which will be well suited to our increasing mobility of living. Temporary relationships will be able to achieve the richness and meaning which heretofore have been associated only with lifelong attachments.”<sup>100</sup> Encounter groups provided a way for suburbanites to attain instant intimacy. If they become sexually involved, if their marriages broke up, if the whole family disintegrated into rootless individuals passing aimlessly through each others lives - as it had in the case of Natalie Rogers and her lesbian daughter Frances - it was a small price to pay in exchange for peak moments in the encounter group.

In a system like this, sexual fidelity is not a prime value. Again, Rogers never tells us that he is denigrating the moral order; we pick it up by osmosis from the subtle cues he throws into the conversation, as when he mentions the film *Rachel, Rachel* and praises Rachel for being

willing to accept her sexual feelings and give herself to a young man whom she has unquestionably idealized. The love affair is not what one would call a success and she is deserted by her boyfriend, but nonetheless she has learned that it is only by taking a risk that she can genuinely encounter another human being. This learning stays with her and strengthens her as a person to move out into the unknown world.<sup>101</sup>

Rogers never used words like “good” and “bad,” but his therapy, like all actions, is predicated on his understanding of those terms. Non-directive therapy was successful in evading the defenses neurotics erected to defend themselves against the truth about themselves they both wanted and

didn't want to know. It was, therefore, a fortiori even more effective in insinuating a form of social engineering and domination into what claimed to be therapy for the healthy.

Carl Rogers never really admitted that the experiment with the IHM nuns ended in failure. This fact admits of two explanations: 1) that he couldn't admit the fact to himself, or 2) that he thought the project was a success. The second possibility is more sinister than the first, and brings up the possibility that Rogers thought he was doing the nuns a favor by liberating them from their "narrow convent rooms." The second possibility also brings up a related question. Was Rogers using the encounter group as a form of psychological warfare against the Catholic Church? W. R. Coulson, who worked with Rogers, is still wrestling with the issue with the benefit of over thirty years of hindsight. In a 1994 interview in *Latin Mass* magazine, Coulson claimed that he, Rogers, "was probably anti-Catholic; at the time I didn't recognize it because I probably was too. We had a bias against hierarchy." In an even more recent interview with the author, he said that because Rogers had so many Catholics working for him, he was "prudent about saying anything about Catholicism." Finally, Coulson settled on a third possibility. "On the other hand, he didn't have to say anything. If he could draw Catholics into the process, the result was inevitable. That was more congruent with what he believed." The evidence was there for Rogers to see, and he cited it in his books. Encounter groups fostered "individual independence, openness, and integrity" and as a result are "not conducive to unquestioning institutional loyalty." As an example of the effect encounter groups have had, Rogers tells the reader that "priests and nuns, ministers and professors, have left their orders and churches and universities because of the courage gained in such groups, deciding to work for change outside the institution rather than within

Far from being apologetic about encounter groups causing nuns and priests to lose their vocations, Rogers sees this outcome as unabashedly positive, and in portraying it as such, he gives some insight into his own religious orientation, and how he would bring about the demise of the Immaculate Heart order and think he was doing a good thing. As the above passage indicates, the key to understanding Rogers's intentions in the Immaculate Heart affair is understanding his religious views, since in the

absence of criteria

like health Rogers could only apply his personal religious and moral views as the direction which his therapy should take, no matter how subtly he directed the conversation and disguised his intentions.

Rogers, a Congregationalist who went to Union Theological Seminary for two years, then dropped out and fell under John Dewey's spell at Columbia Teachers' College, was always reluctant to talk about religion and especially reluctant to talk about his own religious beliefs. In an article which appeared in 1985, Rogers quotes with approval a workshop participant who said of her encounter group, "I found it to be a profound spiritual experience. I felt the oneness of spirit in the community. We breathed together, felt together, even spoke for one another. I felt the power of the 'life-force' that infuses each of us - whatever that is." ~ Whatever it was, it prompted Rogers to a momentary reflection on the transcendent. "I am compelled to believe that I," he wrote, "like many others, have underestimated the importance of this mystical, spiritual dimension."

