

THE PSYCHOTIC LEFT

**From Jacobin France to
the Occupy Movement**



KERRY BOLTON

The Psychotic Left

From Jacobin France to the Occupy
movement

by
Kerry Bolton

Contents

[Foreword](#)

[Introduction](#)

[1 - Political Uses & Abuses of Psychology](#)

[2 - The Left & the Degenerative Personality](#)

[3 - The Revolt of the Under-Man](#)

[4 - 'The Politics of Envy'](#)

[5 - The Psychology of Bolshevism](#)

[6 - 'Pathocracy'](#)

[7 - Leftist Personalities](#)

[8 - Jean-Jacques Rousseau](#)

[9 - Sadism and De Sade](#)

[10 - Jean Paul Marat](#)

[11 - Karl Marx](#)

[12 - Leon Trotsky](#)

[13 - Vladimir Lenin](#)

[14 - Louis Althusser](#)

[15 - Mao Zedong](#)

[16 - Trotskyism in Britain:](#)

[17 - New Left: New Psychosis](#)

[18 - Jerry Rubin](#)

[19 - Abbie Hoffman](#)

[20 - The Weather Underground](#)

[21 - Mark Rudd](#)

[22 - Aftermath: From New Left to New Age](#)

[23 - Feminism](#)

[24 - Intellectualising Paedophilia](#)

[25 - 'Madness' as Social Revolt](#)

[26 - 'Next Left'](#)

[Conclusion](#)

[About the Author](#)

Foreword

Once upon a time, everyone understood politics. Conservatives conserved; Liberals liberated; the left disliked the elite; the right disliked underdogs; Socialists provided the shock troops and cash to achieve the more material liberal objectives more quickly, at least for the industrial worker; and businessmen funded select liberal-conservative efforts such as churches.

The Second World War provided a terminal shock to this happy system. For the left had largely backed pacifism through the 1930s; and then backed the Nazi-Soviet Pact of 1939-41. So it had some adapting to do as Russia and America were dragged into the War and eventually won it. The left's immediate past of accepting National Socialism needed to be forgotten.

As was so often to be true for the modern left, help was at hand. The 1945 opening of the Nazi gas chambers (unmatched by any comparable revelation of the freezing death camps of Siberia) meant it could be said that the War had been fought for Jewish underdogs against anti-Semitism (it being conveniently neglected that Stalin was just as murderously anti-Semitic as Hitler). Jewish intellectuals who had escaped the Holocaust to America and Britain were delighted to oblige. Understandably determined to prevent any recurrence of the Jews' latest persecution, they (in particular the Frankfurt School, relocated to California) set about analysing (psychoanalysing) what they represented as the right – for the national-socialist Hitler had to be demonized, and conservatives (most of whom had also not been keen for another war with Germany) along with him.

The analysis would work like a dream. It was that conservatives were a fundamentally neurotic lot who required heavy authority to contain their disorganized repressed urges. Hitler was to be turned into a role model of conservatism even though it was only people like the liberal-conservative Churchill and Eysenck who had sacrificed themselves for a decade to oppose Hitler. That Hitler had had the works of Freud (and many other modernists) burned in the streets of Berlin, or otherwise banned, was supposedly a graphic testimony to the right's essential 'authoritarianism.' The unwillingness of conservatives to accept 20th century's demand for sexual realism had stimulated the major popular support for Communism against the Russian church-and-state autocracy of 1917. Now it was to provide the main intellectual ammunition against the post-'45 Western right.

The analysis of sex-suppressing father-venerating conservatives struggling to contain themselves and thus inflicting their neuroses on the world had a resonance which was quite unmatched by any ability of conservatives to explain themselves, let alone make counterpropaganda. American conservatives mounted the McCarthy Era; but this had little intellectual influence, especially once Russia got the Bomb. And British conservatives were understandably unwilling to attempt explanations for how they had allowed the UK to be sucked into warfare which finally bankrupted Britain and lost its Empire.

Yet help for the right too was at hand. The Hitler-hating Berlin born-and-bred Jewish psychologist, Hans Eysenck, relocated to London, was no slouch at understanding that the left of his youth had been fully a match in psychopathology for the supposed right. By 1954, to the immense aggravation of the British liberal-left elite (annoyance eventually costing him a knighthood), Eysenck began to maintain that the left and at least the Hitlerian right had much in common. In particular, in their materialism and readiness for violence, they were 'tough-minded' and lacking in the gentler ways of idealism and empathy. Although the left was shocked by this comparison, Eysenck went on to develop his understanding – becoming the first to demonstrate a genetic basis for the trait. Finally, Eysenck concluded that there was (as he had suspected back in 1947) a trait of Psychoticism which subsumed tough-mindedness and needed adding to his famous personality theory (long known for its main dimensions of Neuroticism and Extraversion – about which his students jokingly gave the sign of the Cross). By the 1990s, Eysenck wrote at length about Psychoticism (P) – linking it especially to criminality and paranoia, though also to creativity in the arts.

What Kerry Bolton's book does is to provide full and hilarious detail as to the correctness of Eysenck's hard-worked psychometric-psychological understanding. Bolton's highly entertaining survey uses the latest biographical information about such figures of the left as Marx, Marcuse, Manson, Maslow and Baader-Meinhof. Convincingly, it documents the horrors of the father - and family - hating horrors of leading leftists who agitated a whole generation while themselves suffering psychosis (most often 'bipolar', *i.e.* manic-depressive) or at least narcissistic psychopathy, and not uncommonly ending in suicide.

Engagingly, Bolton also spells out the next twist in the saga of high-P leftism. Yes, not content with being psychotic themselves, far-leftists of the 1970s even turned to venerating madness – regarding the lunatic as shock troops

in their battle against the ‘oppressive bourgeois authority’ of Western doctors and the drug companies which backed them. Amusingly, one crackpot author, of *The Death of the Family*, collapsed into schizophrenia soon after he had written his anti-psychiatry rant – and had to be looked after by, yes, his own family.

Of course, since those days the left (always more ingenious than the right) has moved on to select new underdogs who might help champion its revolutionary family-hating cause. It has taken trouble to keep the feminists (feminazies) of Western female ‘minority’ roughly onside; and in particular – as embourgeoisification stripped it of any hope of skilled working class support – it has backed ethnic minorities (notably Blacks, Hispanics, Muslims and even Palestinians) and demonized opponents as racists and paedophiles.

One day, new biographies will hopefully provide a new Bolton with fresh happy detail of the personality disorders of ‘anti-racists’ and allied champions of the handicapped and homosexual. But meantime the left’s shock troops are succeeding well. With the help of business interests which need multiculturalism to replace the workforce which the left’s domination of the schools has ruined, the left dominates the purposeless West.

Reading *The Psychotic Left* will be an eye-opener for many. The supposed repressive neuroses of the right pale in comparison with the selfish, vicious paranoia of the left (sometimes assisted by drug use and demonstrable brain damage). That the right has not been able to stand up to left-wing rubbish – turning in a generation from backing the Jews (by now too successful) to backing their arch-enemy Muslims – should attract the attention of all serious people and politicians. How can the right have failed to prevent the growth of socialist states all over the West with policies of filling themselves up with third-world immigrants to make up for their own failure to breed eugenically and educate their young to the maximum (according to ability)?

Of course, the right has failed to adopt the truly noble popular modern cause of backing love, sex, traditional marriage and the family. Like the Church before it, it has been resistant to encouraging people in their own favoured form of society. Instead, it has backed economic liberalism, which fell prey to socialist schemes of subprime mortgaging and essentially blew itself up in 2008 and is now dependent on borrowing from future generations. Probably the family-venerating Chinese will sweep all before them as the West collapses under the ridiculous burdens which the psychotics of the left have helped impose. But this book will allow a most enjoyable moment of re-thinking – a new chance to

accept what Eysenck first began to explain academically in 1954.

