The Tavistock roots of the ‘Aquarian Conspiracy’

by L. Wolfe

In June 1980, the Democratic Presidential campaign of Lyndon LaRouche issued a 64-page manual intended to inoculate the American population against the psychological warfare operations of a far-reaching conspiracy directed at the behest of the British Crown. The pamphlet described the origins of the so-called Aquarian Conspiracy which, in creating a New Age paradigm of post-industrial Malthusianism with a rock-drug-sex culture, threatened the very existence of the nation and western Judeo-Christian civilization. “The problem goes deeper than simply changing policies,” LaRouche wrote in the introduction to the report. “Powerful forces are deeply committed to the neo-Malthusian policies, and these policies have become so deeply embedded in our nation’s life that a change in policy requires a massive upheaval in our political parties leadership merely to get back to the policy outlook of the mid-1960s.”

The report identified the Carter administration as an organizing center for Tavistock’s New Age, which itself was the test-tube creation of networks associated with the Crown’s psychological warfare capability centered in London’s Tavistock Institute for Human Relations. But despite the crushing election defeat of Carter by voters in 1980, the Aquarian Conspiracy, as LaRouche had warned, was not defeated. It continued to operate within the Democratic Party, and, in the Reagan-Bush era, New Age Republicans rose to prominence. Newt Gingrich is one of these GOP Aquarians, spouting the same “futurist” babble and with the same policies aimed at destroying the United States, as the New Agers on the other side of the political spectrum.

The assault on reason

EIR researches have traced the approximate point at which the Aquarian Conspiracy and its New Age paradigm was launched, to the November 1963 assassination of President John Kennedy.

Roughly coincidental with Kennedy’s assassination, a key operative of the Tavistock Institute was given a government grant to study the effects of the space program on the American population. Only a portion of that study, which was conducted during 1964-66, was published, in Tavistock’s journal Human Relations. Under the direction of Ronald Rapoport, who, along with his wife, was directly affiliated with the Institute, the report found that the space program was not only creating a proliferation of engineers and scientists, but that this was the result of a perceived value shift in the population that strengthened its belief in the ability of science and industry to solve man’s problems.

The full report, which was supposed to be published as one of a series of books published by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the American Academy of Arts and Science, was never published, but its findings were circulated within Tavistock’s wide-ranging networks internationally. While the so-called Rapoport Report, a portion of which was published under the title Social Change: Space Impact on Communities and Social Groups, made no specific recommendations, the networks associated with Tavistock moved to both shut down the space program and launch the Aquarian Conspiracy, a massive long-term brainwashing campaign to shift the underlying values and moral outlook of the American people. To accomplish this, an assault was launched on that quality which defines man in the image of the Creator and distinguishes him from the beast—his capacity for creative reason.

Tavistock had a long history of perfecting brainwashing techniques. Known as the “Freud Hilton,” the Tavistock Clinic, created and funded by networks directly linked to the British royal family, was the leading repository for Freudian quackery, inclusive of the work of Anna Freud. During World War II, its operatives, under the direction of the clinic’s founder and head, Brig. Gen. John Rawlings Rees, served as the leadership of the British Psychological Warfare Directorate and allied offshoots in the United States. Tavistock studied the effects of war-inflicted terror on both enemy and allied populations, while applying the results of such studies in small-group-brainwashing environments.

Tavistock’s Kurt Lewin, based in the United States and one of the founders of the National Training Laboratories, laid out a basic premise for mass brainwashing: If terror could be used to induce the breakdown of moral and social capacity in an individual, then the same could be done, under circumstances controlled or manipulated from the outside, with a large group. Rees, writing at the war’s end, called for the creation of “psychological shock troops,” which, through the use of mass brainwashing techniques, would be the real controllers of society.
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council, was perfecting a theory of brainwashing on a societal scale, known as "social turbulence," based on the work of Lewin and William Sargent. Trist, who later became the editor of *Human Relations*, was then based at the Wharton School of Business at the University of Pennsylvania. He stated in his 1963 paper, presented with his co-thinker Fred Emery to a select audience at Tavistock, and later published in a short book, *A Choice of Futures*, that a series of sharp and universal, cathartic shocks would destabilize a targeted population, plunging a whole society into a form of managed psychosis. If the shocks were repeated over a period of years, there would be a shift in mental capacity to more infantile forms of reasoning. Under such conditions, the psychotic adaptations of values would become "normative" or accepted; what was once thought to be abnormal would become normal. Trist boldly "predicted" in late 1963 that society had entered into a period of *permanent social turbulence*, which would usher society into a new paradigm.