Noticing Rogers's penchant to describe religion in a way that invariably made it antithetical to organizational structure and hierarchy, Thomas C. Oden described the human potential movement as a new form of eighteenth-century Pietism in his 1972 book, *Intensive Group Experience: The New Pietism*. Common to both encounter groups and Pietism was a belief that religion was not something associated with any organization. Rather, it was a new form of consciousness which enables a "direct transcendental experience of God" through a carefully orchestrated emotional experience involving the religious group - either the Quaker meeting with its absence of liturgy and dependence on spontaneous assertion at the behest of the Holy Spirit or the Methodist revival with its excess of emotion. In each instance, the true power for a change in the social order must stem from the individual. Once this movement spreads it often takes on the form of reform political movements, as was the case with Abolitionism in New England. Either way, in both Pietism and encounter groups, experience always has priority over authority. The only authority which is recognized is the one which works by stealth under the cover of the movement of the spirit either of the Holy Spirit or the spirit of

the individual. The prime concern is to bring about a transformation of consciousness which in turn will bring about a transformation of the culture at large resulting from the erotic and mystical experiences that individuals have during their encounter. Taking his cue from Oden, Michael Weber noticed similarities between sensitivity training and the pietist version of public confession. "The Father Confessor," according to Weber, "because of Luther's concept of the priesthood of all believers, can now be a woman or a brother; it is the group which hears and heals, which protests and which accepts. Now the penitent has been rescued from the darkness of the confessional and the cold virtuosity of private spiritual training."<sup>104</sup>

Weber's description of democratized confession brings up the connection between Pietism and Illuminism, a connection others have noticed as well. Agethen notes that it was "above all in the Protestant states of Northern Germany" where both Pietism and Illuminism spread most rapidly, and that the spread of both led to widespread acceptance of the ideas of the Enlightenment. Common to both Illuminism and Pietism was an inclination to involvement in psychological self-analysis and a sophistication of psychological understanding as it applied to things like repentance for sin and willingness to confess, which were in their turn based on examination of conscience and self-observation.<sup>105</sup> All of these manifestations were absorbed via the religious practices of eighteenth-century religious sects like the Quakers into the psychic repertoire of sensitivity training.

The same sort of techniques were still in use among the Quakers as late as the 1950s. Morton Kaplan tells the story of teaching at Haverford College, a Quaker school outside Philadelphia, during the 1953-54 academic year, when it was discovered that one of the students was prejudiced against Negroes. Teams of teachers and students, according to Kaplan, held sessions with him over a period of a year until he affirmed that he was no longer prejudiced. The Quakers may have termed it "gentle persuasion," but Kaplan saw in it a form of brainwashing and an early version of the orchestration of small-group peer pressure which would find its ultimate expression in sensitivity training. "They could not understand," Kaplan said of the Quakers, "that I thought it better for the young man to

keep his prejudices than that he be subjected to such coercive brainwashing.”<sup>106</sup>

One of the most sinister of all foundations, the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation, traces its penchant for funding psychological warfare and things like the birth-control pill to “the Quaker traditions of simplicity, sincerity and devotion to the service of mankind” as manifested in the life of its founder Kate Macy Ladd. Similarly, Kleiner finds it unsurprising that sensitivity training has religious undertones, considering the family backgrounds of the psychological warriors who created it. Douglas McGregor’s father, for instance,

had been a midwestern reverend; he came out of the great American Protestant liberal tradition, the tradition of Quaker meetings, community ban raisings, and Ralph Waldo Emerson. Perhaps it was not coincidence that so many other NTLers - including Lee Bradford, Ken Benne, Ron Lippitt, and the eminent T-group advocate Carl Rogers - had similar backgrounds. . . . Traditional religious pietism added an element of both force (in the sense of moral legitimacy) and direction to the social engineering that had been programmed into encounter groups from the beginning, something that was not lost on experts on brainwashing like Edgar Schein, who was “well aware that certain exercises, tasks set up by the facilitator, can practically force the group to more of a here-and-now communication or more of a feelings level.

Since the confessional elements in T-groups meant they were a form of Illuminism, that also meant that they were a form of social control, but because T-groups were refracted through the lens of American Pietism, those who made use of the techniques could absolve themselves of any sinister intent, which is what seems to have happened in the case of Carl Rogers. Rogers was simply liberating nuns from their convents where they were slaves to the whore of Babylon. Luther got his wife this way. so why should Americans raised in that tradition see it as reprehensible? T-groups democratized Illuminism. They were also a typical expression of the English ideology, which eschewed overt force and preferred Masonic style secret organizations which could engineer consensus from behind the scenes.