Dr Chris Brand, Author, '*The g Factor*' (1996/2000)

Department of Psychology, University of Edinburgh (1970-97)

Introduction

Much has been written about Leftist doctrines, personalities and movements based on the study of economics, history, sociology, and politics. Little has been written analysing the Left as a reflection of the mental processes of its ideologues, organisers and rank-and-file. On the other hand a relatively large corpus of material exists that has studied the 'Right', often synonymous with 'Nazism', as a psychological aberration of history. Even the conservative Right is generally described in psychological terms as 'regressive' and 'repressive', while Leftist luminaries such as Karl Marx are treated as legitimate economists and sociologists.

However, psychology provides an added and ultimate explanation for historical and ideological phenomena. Psychohistory has been developed in recent years for this purpose, although studies of the Left remain few. This was not always the case. During the late 19th and the early 20th centuries, with the rise of Socialism, psychological analyses were being applied to the movement by keen observers such as Dr. Max Nordau, Dr. Lothrop Stoddard and in the studies of mob psychology by Gustave Le Bon and Friedrich Nietzsche. The fact that this psychological study of the Left and of social revolt was abruptly halted indicates that the forces of the Left were victorious, despite what is generally believed in regard to the implosion of the USSR and the rise of free-market or 'neo-liberal' economics in many Western states. Leftist doctrines are in fact pervasive throughout much of the West, including those regarded as profoundly capitalistic. The widespread use of the term 'Political Correctness' does however give some understanding as to the character of Leftist ideas throughout society.

The Left, laid bare of its ideological façade wrapped about by theories on economics and sociology, is simply a means of dragging humanity down to the lowest denominator in the name of 'equality'. A faction during the English Civil War of the 17th century cogently named themselves the 'Levellers', and the 'levelling' of society remains the ultimate aim of the Left. The fact that virtually all politicians, clerics, journalists, and academics including those called 'conservative', today pay tribute to 'equality' is testament to the triumph of the fundamental premises of the Left. In the starkest terms, the Left is what Stoddard referred to as the 'revolt against civilisation'. Under the name of 'equality' more suffering and killing have been wrought upon 'humanity' than probably by any

other slogan in history. Since 'equality' is a phantasm it must eventually be imposed by literally chopping off the head of society: the most cultured and intelligent, until there is 'equality of suffering' at the same mediocre level of existence. It happened in Bolshevik Russia and in Jacobin France and is happening at more subtle levels today.

A psychohistorical study of the Left should not be confused with *ad hominem* attacks on individuals. That is the tactic of the Left in smearing and ridiculing those whom they oppose. Rather, the purpose is to understand the motivations of the ideologues, leaders, organisers and followers of the Left, and to see how the Left is the intellectualised manifestation of the mentalities of its founders and adherents.

1 - Political Uses & Abuses of Psychology

The 'Right-wing' of the political spectrum, including even social and moral values that have until recently been regarded as normal, has for approximately eighty years been the subject of disparaging and biased analysis not just politically and sociologically, but psychologically.

The impetus for a psychological analysis of the Right, including normal morality, which is now regarded as latently 'fascist', was led by the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory which, with the rise of Hitler, was transferred en masse to the USA under the auspices of Columbia University. There it was re-established in New York as the Institute of Social Research.^[1] The seminal document issued by this coterie, headed by Theodor Adorno, was *The Authoritarian Personality*,^[2] a psychological study which was intended to show through statistical analysis based on an 'F' (Fascism) Scale, that traditional values on morality, required psychological reorientation because they were symptoms of latent 'fascism'. In particular, the patriarchal family came under attack as the root institution for the cultivation of a 'fascist' mentality.^[3]

While Leftist social scientists sought to show that conservative values are psychologically abnormal, there was a concurrent move to show that Leftists have normal values that free the individual from the repression that causes neurosis. What was required was a 'therapeutic state' based on Freudian-Marxian doctrines to 'cure' masses of people of their neuroses through state policies. If this were not done, the outcome would be the return of fascism.

However, Rothman and Lichter in their Psychohistorical study of Jews in the US New Left, state that studies by social scientists have been devised to show that Leftists possess positive, normal values. They write that in the USA and to a lesser extent Europe most 'commentaries and "scientific" studies of the student movement agreed that the radical young represented the best in their societies'. Rothman and Lichter point out that the studies involved very small numbers and that the examiners' sympathies were with their subjects' politics. This coterie of social scientists produced a stream of studies 'that seemed to prove, that radical students were democratic, humanitarian, psychologically healthy and morally advanced'. 'All these critical studies are either impressionistic or based on small samples'.^[4] They wrote:

Many social scientists attributed many 'positive' personality attributes or political views to the New Left largely because their questionnaires were

either constructed in such a manner as to ascribe such attributes to radical students almost by definition, or because the students... knew how to respond ‘appropriately’ to the questions posed.^[5]

Hence the idea has persisted that the ‘Right’ is based on the values of the mentally dysfunctional, centred in the patriarchal family,^[6] which New Left gurus such as Erich Fromm claimed was the hatching-place of authoritarianism and fascism.^[7] Rothman and Lichter are critical of the Frankfurt School, and the use of the so-called ‘F’ scale’ to uncover ‘Fascist’ tendencies as personality types. They contend that *The Authoritarian Personality* was a study intended to confirm the preconceived opinions of the authors.^[8]

However, Rothman and Lichter’s studies of New Left students found that ‘radicals were significantly more likely than moderates to manifest tendencies toward a negative identity, masochistic surrender and treating people as concepts’. Jewish radicals typically manifested a tendency to escape from a dominating mother, while non-Jewish radicals regarded their fathers as more dominant but flawed.^[9]

Although the synthesis of Freudianism and Marxism was unacceptable to the Stalinists, and the Critical Theorists were rejected by the German Communist Party,^[10] the USSR found psychiatry a useful means of silencing ‘dissidents’ by subjecting them to psychiatric examination and routinely diagnosing them as schizophrenic, after which they were confined to a mental asylum and consequently anti-Sovietism was identified as a form of psychosis.^[11] The democratic West was also not averse to using psychiatry to discredit dissidents. Celebrated poet Ezra Pound, who had broadcasted for Fascist Italy during World War II, received similar treatment on his forcible return from Italy to the USA after the war, having first been confined to an open-air cage by the American occupation forces in Italy. To avoid the publicity of a treason trial for one of the world’s most eminent of the literati, Pound was confined to St Elizabeth’s mental asylum.^[12]

Use of Psychiatry Against Dissidents in the Liberal West

The Right has continued to be portrayed as a mental aberration, whether in its most extreme Hitlerite forms, or merely as conservative values on the family. Such values are being portrayed as regressive, following the work of the Frankfurt School of Adorno, Fromm, et al.

Indeed, Dr Thomas Szasz, professor emeritus of psychiatry at the University

of Syracuse, New York Upstate Medical University, and an eminent critique of Freudian psychiatry, has written that ‘we are replacing social controls justified by race with social controls justified by psychiatric diagnosis’. This was precisely the recommendation of Adorno and his team in writing *The Authoritarian Personality*. Szasz cites the case of General Edwin Walker, a primary victim of the Kennedy era witch-hunt against ‘Right-wingers’ in the military. Walker was forced to resign due to his anti-Communist education programme among the American military forces in Germany.^[13] Apparently the Liberal-American conflict with the USSR and Stalinism was not supposed to extend to an examination of Communist ideology, which might come uncomfortably close to ‘Right-wing extremism’ and ‘Fascism’. General Walker, after his forced resignation, became a prominent fighter against desegregation, communism and liberalism. Walker assisted Governor Ross Barnett in leading mass resistance against the desegregation of the University of Mississippi, enforced by the invasion of Mississippi by Federal Troops in 1962. Szasz writes of the Walker case:

Arrested on four federal charges, including ‘inciting, assisting, and engaging in an insurrection against the authority of the United States,’ Walker was taken before a U.S. commissioner and held pending the posting of \$100,000 bond. While he was making arrangements to post bail, Attorney General Robert Kennedy ordered Walker flown, on a government aircraft, to Springfield, Missouri, to be incarcerated in the US Medical Center for Prisoners for ‘psychiatric observation’ on suspicion that he was mentally unfit to stand trial.