In *Futures We Are In*, a book published in 1975, by Trist’s associate Fred Emery, the three stages of societal disintegration of Trist’s paradigm shift are laid out. The first stage is called *superficiality*, in which people start to break the bonds with the societal values of the past, the values of Judeo-Christian civilization. *Superficiality* results in the collapse of moral judgment, says Emery. The next, lower stage of societal disintegration is called *segmentation*, in which the larger institutions of society start to disintegrate, and the focus moves from the nation-state to the local community, then to the block and even to the family; people, says Emery, retreat into small and increasingly more paranoid groups, whose interests are pitted against each other. *Segmentation* gives rise to potential fascism of the Nazi type, writes Emery, which, he said, was built on the ability to control “paranoid rage.”

But Tavistock knew that such a model is inherently unstable, relying too much on terror applied by organized government to maintain control. They, therefore, proposed instead to plunge society to yet a deeper level of degradation and destabilization, called *disassociation*. The individual becomes the societal unit, withdrawing from society into a "world in which fantasy and reality are indistinguishable," and in which the difference between fantasy and reality, according to Emery, hardly matters. Man is reduced to a worldview dominated by "fantasy and superstition," in which he trusts no one. Government-by-reason is impossible, thus it and all its institutions must give way to "direct decisionmaking," with decisions made by "feeling states."

Emery uses the term "Clockwork Orange," from the Anthony Burgess novel of the same name, as a descriptive metaphor for this type of society gone completely insane, in which habituated, random violence committed by gangs of youth is the order of the day, while the adults retreat into their television and other entertainments.

Trist later writes that the so-called "wired society," with individuals hooked together by cable television, personal computers, and other interactive electronics, is a more "popular" metaphor for this same disassociated, totally controlled social order. A "new order" was coming into being, he proclaimed, the dawning of the "Information Age." This is precisely the brainwashing paradigm now being promoted by Gingrich and his ilk.

The Malthusian ethic

In May 1967, a "war council" in Tavistock's battle against western civilization was convened in Deauville, France under the auspices of the Scientific and Technological Committee of the North Atlantic Assembly and the U.S.-based Foreign Policy Research Institute, headed by U.S. NATO Ambassador Robert Strauz-Hupe. With the title "Conference on Transatlantic Technological Imbalance and Collaboration," it featured the participation of Harland Cleveland, a future NATO ambassador and leading coordinator of Tavistock’s futurist networks; Willis Harman, of the Tavistock-connected Stanford Research Institute (SRI); and Trist collaborator Fred Emery. Also participating were Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, the future Carter national security ad-
viser then working out of the State Department Policy Planning Council, and Dr. Aurelio Peccei, the future head of the Club of Rome, the leading Malthusian organization, and then-chairman of NATO’s most important think-tank, the Economic Committee of the Atlantic Institute. Sir Solly Zuckerman and Sir Alexander King, top advisers to the British Crown, were also reported to be active participants.

According to participants who were interviewed later, the conference served to update the Tavistock network on various “works in progress,” and to help further define them. Emery reported on the work of Trist and himself on “social turbulence” theories. Harman discussed the ongoing SRI-Tavistock “The Images of Man” project, which sought to define the new paradigm in terms and methods developed by Kenneth and Elise Boulding a decade earlier. A general consensus reportedly was achieved on certain “principles”:

1) The promotion of the rock-drug-sex counterculture would, over a span of little more than a generation, lead to its becoming the dominant global culture; this would mark the end of western Christian civilization, ending what was referred to as the “Age of Pisces” and ushering in the “Age of Aquarius.”