In his role as the non-directive group leader always claiming that he had nothing to force on his unwitting clients, Carl Rogers was a classic expression of the English ideology and the religious movements which epitomized it and the secret societies which implemented it. Like Newton, Rogers framed no hypotheses. What claimed to be non-directive and client centered was in reality, however, an Illuminist technique that accomplished psychic control through a subtle manipulation of the passions. (In the epigone who emulated Rogers, the manipulation was not so subtle.) In proposing encounter groups as simultaneously a form of both exoteric liberation and esoteric control, Rogers was proposing something completely compatible with both his religious tradition and his ethnic heritage, and in bringing it to bear on a willing if unsuspecting group of California nuns, he was using this technique in a way that was compatible with the interests of the ethnic group to which he belonged, an ethnic group which was then engaged in a cultural civil war that was being waged against the Catholic Church.

Rogers was even more reluctant to talk about his ethnicity than he was to talk about his spirituality, but Natalie Rogers, in her inimitable way, fills in some of the gaps here.

“I grew up.” she writes in *Emerging Woman*,

adamantly agnostic, pragmatic, a skeptic about anything religious or spiritual, with a down-to-earth orientation. I scorned notions of god, of life after death. I dismissed the possibility of psychic phenomena and denied that dreams might be an important part of life. In college the only spiritual philosophy I ever accepted was Emerson’s view of the Over-Soul.

In describing the moral code according to which her parents raised her, Natalie says that she “grew up in an era where many of us were given the following messages: ‘Girls stay virgin until married’” but also “birth control and family planning are the right and duty of responsible couples.”<sup>109</sup> At another point, Natalie praises her mother as “an outspoken leader for the right of women to choose whether and when they will get pregnant.”<sup>110</sup> At another point, Natalie Rogers criticizes her mother for not going far enough in educating her away from moral prejudice in matters sexual: “Although she was a progressive on the political scene - giving her

time to the Margaret Sang-er/Planned Parenthood movement - I didn't find her views of my behavior

very liberal.... Between age forty and sixty you missed an opportunity to become more fully you - more independent in your art work or fully effective with Planned Parenthood.”<sup>111</sup>

Taken as a whole, Natalie's comments show that members of her family were typical examples of the progressive WASP, their ethnic group, which had adopted the use of the contraceptive, and then as a result of that got drawn into eugenic warfare against those groups which didn't use contraception, most notably blacks and Catholics. Support for Planned Parenthood meant for Natalie's parents' generation support for the eugenic crusade that characterized the WASP ethnics' concern about differential fertility. Having adopted the use of the contraceptive as part of their moral code, they were too ethnically provincial to see that it contradicted the rest of their sexual morality. The only coherence this world view had was ethnic. As a result, the Rogers family joined in the great WASP ethnic project, the eugenics movement as prosecuted by Planned Parenthood as it turned into the anti-Catholic crusade of the post-war period. W. R. Coulson never remembers discussing his large family with Rogers, but his wife remembers getting a matchbook with Planned Parenthood's address on it after the birth of their seventh child. His wife also clearly remembers Helen Rogers giving a donation of \$10,000 to Planned Parenthood.

Because of his support of Planned Parenthood, Carl Rogers was engaged in ethnic conflict with the Catholics who were his clients in therapy. That he didn't advertise the fact was due in equal measure to his personality and his ethnicity, neither of which was comfortable with overt or antagonistic declarations of clear intent. “A facilitator,” Rogers wrote in his book on encounter groups, “is less effective when he pushes a group, manipulates it, makes rules for it, tries to direct it toward his own unspoken goals.”<sup>112</sup> In a videotaped interview Rogers told Warren Bennis in 1976 that

Nobody knows where I'm going until I've gone so far they can't stop me.... And really in large measure, that's the way I've gone through life. Nobody (Rogers laughs) knows where I'm going until I've gone so far they can't stop me, that's one thing... and also I don't like to be interfered with on the

way.... It's a strange word to airaly because it seems contradictory, but I'm in a way sort of stealthy."

In the same interview Rogers said that he got the idea of indirection from his parents, something which he gave a revolutionary twist: "One of the fascinating things about my parents' control was that it was so subtle that it did not seem oppressive. I was a good boy, but that seemed to be the way I should be. It didn't seem as though I had to be this way against my will."

Bennis: "Yeah, that's neat. Marx said the sign of a truly oppressed person is when they don't know they're oppressed.