Walker’s entry in Wikipedia mentions neither this nor the ensuing confrontation between Walker’s legal team and the government’s psychiatric team. The reader is told only that Walker ‘posted bond and returned home to Dallas, where he was greeted by a crowd of supporters. After a federal grand jury adjourned in January 1963 without indicting him, the charges were dropped’.^[14]

Szasz is able to write on the Walker case from first-hand experience, as he was asked to advise Walker’s legal team. Of particular interest here is that Szasz writes:

I summarized the evidence for my view that psychiatry is a threat to civil liberties, especially to the liberties of individuals stigmatised as ‘right-wingers’, illustrated by the famous case of Ezra Pound, who was locked

up for 13 years while the government ostensibly waited for his ‘doctors’ to restore his competence to stand trial. Now the Kennedys and their psychiatrists were in the process of doing the same thing to Walker.^[15]

Szasz told the legal team that it would be no use trying to argue for Walker’s release on the basis of truth. However, the defence expert witness, Dr Robert L Stubblefield, chief psychiatrist at the Southwest Medical Center in Dallas, was able to expose Dr Manfred Guttmacher, long-time chief medical officer at Baltimore City’s Supreme Court, as ‘an evil quack’, as Szasz states it. Walker was declared mentally fit, and a Federal Grand Jury refused to indict him.

Szasz states that even Senator Barry Goldwater two years later, as Republican Presidential candidate, was a target of politicised psychiatry:

Less than two years later, my view that organized American psychiatry was becoming overtly political, seeking the existential invalidation and psychiatric destruction of individuals who do not share the psychiatric establishment’s left-liberal ‘progressive’ views, received further dramatic support. In 1964, when Senator Barry Goldwater was the Republican candidate for president, 1,189 psychiatrists publicly declared – without benefit of examination – that Goldwater was ‘psychologically unfit to be President of the United States’. Many offered a diagnosis of ‘paranoid schizophrenia’ as the basis for their judgment.^[16]

The use of psychiatry to marginalize political opponents of Left-liberal dogma is obviously not a mere paranoid delusion of the Right. Hence, for example, The Nizkor Project, which specialises in smearing Rightists as ‘Holocaust deniers’, uses a psychiatric term in describing the US ‘militia movement’ as ‘paranoid’.^[17]

Yet the Left, despite its manifestation of the most extreme forms of sadism since the French Revolution of 1789-92, has largely escaped critical psychological analysis. The Left is now accepted as normal, and the adherents of its most extreme variation – communism – can maintain respectable positions in academia, and have their books published by the large publishers, while those of the Right are marginalized, and even forced out of the professions.

On the other hand Karl Marx, for example, continues to be feted among respectable quarters as a seminal and still valuable contributor to sociology and economic theory. While Jim Jones is generally perceived as deranged, he is considered within the context of any other cult leader such as David Koresh.

What is rarely realised is that Jones was an important apostle of the Left, feted by the US liberal Democratic Establishment, although his psychological profile is comparable to other Leftists still regarded as paragons of democratic and liberal values.

2 - The Left & the Degenerative Personality

Psychohistory [is] the science of historical motivations [which] combines the insights of psychotherapy with the research methodology of the social sciences to understand the emotional origin of the social and political behavior of groups and nations, past and present^[18].

Psychohistory was formalised as a new branch of the social sciences by Lloyd deMause, director of The Institute for Psychohistory, editor of *The Journal of Psychohistory* and president of the International Psychohistorical Association.^[19] Psychohistory however has a longer pedigree in the writings on mob psychology by Gustave Le Bon in *The Crowd* (1895),^[20] Max Nordau, *et al.* Despite the Conservative origins of such psycho-sociological studies, comparatively little seems to have been written on the psychosis of the Left since Lothrop Stoddard's *Revolt Against Civilisation*, with the exception of academic papers by the Australian John Ray, and the study of Jews in the New Left by Rothman and Lichter. However, it is the Left and its myriad of variations that continues to riot in the streets and to haunt academia, churches, state bureaucracies and schools, often under the name of 'political correctness',^[21] and without the public realisation as to the origins and mentality of the forces still at work.

Nordau on Mattoids

The Hungarian physician and sociologist Dr Max Nordau wrote on the degeneration of culture and philosophy as a symptom of mental and moral degeneration. Writing in 1895, Nordau provided an early psycho-historical perspective on Leftist revolutions. This theory was developed several decades later by the American, Dr Lothrop Stoddard, who described such upheavals as the 'revolt against civilisation'.^[22] This theory states that civilised values are an unendurable burden upon the mentally subnormal, including both the 'unbalanced genius' and the common criminal. Hence, the 'revolt against civilisation' is rationalised as a political doctrine for the overthrow of social order, and the unleashing of pent-up depravity. In short: The Left is rationalised sociopathy.

Nordau described several types of social marginality, which often includes the highly intelligent:

Quite a number of different designations have been found for these persons. Maudsley and Ball call them 'Borderland dwellers' - that is to say, dwellers on the borderland between reason and pronounced madness. Magnan gives to them the name of 'higher degenerates' and Lombroso^[23] speaks of mattoids (from matto, the Italian for insane).^[24]

These 'mattoids' or 'borderland dwellers' provide the leadership of social upheavals, while the types that might typically be found in the criminal underworld provide the mobs. Nordau states:

That which nearly all degenerates lack is the sense of morality and of right and wrong. For them there exists no law, no decency, no modesty. In order to satisfy any momentary impulse, or inclination, or caprice, they commit crimes and trespasses with the greatest calmness and self-complacency, and do not comprehend that other persons take offence. When this phenomenon is present in a high degree, we speak of 'moral insanity' with Maudsley; there are, nevertheless, lower stages in which the degenerate does not, perhaps, himself commit any act which will bring him into conflict with the criminal code, but at least asserts the theoretical legitimacy of crime; seeks, with philosophically sounding fustian, to prove that 'good' and 'evil,' virtue and vice, are arbitrary distinctions; goes into raptures over evildoers and their deeds; professes to discover beauties in the lowest and most repulsive things; and tries to awaken

interest in, and so-called ‘comprehension’ of, every bestiality. The two psychological roots of moral insanity, in all its degrees of development, are, firstly, unbounded egoism, and, secondly, impulsiveness: - i.e., inability to resist a sudden impulse to any deed; and these characteristics also constitute the chief intellectual stigmata of degenerates.^[25]

The psychological types that Nordau was describing are now known as Narcissists and Sociopaths. As Nordau mentioned, these ‘mattoids’ formulate philosophies and theories to intellectualise and justify their hatred of civilised values, which they seek to destroy. The Narcissists and Sociopaths are common types among the leadership of the Left. Nordau considered how the ‘mattoid’ uses revolution as an outlet for destructive urges:

In view of Lombroso’s researches [Lombroso, *La Physionomie des Anarchistes*, 1891, p. 227] it can scarcely be doubted that the writings and acts of revolutionists and anarchists are also attributable to degeneracy. The degenerate is incapable of adapting himself to existing circumstances. This incapacity, indeed, is an indication of morbid variation in every species, and probably a primary cause of their sudden extinction. He therefore rebels against conditions and views of things, which he necessarily feels to be painful, chiefly because they impose upon him the duty of self-control, of which he is incapable on account of his organic weakness of will. Thus he becomes an improver of the world, and devises plans for making mankind happy, which, without exception, are conspicuous just as much by their fervent philanthropy, and often pathetic sincerity, as by their absurdity and monstrous ignorance of all real relations.^[26]

These ‘mattoids’ – Narcissists and Sociopaths – if they were of lesser intelligence, would be common criminals; rapists, muggers, thieves and thugs. Instead, because of their intelligence, they channel their destructive urges into destructive politics and theories: the Left. They recruit their followers from both common criminals and neurotics.