2) “Scientific progress,” as defined by man’s successive mastery of ever-higher laws of the universe, giving him dominion over nature, was to give way to man reduced to being part of nature, whose laws were unchangeable and unknowable.

3) The term “science” was to be substituted with the loosely defined term “technology,” which was to be given a meaning separated from physical economy. Hence, Harman and Emery both spoke of “science” creating a new “technological age,” in which man was no longer bound to the production of material goods, but in which “information” and “ideas” were the new “commodities.”

4) Systems of government, founded for the previous, industrial and pre-industrial paradigms, would no longer function in this “post-industrial” New Age. Government would have to give way, nation-states fall aside, as man found new, more “empathetic ways” to deal with each other.

Taken as a whole, the reports from participants and the conference documents are a statement of a new “ethic” for the post-industrial age, or, as Boulding and Harman referred to it, an “image” for the coming Age of Aquarius. Under the psychological pressure of the terror of the Cuban missile crisis, the Kennedy assassination and its coverup, the Vietnam War, and the assault by the rock-drug-sex counterculture, the shift to this new paradigm was already well under way.

In a 1980 article in Futures magazine, Trist looks back on the previous two decades of imposed chaos and confusion, beginning with the Kennedy assassination, through the assassinations of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. and Bobby Kennedy, the inability of the United States to “win” the Vietnam War, the oil embargoes and subsequent energy rationing crises, the collapse of the Bretton Woods monetary system, Watergate, the Iranian hostage crisis, the Volcker measures, and so forth. He concludes that the successive waves of “turbulence” were sufficient to force people to give up closely held values about society: “All of these events, and there are many others, came as surprises. They were not predicted. They are not understood. For this reason they create bewilderment, raising levels of anxiety and suspicion. Such is the experience of turbulence and loss of the stable state.”

Aquarian fascism

The 1967 conference and a series of similar NATO-sponsored events, were the launching pad for other developments, of which we will highlight a few seminal ones relevant to Newt Gingrich’s Aquarian ideology.

In 1968, Brzezinski published The Technetronic Age, an almost unreadable work which, in its more lucid passages, argues that the new “technetronic age” will lay the basis for a benevolent dictatorship by a world elite. Society, he states, will be characterized by an “information revolution,” “cybernetics,” and the replacement of “achievement orientation” by an “amusement focus,” based on “spectator spectacles (mass sports and TV) providing an opiate for increasingly purposeless masses. . . . New forms of social control may be needed to limit the indiscriminate exercise by the individual of their new powers. The possibility of extensive chemical mind control . . . will call for a social definition of the common criteria of restraint as well as of utilization.”

Presaging Gingrich’s “anticipatory democracy” (A/D) movement, and echoing Boulding, Trist, and Emery, Brzezinski declares that the post-industrial era “is prompting subtle and still undefinable changes in the American psyche. . . . What makes America unique is that it is the first society to experience the future . . . be it pop art or LSD. . . . Today, America is the creative society; the others, consciously or unconsciously, are emulative.” He concludes with a call for a new form of government, based on a society “wired” together, and with the ability to respond to crises before they occur. However, this form of government, while providing certain availability of “inputs,” could encourage tendencies toward a “technocratic dictatorship” which would leave “less and less room for political procedures as we now know them.”

These are not the ravings of some unknown fascist nut, but the professed beliefs of the man who was to head the United States national security establishment as national security adviser to President James Earl Carter.

Brzezinski’s declarations are echoed in The Chasm Ahead, a book by Aurelio Peccei, the man assigned by Tavistock to create the Club of Rome, the super-organization for the worldwide promotion of Malthusianism. Peccei had met with former National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy, then coordinating funding for the various components of the Aquarian project through his position as head of the Ford
The Club of Rome was created in late 1968.

The “New Age,” the “IBM Age,” is upon us, writes Peccei. It will require dramatic shifts in the way man governs himself, as well as his relationship to nature. What is required, he states, is a new form of “crisis management” and planning, which is global in nature, which existing governments are going to resist. The choices that such new forms of government will have to make are difficult, and even horrible, he says, and it were important that “consensus” be created to support them. But even absent that consensus, declares Peccei, the decisions will have to be made and enforced.