Rogers: "There's a lot of truth to that."<sup>114</sup>

Rogers here evidently forgot that moral behavior is natural because, in scriptural terms, it is written on the heart. By the time he was being interviewed, Rogers had completely internalized the Watsonian view that man had no nature. As a result everything was conditioning, and every conditioning technique was potentially brainwashing. What Rogers knew that Watson didn't was how to be subtle, how to be (to use his word) "stealthy." Because his influence was always indirect, Carl Rogers was virtually irresistible. Not too long after a speech he gave in 1969 at Sonoma State listing the qualities of the man of the future, one of Rogers's colleagues referred to him as a "quiet revolutionary," and Rogers applied the term to himself thereafter until his death.

Natalie seems to have tried to learn the same lesson from her father without as much success. "My father, Carl Rogers," she wrote in her memoir, "has always been the earth from which my philosophical roots have been nourished. He values the integrity of each individual not only in his words but in his way of living. He has never dominated, controlled, or tried to push me. I have felt accepted and appreciated even when we disagree."<sup>115</sup>

No one is ever coerced Rogerian therapy. Or, better put, no one is ever aware that he is coerced in Rogerian therapy. This subtle system of control based on the manipulation of passion was, however, full of unintended consequences for the ethnic group which used it to wage cultural war on their opponents. One of the unintended consequences was

the generational decline of those who made use of it. That decline began with the sexual liberation of Carl and Helen, though that is certainly not how they saw it, when they became involved in the use of the contraceptive. That fateful step led to divorce, adultery, masturbation, drug use, compulsive promiscuity in their daughter Natalie's generation, and it led to lesbianism in the next generation in Frances Fuchs, her daughter, who is now active in lesbian politics in California.

The WASP elite chose the contraception and psychological warfare as a way of defeating the Catholics and maintaining their hegemony over the culture that was slipping out of their grasp, but in the final analysis their strategy backfired because in the end it was their own children who adopted the tenets of sexual liberation even more avidly than the sexually repressed Catholic priests and nuns, and in adopting the tenets of sexual liberation, they put themselves out of existence. In the end, the sexual revolution was just another word for the anti-Catholic campaign, and Carl Rogers, the modern pietist, tried to destroy them by liberating them, or he tried to liberate them by destroying what made them Catholic.

"Never in my life before that group experience," one Catholic priest wrote, had I experienced "me" so intensely. And then to have that "me" so confirmed and loved by the group, who by this time were sensitive and reacting to my phoniness, was like receiving a gift I could never have hoped for, because until then I never dreamed that it could exist.

... I was in the seminary at that time and have since been ordained a priest. But within my vocation as a priest there have been profound changes both inside me and outside me. Inside, I began to grow from a boy to a man. Outside I became much freer in relation to authority and human respect. Inside me I was so much more present to myself and therefore to others that my work as a counselor and a therapist shot up one hundred per cent in its effectiveness.

Anyway I began to become\_\_\_\_\_I have so much more hope in the future of man. Because if we can touch one another as persons the way it can happen in an encounter, then "redemption" begins to happen for all of us, and we emerge from a death-like existence of loneliness and diminution

to a possibility of fully-aliveness. I can really say “yes” to mankind, because I have discovered in a deeply personal way, in a way which I can deeply feel as well as think, that each person in the world is an abundant reservoir of life and love that only needs to be tapped to be made available for self-nourishment and for the refreshment of others.<sup>116</sup>

Other priests were not so sanguine. Weber tells the story of a seminarian in Germany who was exposed to sensitivity training and as a result “feeling like a tool without a will of my own in the hands of the group leader. In each group exercise, I wanted to win his attention and recognition. I couldn’t pray anymore and I also suffered from psychosomatic disturbances.”<sup>117</sup>

On December 10, 1968, Thomas Merton had just finished the morning lecture at a conference he was attending in Bangkok, Thailand when he announced to his audience, “I think I am going to disappear.” Merton had resolved the sexual crisis that was threatening his vocation to the priesthood by pulling back from his affair with M., partially at least because he feared that he would become “enslaved to the need for her body.” He felt in part as well that the “objective fact of my vows is more than a juridical obligation. It has deep personal and spiritual roots. I cannot be true to myself if I am not true to so deep a commitment.”<sup>18</sup> After making his cryptic announcement to the attendees at the conference in Bangkok, Merton went up to his hotel room where he inadvertently pulled a defective fan on top of himself in the bathtub and died of heart failure and burns caused by electric shock.