It is the ‘mattoids’ who provide the philosophical justification for violence done against civilised values in the name of ‘freedom’, and who continue to be upheld by today’s intelligentsia, itself often of Narcissistic type, as ‘great thinkers’. Nordau wrote of them:

‘The degenerate,’ says Legrain, [Paul Maurice Legrain, *Du délire chez*

les dégénérés; Paris, 1886, p. 11] may be a genius. A badly balanced mind is susceptible of the highest conceptions, while, on the other hand, one meets in the same mind with traits of meanness and pettiness all the more striking from the fact that they co-exist with the most brilliant qualities. 'As regards their intellect, they can (says Jacques Roubinovitch, *Hystérie male et dégénérescence*; Paris, 1890, p.33) 'attain to a high degree of development, but from a moral point of view their existence is completely deranged ... A degenerate will employ his brilliant faculties quite as well in the service of some grand object as in the satisfaction of the basest propensities (Lombroso has cited a large number of undoubted geniuses who were equally undoubted mattoids, graphomaniacs, or pronounced lunatics).^[27]

The Left in general, whether called Social Democratic, Communist or Liberal, masquerade as the wave of the future. The very word 'Left' is made synonymous with 'progress', while any individual, doctrine or institution opposing Leftism is disparaged as regressive. Yet, as Nordau pointed out over a century ago, these 'progressives' who want to destroy tradition and re-make the world are really the heralds of atavism, of the return to the primitive, whether in the arts, ethics or politics. Nordau continues:

Retrogression, relapse - this is in general the ideal of this band that dares to speak of liberty and progress. They wish to be the future. That is one of their chief pretensions. That is one of the means by which they catch the largest number of simpletons. We have, however, seen in all individual cases that it is not the future but the most forgotten, far away past Degenerates lisp and stammer, instead of speaking. They utter monosyllabic cries, instead of constructing grammatically and syntactically articulated sentences. They draw and paint like children, who dirty tables and walls with mischievous hands. They compose music like that of the yellow natives of East Asia. They confound all the arts, and lead them back to the primitive forms they had before evolution differentiated them. Every one of their qualities is atavistic, and we know, moreover, that atavism is one of the most constant marks of degeneracy.^[28]

Nordau wrote of these supposed 'progressive' trends in the arts, philosophy and politics as in reality a return to the primitive on the ruins of civilisation:

The 'freedom' and 'modernity', the 'progress' and 'truth', of these

fellows are not ours. We have nothing in common with them. They wish for self-indulgence; we wish for work. They wish to drown consciousness in the unconscious; we wish to strengthen and enrich consciousness. They wish for evasive ideation and babble; we wish for attention, observation, and knowledge. The criterion by which true moderns may be recognised and distinguished from impostors calling themselves moderns may be this: Whoever preaches absence of discipline is an enemy of progress; and whoever worships his 'I' is an enemy to society. Society has for its first premise, neighbourly love and capacity for self-sacrifice; and progress is the effect of an ever more rigorous subjugation of the beast in man, of an ever tenser self-restraint, an ever keener sense of duty and responsibility. The emancipation for which we are striving is of the judgement, not of the appetites. ^[29]

If Nordau was writing today rather than 1895 he would be diagnosed as having an 'authoritarian personality' in need of curing, and as an incipient 'fascist', possibly even an 'anti-Semitism' – if we disregard his Jewish background and role in later life in the Zionist movement – by Adorno and others of the Frankfurt School.

Savanna-I.Q. Interaction Hypothesis

In recent years Dr. Satoshi Kanazawa^[30] has espoused what he calls the 'Savanna-I.Q. Interaction Hypothesis'. This suggests that the reason why intelligent individuals are drawn to left-Liberal causes is that there is a difference in types of intelligence, one relating to evolutionary survival and the other relating to seeking out the new. 'General intelligence' evolved on the basis of what is familiar and therefore in political terms it is 'conservative'. Sociologically, it is tribalist and nationalistic, as altruism was based on sharing and co-operation with those who are most closely related. This has survival value, especially where there is competition for resources between kinship groups. Today, this basic competition still exists between nations. Individuals with high I.Q. s, however, are more likely to seek out new situations and ideas, according to the 'Savanna-I.Q. Interaction Hypothesis', and to discard kinship altruism in favour of altruism on a world scale; Kanazawa's definition of 'liberal'. This however does not have evolutionary survival value, and in a survival situation would be self-destructive. Kanazawa and Perina write:

It is important to note that, although the theory of the evolution of general

intelligence proposes that general intelligence originally evolved to solve evolutionarily novel and non-recurrent adaptive problems, the Savanna-IQ Interaction Hypothesis does not suggest that evolutionarily novel preferences and values that more intelligent individuals are more likely to acquire and espouse are necessarily adaptive and increase their reproductive success in the current environment. It is not obvious how being a left-wing liberal ... increases reproductive success today. And some of the evolutionarily novel preferences that more intelligent individuals are more likely to acquire and espouse, such as the consumption of alcohol, tobacco, and psychoactive drugs are manifestly detrimental to health and survival. The Savanna-IQ Interaction Hypothesis does not predict that more intelligent individuals are more likely to acquire and espouse healthy and adaptive preferences and values, only evolutionarily novel ones.^[31]

If we accept Kanazawa's Hypothesis that those with high I.Q.s are attracted to the Left because they seek out the new, does this contradict what Nordau and Stoddard observed of Leftist intellectuals – in alliance with the least intelligent – as wanting to destroy civilization and return to the primitive? I suggest that in civilization the attraction of the primitive – or what the 18th century liberal philosophers were heralding as a return to 'Nature' – does represent the 'new', the 'novel'. This 'return to Nature' was heralded as 'progressive', and is still the basis of much of the Left, which resorts to the primitive in its mob psychology. What is called 'novel' involves the repression of one's ancient genetic heritage based on the accumulated experience of one's ancestors over millennia. Indeed, 'culture' itself is founded on accumulated experience, and here is another reason – I suggest – why the 'highly intelligent' are attracted to a return to the primitive in the arts: in seeking the 'novel' they look for inspiration in the exotic, such as the primitive cultures of Africa.

I suggest therefore that what can be said of those intelligent individuals who have a compulsion to follow behind the pied pipers of every 'new cause' is that despite their 'intelligence' they make stupid decisions; stupid insofar as their beliefs do not proceed from reality. They are, in short, delusional. We shall examine the life-choices of such 'intelligent' individuals in their pursuit of novelty.