In another ideological document for the Club of Rome, titled The Human Quality, Peccei argues in the same vein as does Prince Philip, that man has too high an opinion of himself. Man is part of nature, and but an animal, who, through his arrogance, places all of nature in danger. Man, says Peccei, is “the enemy or tyrant of most forms of life. . . . Man invented the story of the bad dragon, but if ever there was a bad dragon on earth, it is man himself.” Man must reject “technology” as a solution, since it is technology that has created this “problem”; he must find new systems, new ways of understanding himself, and must accept his subservience to “nature.”

The publication of Alvin Toffler’s 1970 Future Shock, is of one piece with the above-cited works and thinking, which are themselves products of the Aquarian project. The Toffler book is intended to popularize the “post-industrial” thesis. The 1972 Club of Rome report Limits to Growth is merely a more extreme presentation of the same general thesis of the consequences of the end of the Christian paradigm, and the rise of the Malthusian Age of Aquarius to take its place. Limits to Growth is a scientific fraud, based on systems analysis models; its promulgators have rejected the fundamental concept of science itself.

In 1974, the Changing Images of Man, the result of the Willis Harman-directed SRI study, was published. It asserts that there are 19 dominant “images of man”—the brainwashers’ shorthand for popular opinion “axioms” that govern human behavior and organization—throughout arbitrarily defined historical periods. Those assertions are then used to put forward the study’s “big lie,” that the present “image of industrial and technological man” is obsolete and must be discarded. In particular, says the team of SRI researchers and Tavistock-related contractors, the image of man that emerged from the Renaissance, “the economic man” with his belief in “scientific and technological progress,” is inappropriate.

In its stead, the SRI gaggle proposes to substitute the ethos and ethics of the countercultural swamp, and worse, as the “new image.” Among its “generative forces” are included: “Youth rebellion against societal wrongs. . . . The generation gap implying a changing paradigm. . . . The anti-technological bias of young people. . . . Experimentation with new family structures and interpersonal relationships. . . . The emergence of the conservation/ecology movement. . . . A surge in interest in Eastern religions and philosophical perspectives. . . . A renewed interest in ‘fundamentalist’
Christianity. . . . The increasing importance of ‘self-realization’ processes. . . .

“These disparate trends do not when taken individually signify the emergence of a new image of a human being; yet, when they are considered collectively, they suggest the substantial societal stirrings which may eventually emerge into a new and guiding image.”

**The Aquarian Conspiracy**

In publishing the SRI report, the Tavistock network made no mention of its work, through political and other means, to bring about the “observed” transformation factors. Six years later, in February 1980, Willis Harman had the *Images of Man* report reworked into a popularized form and published under the name of his assistant, Marilyn Ferguson, under the title *The Aquarian Conspiracy*. The book, heavily promoted by the media, became a bestseller; it openly boasted that what had been occurring over the last two decades was the work of a deliberate “open conspiracy” of the type discussed by former director of the British intelligence service and novelist H.G. Wells:

“A leaderless but powerful network is working to bring about radical change in the United States. Its members have broken with certain key elements of Western thought. . . . This network is the Aquarian Conspiracy. . . . The great shuddering, irrevocable shift overtaking us is not a new political, religious or philosophical system. It is a new mind, the ascendance of a startling worldview.”

These statements came after four years of an administration led by President James Earl Carter, who once claimed to have seen an alien spaceship, who was noted for his “Tavistock grin” and his “new paradigm” ethics, and whose psychiatrist was the Tavistock-linked Dr. Peter Bourne. That administration was run by Tavistock Aquarians from top to bottom, with a blueprint handed to it for the disintegration of the economy and global order—the New York Council on Foreign Relations “Project 1980s” report. After putting the population through a series of continuous and degrading political and economic shocks, promoting British policy interests globally and establishing the genocidal planning apparatus of Global 2000 within the government, it was discarded by the media, became a bestseller; it openly boasted that what had been occurring over the last two decades was the work of a deliberate “open conspiracy” of the type discussed by former director of the British intelligence service and novelist H.G. Wells:

“A leaderless but powerful network is working to bring about radical change in the United States. Its members have broken with certain key elements of Western thought. . . . This network is the Aquarian Conspiracy. . . . The great shuddering, irrevocable shift overtaking us is not a new political, religious or philosophical system. It is a new mind, the ascendance of a startling worldview.”