At around the same time, Sister Mary Benjamin, IHM, decided that she was going to leave the Immaculate Heart nuns. In discussing her decision, she never mentions the effect that her sexual practices might have had on her decision. All she can mention is the images that her sexual practices had created in her mind, turning the convent’s walls into a “prison.”

“The fear that drew me there for protection had lost its power. The convent could do nothing now but hold me back. My spirit was starving for the life I had surrendered as a child. It was time to catch up. I felt like a long distance runner about to run the first mile of her marathon.”<sup>19</sup>

For the first lap in her spiritual marathon, Sister Mary flew to New York in 1970 with a suitcase of second-hand clothes. While there she became lovers with a guy named Larry, who sucked his thumb in his sleep. She also had sex with a number of other people from whom she contracted sexual parasites. Then, tiring of her boyfriend she moved off into a series of even more transient lesbian relationships, until, finally, at the prompting of political and spiritual forces she was never able to understand, she “proclaimed [her]self a dyke.” At that point, she went off in search of the lesbian equivalent of the community she had abandoned when she left the Immaculate Heart nuns. By the mid-’80s she was living alone again, oftentimes in a tent in the woods, where she claimed to be communing with spirits.

Ann Campbell’s life followed much the same trajectory after she left the convent in 1971. Ann had her first sexual experience in 1969 when she was 30 years old. The results could have been predicted by Wilhelm Reich:

Gradually I backed away from Mass and the sacraments. By then there was so much flexibility in scheduling that no one noticed. I would sometimes go to confession and allude to my transgressions; at times I went guiltily to Communion and asked God to forgive me. This went on for two and a half incredible years.

When she finally left the convent in 1971, Campbell “claimed that my convictions on social justice, racial equality, peace and intellectual freedom were the reasons,” something which she finds less persuasive fifteen years after the fact than she did at the time. The real reason for leaving the convent was sexual: “I had finally acknowledged that my love for this woman was inconsistent with my vows. And since I judged this love to be incompatible with God’s plan, I was prepared to pay the price in guilt and inner misery until I could extricate myself. My theology of freedom had deserted me.”<sup>1-1</sup>

Unable to find comfort in either religion or the rejection of religion, Campbell tried to drown her anguish in alcohol, but all the alcohol succeeded in doing was to give her the “sensation that I had lost control over my own life’s direction.”<sup>1””’1</sup> Eventually, “drinking to blot out feelings became a nightly ritual” as the isolation which her “liberation” from

convent life and family ties brought about became intolerable. When ex-nuns like Ann Campbell really needed counseling, there was no one there to do the counseling. And in retrospect, what could people like Carl Rogers have offered her? She was already liberated; she was already free of sexual repression. What more did Illuminist counseling have to offer, once the victim had adopted the categories which were to bring about her happiness? By 1970 the Immaculate Heart nuns were gone from the scene. The operation was a success; the patient died.

At around the same time that the IHM order fell apart, Harry the Therapist and Genevieve the ex-nun got married, after Harry's divorce came through. At around the same time, after his stay at Esalen and Rogers's Cen-

ter for the Person in La Jolla, Father Kieser decided to undergo therapy at the hands of a therapist whose "general orientation was existential and Jungian, both of which I found simpatico."<sup>123</sup> Father Kieser's therapist made no attempt to interpret what I was seeing through the prism of his own set of dogmatic categories (as far as I know he had none). Nor did he ever suggest a course of action beyond the process of therapy itself. His job was to help me to discover the truth. It was my job, with the freedom of the newly discovered truth gave me, to make the decisions.<sup>u</sup>

Like Father Kieser, the overwhelming majority of American Catholics never knew what hit them. They lost a cultural war that they didn't even know was being waged against them. Because the Catholics lost that cultural war, the victors in that struggle would use the same techniques - psychological warfare, feminism, population control, pornography, encounter groups - to subject larger segments of American life and larger segments of the world to their control. Sensitivity training would be introduced to the public schools over the next thirty years, where it would be presented under various guises - as "character education," "drug education," and "sex education" under brand names like DARE, Deciding, Tribes, Valuing Values, Choices and Decisions, the Michigan Model, Magic Circle, Me-ology, Quest, Here's looking at you. Values and Choices, Project Charlie, DECIDE, etc. Assaulted by this form of "social engineering at its worst," American students would be "regimented into shock-troops of a new politically correct millennium."<sup>125</sup>