4 - 'The Politics of Envy'

There should be a careful distinction between those who work for genuinely needed reforms, even of a radical nature, and those who seek revolution for an entirely destructive purpose albeit behind the mask of 'equality' and 'freedom' - according to their sociopathic characters. For example, this writer contends that the international system of debt finance and trade needs a radical transformation. Such a radical change would serve creative, not destructive purposes, and subordinate the role of Mammon, of the pervasive money-ethic to higher human pursuits, such as those of culture. Such a change would encourage private enterprise and private property ownership rather than destroy it in Bolshevik manner, and enable the reduction of crippling taxes, the panacea of Socialists for 'robbing the rich to [ostensibly] give to the poor'. This is the reason why great cultural figures in the 20th century, such as Ezra Pound, Hilaire Belloc, G. K. Chesterton, et al advocated alternatives to both Marxism and debt-finance, such as Social Credit and Distributism.^[51] Such reforms certainly do not necessitate the destruction of family and religion, the main targets of the Old and New Lefts. Certain others even of the Left supported types of Socialism that were intended to be creative and spiritual, as opposed to Marxism which is destructive and materialistic. These aesthetic Socialists included Oscar Wilde^[52] and William Morris who combined social reform with the Arts and Crafts movement, and the Guild-Socialist and literary promoter A. R. Orage.

The distinction between creative social reform and the sociopathic destruction advocated by the Left might be said to be the difference between reforms founded on tradition, and reforms founded on the destruction of tradition.

Winston Churchill recognised the inner motivates of the Socialism that was then bringing wholesale death and destruction to Russia, writing: 'Socialism is a philosophy of failure, the creed of ignorance, and the gospel of envy, its inherent virtue is the equal sharing of misery'.

Nathaniel Weyl's Concept of 'Aristocide'

Envious destruction via socialist 'equality', what has been called 'levelling' by simply killing off those who have attained something of significance – and not necessarily merely financial wealth - beyond the lowest denominator, was identified by Nordau, Stoddard, *et al.* as the motive behind social revolt. More recently a former member of the Communist Party USA, the eminent economist

Dr. Nathaniel Weyl, developed this as the theory of ‘envy and aristocide’. By ‘aristocracy’ Weyl did not necessarily mean that of inherited privilege, but those of innately noble character and notable abilities, regardless of birth. Weyl also distinguished ‘envy’ from ‘ambition’:

Envy should be distinguished from ambition. Envy is not the desire to excel, but the spiteful urge to pull down the more gifted. Christopher Marlowe wrote in Dr. Faustus: “I am Envy. I cannot reade, and therefore wish all books were burnt”.^[53]

Weyl explained:

... I shall advance the hypothesis that envy of non-achievers against creative minorities is the mainspring of modern revolutionary movements, that this envy is incited and exploited by alienated intellectuals, and that the result is aristocide - the murder of productive, gifted and high-achieving people - along with consequent genetic decline.^[54]

It is notable that Weyl referred to the revolutionary mobs being agitated and led by ‘alienated intellectuals’. These are the under-class of the unbalanced intelligentsia that Nordau had referred to the previous century as mattoids. Of these Weyl states:

The leadership element of revolutions is rarely composed of indignant peasants or enraged lumpenproletarians. It generally consists of frustrated, alienated and misguided intellectuals, without whom the envy of the masses would remain directionless, nothing more than sullen and silent resentment. Alienated intellectuals serve as catalysts, inciting and actuating the prevalent sentiment of envy, providing it with a seemingly legitimate target, even gracing it with an ideology and a meretricious sort of moral justification...^[55]

5 - The Psychology of Bolshevism

John Spargo's Observations

It is notable that even prior to Lothrop Stoddard, a former American Socialist had written on the 'psychology of Bolshevism' in the aftermath of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia. John Spargo^[56] stated in his 'Preface':

In this little volume I have attempted to explain the psychology of that great movement of impassioned discontent and violent revolution which because of its rapid development in Russia, and because of the impetus it has received from its terrible pre-eminence in that unfortunate country, we call Bolshevism. Revolutionary Communism is a menace to civilization. It is an ironic fact, providing food for deep and serious thought, that the end of the great world war has brought mankind not peace, but only a more difficult and serious conflict...

Every organized nation, with its culture, its laws, its arts, and its institutions its civilization, ... is menaced by a new form of despotism and terrorism. In country after country we find large masses of people ready to revolt against the existing social order, and to establish by the relentless and unscrupulous use of brute force a despotism more formidable than anything ever attempted by Hapsburg, Hohenzollern, or Romanov. Like these and all their predecessors, the creators of the new tyranny make fair promises of ultimate freedom, well-being, and happiness. But in their experiment upon the living body of human society they would destroy the institutions and the usages which alone can make possible the orderly development of humanity toward a self-chosen ideal.^[57]

Spargo, like Stoddard, was concerned with examining Bolshevism and similar movements as not merely political manifestations, but as forms of mental aberration, of 'not only the program but the spirit and the mental processes which have developed the program'.^[58] Spargo observed first-hand the characters of the Bolshevik and other Socialist leaders, along with their wealthy sponsors and followers, stating:

In analyzing the various types of men and women who become imbued with the spirit of Bolshevism I have had the advantage of an extensive acquaintance with a very large number of men and women, belonging to

widely differing social groups, who are either intense Bolsheviki or belong to the large class of near-Bolsheviki.^[59]

Spargo was by no means a defender of the status quo, but believed that a better society cannot arise if it is founded on defective individuals with flawed doctrines:

Anti-social conduct, whether on the part of individuals or masses, can never advance genuine Socialism. No social state can be stronger than its human foundations. Only men and women whose lives are governed by social consciousness can build and maintain a truly socialized society. Bolshevism is wrong because it is anti-social, because its ideals and its methods are as selfish and tyrannical as those of unrestrained capitalism.^[60]

Spargo, having been closely associated with the leading Socialists of both England and the USA observed several primary personality disorders among them. Spargo observed Hysterical hyperesthesia^[61] among a large number of Leftists:

...Their thought processes are spasmodic and violently emotional. They are obsessed by some fixed idea, which is emotionally and not rationally derived. This type of mind has been the subject of much extensive observation and study, particularly in connection with religious forms of hysteria. No one who has attended many Bolshevik meetings, or is acquainted with many of the individuals to whom Bolshevism makes a strong appeal, will seriously question the statement that an impressively large number of those who profess to be Bolsheviks present a striking likeness to extreme religious zealots, not only in the manner of manifesting their enthusiasm but also in their methods of exposition and argument. Just as in religious hysteria a single text becomes a whole creed, to the exclusion of every other text, and instead of being itself subject to rational tests is made the sole test of the rationality of everything else, so, in the case of the average Bolshevik of this type, a single phrase received into the mind in a spasm of emotion, never tested by the usual criteria of reason, becomes not only the very essence of truth, but also the standard by which the truth or untruth of everything else must be determined. Most of the preachers who become pro-Bolsheviks are of this type.^[62]

Despite the intelligence the Leftist zealot might possess, the disorder of hysterical hyperesthesia means that political ideas have been initiated through emotionalism, and are not liable to alteration by contrary evidence. 'They fall very easy victims to religious hysteria, and to all forms of propaganda and agitation in which the main characteristics of hysteria are present'.^[63] Spargo noted other traits of Hysterical hyperesthesia 'strongly marked among the average Bolshevik' and other 'Socialists':

There are other recognized characteristics of this type of abnormality, all of which will be found strongly marked in the mentality of the average Bolshevik. Bitter intolerance is one of these. Of course, intolerance is not, per se, a sign of hysteria. Sometimes, indeed, intolerance is the outcome of pure rationality. But when an audience of radical protesters against limitations upon the right to free speech and free publication hiss and howl down whoever tries to express an opinion with which they do not agree, their conduct is hysterical, that is, excessively emotional, and not rational: they are not logically consistent to any ideal of freedom. In the moment of demanding freedom they are denying the freedom already existing. More than once I have seen Bolshevik audiences, as well as audiences of Socialists, howl with fury in denunciation of the suppression of free speech by police authorities, and then furiously clamor till they have howled or terrorized into silence some speaker with whose views they did not agree; thus suppressing, most effectually, the expression of opinions they did not favor. Thus they were coincidentally doing a thing and denouncing others for doing it.^[64] Certainly, wholly rational minds would not be so inconsistent. Of course, emotional infectiousness and mass suggestion are present in such cases. Crowd psychology is distinct from individual psychology. The fact remains, however, that the individuals comprising the crowd are peculiarly over-emotional.^[65]

This intolerance towards any dissent from the Left can be seen in the present day among the New Left, and the predominant Anarchist and Trotskyite factions among the Left in the Western world. Whether it is trying close down a lecture by an academic at a university or attempting to physically smash a 'radical Right' activity and afterwards expressing outrage if the police attempt to maintain order during a riot, the Leftist on such activities is typically given over to histrionics and hysteria. This is often accompanied by cowardly attacks against opponents if a mob can gather to sufficiently outnumber their targets.