These statements came after four years of an administration led by President James Earl Carter, who once claimed to have seen an alien spaceship, who was noted for his “Tavistock grin” and his “new paradigm” ethics, and whose psychiatrist was the Tavistock-linked Dr. Peter Bourne. That administration was run by Tavistock Aquarians from top to bottom, with a blueprint handed to it for the disintegration of the economy and global order—the New York Council on Foreign Relations “Project 1980s” report. After putting the population through a series of continuous and degrading political and economic shocks, promoting British policy interests globally and establishing the genocidal planning apparatus of Global 2000 within the government, it was discarded in the 1980 elections, having outlived its usefulness.

The call in the *Aquarian Conspiracy*, for a movement based neither on political parties nor philosophy, but on a new paradigm, was therefore “non-political.” Thus, paradigm shifts proposed by Ferguson and her ghostwriters could be embraced by Aquarians of the Carter-Democratic stripe, or Republicans such as Gingrich. A sample of “power and politics” paradigm shifts outlined in the book, from “old assumptions” to “new assumptions,” is illustrative:

“Change is imposed by authority,” to “Change grows out of consensus and/or is inspired by leadership”;

“ Institutionalization of help, services, etc.;” to “Encouragement of individual help, voluntarism, as complement to government role. Reinforces self help mutual help networks”;

“Impetus toward strong central government,” to “Reversing trend, decentralizing government wherever feasible; horizontal distribution of power. Small focussed central government would serve as clearinghouse”;

“Government as monolithic institution,” to “Government as consensus of individuals, subject to change”;

“Aggressive leaders, passive followers,” to “Leaders and followers engaged in dynamic relationship, affecting each other”;

“Party- oriented,” to “Paradigm oriented. Politics determined by worldview, perspective of reality”;

“Either pragmatic or visionary,” to “Pragmatic and visionary”;

“Emphasis on freedom from certain types of interference,” to “Emphasis on freedom for positive, creative action, self-expression, self-knowledge”;

“Left vs. Right,” to “ ‘Radical Center’—a synthesis of conservative and liberal traditions. Transcendence of old polarities, quarrels”;

“Humankind as the conqueror of nature; exploitive view of resources,” to “Humankind in partnership with nature. Emphasis on conservation, ecological sanity”;

“Quick-fix or pay-as-you-go programs,” to “Emphasis on foresight, long-range repercussions, ethics and flexibility”;

“Entrenched agencies, programs, departments,” to “Experiments encouraged. Favor frequent evaluation, flexibility, ad hoc committees, self-terminating programs.”

Wrote Ferguson: “Our crises show us the way in which we have betrayed nature. We have equated the good life with material consumption, we have dehumanized work and made it needlessly competitive. . . . Our support system is breaking at every stress point. . . .

“. . . We can intentionally realign ourselves with nature for a rapid remaking of ourselves and our collapsing institutions.

“The paradigm of the Aquarian Conspiracy see humankind embedded in nature. It promotes the autonomous individual in decentralized society. It sees us as stewards of all our resources, inner and outer. . . . Only through a new mind can humanity remake itself.”

The 1980 LaRouche campaign pamphlet warned that what the Aquarians were proposing was to rob mankind of its sacred soul, man’s inner sense of true human identity, his belief in his powers of creative reason, and to replace it with an artificial “pseudo soul”—the Aquarian paradigm.

“The very existence of our nation—perhaps all of western civilization—stands in immediate jeopardy unless we rid ourselves of the Malthusian forces reflected in Zbigniew Brzezinski’s ‘technetronic’ obsessions,” wrote LaRouche at the conclusion of the pamphlet’s introduction. Substituting the Aquarian Newt Gingrich’s name would make that warning just as timely today.