What Spargo states about hysterical hyperesthesia being at the root of religious hysteria, accounts for the vehemence that Leftists treat any perceived disagreement in the manner of a religious fanatic trying to liquidate 'heresy'. As with religious hysteria, the perceived opposition is also quite literally demonised by the Left. Hence, it is sufficient for someone of conservative beliefs to be targeted both verbally and physically as a 'neo-nazi', 'racist, or 'fascist'.

Of the leadership of the Bolsheviks, Spargo wrote that the mentality 'is marked by the following hysterical characteristics:

... exaggerated egoism, extreme intolerance, intellectual vanity, hypercriticism, self-indulgence, craving for mental and emotional excitement, excessive dogmatism, hyperbolic language, impulsive judgment, emotional instability, intense hero-worship, propensity for intrigues and conspiracies, rapid alternation of extremes of exaltation and depression, violent contradictions in tenaciously held opinions and beliefs, periodic, swift, and unsystematic changes of mental attitude. Not every individual invariably exhibits all of these characteristics, of course, nor are these the only characteristics, generally symptomatic of hysteria, to be observed in this type.

It would be going too far to say that these individuals are all hystericals in the pathological sense, but it is strictly accurate to say that the class exhibits marked hysterical characteristics and that it closely resembles the large class of over-emotionalized religious enthusiasts which furnish so many true hystericals. It is probable that accidents of environment account for the fact that their emotionalism takes sociological rather than religious forms. If the sociological impetus were absent most of them would be religiously motivated to a state not less abnormal.^[66]

The reader is invited to note the behaviour, the body language and the vocal outpourings of Leftists whether in a debate between individuals or as a group demonstrating in the streets. If disagreement is encountered it is met by hysteria, and if the odds are sufficiently in the Left's favour, by violence.

Neurasthenia

A significant number of the traits Spargo observed in relation to 'hysteria' among the Leftists of his time are now listed as the traits of Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). NPD seems to most frequently run through Leftist

leaders past and present. Another category of mental disturbance that Spargo observed among the Left was neurasthenia^[67]:

Finally, there are the neurasthenics whose mental nerves require the constant excitation of novelty, precisely as others require the excitation of alcoholic exhilaration, and those who similarly crave the stimulus derived from notoriety. These last find their contacts with revolutionary agitations an easy way into the headlines of the daily press.^[68]

6 - 'Pathocracy'

The Polish clinical psychologist Dr Andrew M Lobaczewski adopted a Greek term 'ponerology' (*poeneros* =evil)^[69] to name his psycho-historical study of the affects of psychopathy on society, history and politics. Ponerology therefore appears to be analogous to Psychohistory developed in the USA. Lobaczewski along with a team of psychologists covertly studied the role of psychopaths in Communist Poland.

Lobaczewski's Political Ponerology

Lobaczewski's manuscript for the book *Political Ponerology* went through a circuitous process before being published in the 1980s in Canada. Lobaczewski destroyed the first draft after he was warned a few minutes before a search by State authorities. The second draft was given to an American tourist for delivery to a Vatican dignitary, but Lobaczewski was not able to discover anything further of it. Statistical material and case studies were thereby lost, and the third draft had to be written by Lobaczewski from memory in general terms when he arrived in the USA.^[70] Then there were problems finding a publisher in the USA, and Lobaczewski was surprised by the extent of the influence of the American Left.^[71]

Lobaczewski came to the same conclusions as Max Nordau and Lothrop Stoddard:

To individuals with various psychological deviations, the social structure dominated by normal people and their conceptual world appears to be a 'system of force and oppression'. Psychopaths reach such a conclusion as a rule. If, at the same time, a good deal of injustice does in fact exist in a given society, pathological feelings of unfairness and suggestive statements emanating from deviants may then be easily propagated among both groups^[72] although each group has completely different reasons for favoring such ideas.^[73]

Leftist political doctrines serve as a means of recreating the world after the image of the psychopath, in the name of 'justice', while overthrowing those normal social laws, rules and morals that the psychopath regards as insufferable oppression.

In the psychopath, a dream emerges like some Utopia of a 'happy' world and a social system which does not reject them or force them to submit to

laws and customs whose meaning is incomprehensible to them. They dream of a world in which their simple and radical way of experiencing and perceiving the world would dominate, where they would, of course, be assured safety and prosperity. In this Utopian dream they imagine that those ‘others’, different, but also more technically skilful than they are, should be put to work to achieve this goal for the psychopaths and others of their kin.^[74]

Lobaczewski points out that psychopaths quickly realise the effects of their personalities in traumatising normal people, and they are able to use this as a means of reaching goals through terror.^[75] This explains why such small groups of psychopaths can lead vast multitudes of normal people through the imposition of terror. ‘Subordinating a normal person to psychologically abnormal individuals has severe and deforming effects on his or her personality: it engenders trauma and neuroses.’^[76]

On an individual basis, one might observe the effects on a normal person living with a sociopathic spouse: that normal individual will probably eventually suffer from post-traumatic stress syndrome, or other forms of neurosis that can be severe. When psychopaths assume total rule over an entire nation, or even over a small group, the negative influence of the psychopath is thereby extended using politics or religion as a control mechanism. This influence is readily observable in a cult, but the same factors are at work in politics.

Among the categories that Lobaczewski describes is pathological egotism, in which the individual represses anything of a self-critical nature. Lobaczewski relates this to deformities or injuries of the brain, as a symptom of prefrontal characteropathy.^[77] He ascribed this condition to Lenin. As we shall see, the condition relates as well to Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Karl Marx, Mao Zedong, Leon Trotsky, *et al.*

Ponerogenic Associations

Lobaczewski was describing the effects of individual psychosis on groups and entire states, with ideologies used as a mask for psychotic aims. This involves the formation of movements and the fermentation of revolts or riots in the name of some high sounding ideal. Lobaczewski writes of this:

It is a common phenomenon for a ponerogenic association or group to contain a particular ideology which always justifies its activities and furnishes motivational propaganda. Even a small-time gang of hoodlums has its own melodramatic ideology and pathological romanticism. Human nature demands that vile matters be haloed by an over-compensatory mystique in order to silence one's consciousness and critical faculties, whether one's own or those of others.

If such a ponerogenic union could be stripped of its ideology nothing would remain except psychological and moral pathology, naked and unattractive. ^[78]

The ponerogenic association and the doctrine that is developed to justify it is formulated and supported by individuals who sublimate their own psychological failings and free themselves from the need to abide by normal moral principles^[79] The process was at work in the terrorism of the Baader-Meinhof Gang in Germany and the Weather Underground in the USA, who undertook criminal actions in the name of ideology. Andrea Baader was a common criminal before adopting communist doctrine to enhance his life as a sociopath. Donald DeFreeze, the founder of the 1970s communist terrorists in the USA, the Symbionese Liberation Army (SLA), was a violent criminal before intellectualising his criminality with communist doctrine. He started his criminal career at the age of 14 as a gang member in New York, and was serving a sentence in Soledad Prison, California, for armed robbery, when he adopted Leftist doctrine. He had once robbed a prostitute of \$10 and had turned a friend into the police. Those who knew him in prison regarded him as an unimpressive thug. DeFreeze escaped from Vacaville Prison in 1973, and while a fugitive founded the SLA. ^[80]

Despite its ideological pretensions, SLA continued serving as little more than a gang of bank robbers and kidnappers behind the mask of fighting for 'equality'. One of the first actions of the SLA was to murder Oakland School

Superintendent Marcus A Foster in November 1973 because of his endorsement of mandatory student identification cards to control juvenile crime.^[81] To a sociopath such as DeFreeze such measures would indeed represent ‘injustice’, and the killing of an authority figure could be rationalised as the elimination of an oppressor.

Considering the premises established by Lobaczewski, Nordau and Stoddard, and the techniques of both Ponerology and Psychohistory, most forms of Leftism over the past several hundred years can be seen as the sublimated masks for individuals who would in other circumstances be thieves, rapists, sadists, and murderers. With the extremist notion that the ‘end justifies the means’, and, for example, that lying and any type of deceit are justified in the pursuit of the ideal, the psychopath is given a heroic and noble sanction. Such documents as *The Communist Manifesto* and *Das Kapital*, or Mao’s *Little Red Book* and the multitude of high-sounding manifestoes issued by the Baader-Meinhoff Gang or Weather Underground are the declarations of a psychopathic war against society, or what Lothrop Stoddard called the ‘revolt against civilisation’. In this credo of the Left, morality, religion and truth are regarded as nothing more than the props of the bourgeoisie. Lobaczewski maintained that gangs, mafias and mobs^[82] are of the same type as a communist group.

A phenomenon common to such groups is the loss of the individual member to perceive psychotic traits in their leaders; or the ‘atrophy of natural critical faculties’. Psychotic behaviour becomes interpreted as heroism.^[83] One might think immediately of the heroic qualities bestowed upon charismatic psychopaths such as Jim Jones or Charles Manson, yet the same process is at work in glorifying the actions of certain political leaders and ponerogenic associations.

Pathocracy

Lobaczewski chose^[84] the word pathocracy to describe a state that is run by psychopaths:

I shall accept the denomination of pathocracy for a system of government thus created, wherein a small pathological minority takes control over a society of normal people. The name thus selected, above all, emphasizes the basic quality of the macrosocial psychopathological phenomenon, and differentiates it from the many possible social systems dominated by normal people's structure, custom, and law.^[85]

Lobaczewski ascribes the origins of pathocracies to 'a disease of great social movements' that infects 'entire societies, nations, and empires'.^[86] The origin of pathocracies and ponerogenic associations among those of a common psychopathic mentality explains their similarity through history.^[87]

The ponerogenic doctrine expounds the 'end as justifying the means', and such rationalisations for extreme actions of a psychopathic character open the way for psychopaths to enact their tendencies in the name of ideals. An ideology thereby becomes 'useful for the purposes' of liberating the psychopath 'from the uncomfortable pressure of normal human custom'. Every great social movement can thereby become 'a host upon which some pathocracy initiates its parasitic life'. Hence a great social movement might have been marked by psychopathic traits from its start, or might have been subsequently taken over by psychopaths.^[88] An example of this is the original Labour movement that began with noble and necessary aims, which was taken over by Marxist and other ponerogenic doctrines and associations.

7 - Leftist Personalities

In order to understand how such outbreaks of mass psychosis manifest with the aim of overthrowing of civilisation and the resurgence of the primitive – atavistic impulses, it is instructive to examine the personality types of some of the revolutionary leaders and theorists. These are the individuals who feel civilisation to be a burden; a social and cultural prison. Their urge to destruction is rationalised by ideology and implemented by the agitation of mobs; their bloodlust is rationalised with slogans about justice and liberty. They enact on a mass scale what Jeffrey Dahmer and Edward Gein enact on limited scales, for similar reasons, but behind a façade of ideology. They are thereby generally called by history ‘revolutionary leaders’ rather than ‘psychotic murderers’. We can still often see the same dregs on the streets in Western societies, rioting and looting, calling themselves ‘anarchists’, cultivating a filthy appearance, sneering, bitter, humourless, with the proverbial ‘chip’-on-the shoulder’, ‘brave’ when in a mob, but cowardly when confronted.

Carl Jung, founder of Analytical Psychology, recognised the atavistic character of such doctrines, stating: ‘Communitic or Socialistic democracy is an upheaval of the unfit against attempts at order...’^[89]

Leftist personality types might be understood from case studies of leading characters in the Leftist across the course of several centuries. The personality types are constant.

Lack of Genuine Empathy

While the Leftist extols ‘humanity’ his interpersonal relationships are often dysfunctional. People exist in abstract terms, as ideological constructs. The Leftist will turn on a fellow Leftist ‘friend’ and ‘comrade’ as soon as the ‘cause’ demands it, without sentiment.

Douglas Hyde, who served as an editor of the *Daily Worker*, newspaper of the Communist Party of Great Britain, and was a leading British Communist functionary from 1928 to 1948, records an incident that indicates the lack of personal empathy among Communist cadres: Hyde described an event during the war on a day that the editorial staff of the *Daily Worker* did not have a story sufficiently sensational for the front page. Their predicament was solved when, ‘at the last moment’ the chief sub-editor presented a story to the editor which he

called ‘an absolute godsend. It’s a marvellous story. Stick of bombs dropped on to a kid’s school down in Kent. Scores of them killed. It’s saved the edition and if it doesn’t make the customers fighting mad I’ll eat my hat’. Harry Pollitt, the Communist Party’s General Secretary, ‘used the incident over and over again in his propaganda...’, bringing tears to multitudes at rallies with his references to the children’s ‘little velvet bodies’.^[90] Hyde recalled:

It was the type of demagogic phrase which is so useful in communist propaganda, but the seasoned Party members became utterly cynical about it. ‘Pollitt’s little velvet bodies’ became a joke in the Party. When groups of communists were heading for yet another demonstration... someone would groan: ‘I suppose we shall have to put up with another dose of Harry’s little velvet bodies’.^[91]

The Leftist expresses emotions through slogans, demonstrations, vandalism, rioting and violence; his hatred is expressed behind a façade of ‘love’. His hatred and anger are rationalised as the ‘love of humanity’ against the injustice of a system and its representatives and institutions. The Leftist is able to doctrinally project his hatred onto his enemies, because in theory the Left represents ‘liberty, equality, fraternity’, which might require much bloodletting to achieve.

Commenting on some of the personalities that he had observed in the Communist Party, Hyde stated that William Rust, editor of the *Daily Worker*, was ‘not very approachable. He made few friends and very few established any warm relationship with him’. He was by nature cold. He was all but incapable of warmth even though he could generate great heat’. He was ‘well informed but had little culture. In some ways he was curiously adolescent’.^[92] Rust was motivated by power, both within the Communist Party, and with the prospect of a revolution that would propel him to real power over Britain under the ‘dictatorship of the proletariat’.

If he remained in the leadership, therefore, it mattered little which indignities, what sacrifices, might be demanded of him. Sooner or later communism would triumph and he would be one of the mighty. He would have power. He would have the chance of retribution.^[93]

R. Palme Dutt, Vice Chairman of the Communist Party, was the most powerful man in the party. Hyde observed that, ‘like Rust, he was lacking in warmth, but unlike him he was almost entirely without humour’, other than his ‘shoulders shaking with silent laughter’ at the misfortune of his political

opponents, including those who thought they were his friends. ‘Human sympathy and idealism appeared not to enter into his make-up at all’.^[94] His conversion to communism was purely intellectual, and lacked any ‘real humanism’.

Harry Pollitt, General Secretary of the Communist Party, was, stated Hyde, ‘capable of terrific hatred, a characteristic which like most Marxists, he has deliberately cultivated as necessary and desirable.’^[95]

Commenting on women members of the party Hyde stated: ‘go to any Communist Party congress and watch the hard-faced women who go to the rostrum. Then hatred, which the Party kindles and uses, is often quite shockingly apparent in eyes as hard as those of a Soho prostitute and lips as tight as those of a slumland money-lender. One does not have to go to Romania to see Anna Pauker’.^[96] A member of the Political Bureau, the governing body of the Communist Party, commented to Hyde that ‘within twelve months’ of women recruits becoming Marxists, ‘they are about as attractive as horses’.^[97] However, Hyde states that few women who joined the party stayed for long, and it was a significant concern of the party leadership that they were unable to recruit average, working class housewives.^[98]

Likewise, there were problems with the youth who joined the party, who became ‘arrogant, excessively self-assertive and self-confident’. They joined with the expectation that one day soon they would be leading millions. The party cultivated the weaknesses of adolescence.^[99]

The lack of empathy on an interpersonal level, rationalised instead as empathy for ‘mankind’, or at least sections of it, has been perhaps no better explained than by actress Vanessa Redgrave, for many years a luminary of British Trotskyism:

My paradox is that though I care a great deal for the masses — the orphans in Vietnam, the starving in India — I seem to care little about the individuals around me. I’ve resisted that accusation. But, quite bluntly, it’s me.^[100]

Using Psychohistorical theory as the basis for our study, we shall now examine some leading theorists and organisers of the Left over the course of several hundred years.

8 - Jean-Jacques Rousseau

Among the seminal intellectuals of the revolutionary ferment in Europe that paved the way for the French Revolution was Jean-Jacques Rousseau. Rousseau is one of the fathers of Liberalism, and hence his legacy endures even more so than Karl Marx.

Father of Jacobinism and Liberalism

Rousseau's doctrine of the 'general will', expressed in his seminal work, *The Social Contract*, is still the basis of anyone claiming to speak on behalf of a 'democratic majority' in justifying their governance.^[101] This 'general will' once established, is justifiably maintained by violence. The Rousseauian doctrine of the 'general will' was a major influence on the Jacobin revolutionaries of France, and especially on Robespierre and Saint Just, the fathers of the Reign of Terror, a forerunner of the Bolshevik 'Red Terror' in Russia about 130 years later. The 'general will' of Liberalism became the 'dictatorship of the proletariat' of Communism, and the rationalisation for totalitarian states self-described as 'people's democracies', and 'people's republics'. Once a mandate of a 'majority' of citizens – the 'general will' – has been claimed, any method of violence is justified in maintaining the regime.

The spiritual foundation of the Rousseauian ideal republic was a 'civic religion' and this too was taken up with zeal by the Jacobins, whose Cult of Nature and Cult of the Goddess of Reason^[102] vied for dominant status in Jacobin France on the ruins of the Catholic Church and the slaughter of the clergy. In 1793 when a quasi-religious ceremony was held at the site of the demolished Bastil^[103] to celebrate the inauguration of a new constitution a cantata based on Book Four of Rousseau's *Emile*^[104] was declared.^[105]

Rousseau's other premise that has most impacted upon notions of state and law – both Liberal-democratic and Communist – is that a political regime can reshape humanity according to its preconceived ideology. Rousseau recalled the beginning of his own political ideas:

I had perceived everything to be radically connected with politics, and that, upon whatever principles these were founded, a people would never be more than that which the nature of the government made them; therefore the great question of the best government possible appeared to

me to be reduced to this: What is the nature of a government the most proper to form the most virtuous and enlightened, the wisest and best people, taking the last epithet in its most extensive meaning? I thought this question was much if not quite of the same nature with that which follows: What government is that which, by its nature, always maintains itself nearest to the laws, or least deviates from the laws.^[106]

This idea that ‘a people would never be more than that which the nature of the government made them’, means in practice, so far from the perfect ‘liberty’ being attained under Liberalism, which Rousseau, and Liberals in general continue to imagine, the state would become increasingly draconian and tyrannical as it failed to take a realistic account of the factors that do shape humanity above and beyond changes in political, economic or social structures. Rousseau and other philosophers of the 18th century ‘Enlightenment’ era assumed Man to be infinitely malleable. They believed that ‘ideal’ laws and governments could re-make all of humanity as happy, free, equal and peaceful. When the first modern experiment in both Liberalism and Communism, the Jacobin French Revolution, inspired by these Enlightenment philosophers failed to achieve their slogan of ‘liberty, equality, fraternity’, the ultimate recourse was to the guillotine and to mass murder, and to a network of spies and informers under the control of Rousseau’s most avid admirers among the Jacobins: Robespierre and Louis Antoine de Saint Just. The Jacobins literally cut the head off France in the pursuit of ‘equality’.

The same doctrine motivated Bolshevism and the Red Terror around 130 years later, and continues to motivate the Left in general, whether Old Left, New Left, or Next Left. What is even less realised is that the doctrine that human nature can be shaped by laws continues to be the basis of all Western governments, whether calling themselves ‘Left’, ‘Right’ or ‘Centre’. The now largely meaningless political spectrum has adopted to some degree the Enlightenment doctrine on Mankind. In the Western liberal-democracies such laws most obviously take the form of ‘human rights’ and ‘race relations’ legislation designed to impose by force the doctrine of ‘equality’ taken directly from the 18th Century. The more equality is attempted, the more laws are needed. This is a fact whether in states that call themselves liberal, democratic, socialist, or communist. The philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville wrote of this: ‘...But one also finds in the human heart a depraved taste for equality which impels the weak to want to bring the strong down to their level, and which reduces men to

preferring equality in slavery to inequality with freedom'.^[107]

Edmund Burke^[108] stated of Rousseau's influence on Revolutionary France:

The [French] assembly recommends to its youth a study of the bold experimenters in morality. Everybody knows that there is a great dispute amongst their leaders, which of them is the best resemblance of Rousseau. In truth, they all resemble him. His blood they transfuse into their minds and into their manners. Him they study; him they meditate; him they turn over in all the time they can spare from the laborious mischief of the day, or the debauches of the night. Rousseau is their canon of holy writ; in his life he is their canon of *Polycletus*; he is their standard figure of perfection. To this man and this writer, as a pattern to authors and to Frenchmen, the foundries of Paris are now running for statues, with the kettles of their poor and the bells of their churches. If an author had written like a great genius on geometry, though his practical and speculative morals were vicious in the extreme, it might appear, that in voting the statue, they honoured only the geometrician. But Rousseau is a moralist, or he is nothing. It is impossible, therefore, putting the circumstances together, to mistake their design in choosing the author with whom they have begun to recommend a course of studies.^[109]

Rousseau stated that his method of arriving at his doctrine for the perfection of humanity was to observe changes in himself and those around him:

By examining within myself, and searching in others what could be the cause of these different manners of being, I discovered that, in a great measure they depended on the anterior impressions of external objects; and that, continually modified by our senses and organs, we, without knowing it, bore in our ideas, sentiments, and even actions, the effect of these modifications. The striking and numerous observations I had collected were beyond all manner of dispute, and by their natural principle seemed proper to furnish an exterior regimen, which varied according to circumstances, might place and support the mind in the state most favourable to virtue. From how many mistakes would reason be preserved, how many vices would be stifled in their birth, were it possible to force animal economy to favour moral order, which it so frequently disturbs! Climate, seasons, sounds, colours, light, darkness, the elements, ailments, noise, silence, motion, rest, all act on the animal machine, and consequently on the mind: all offer a thousand means, almost certain of

directing in their origin the sentiments by which we suffer ourselves to be governed.^[110]

This doctrine that Rousseau was formulating on the basis of his own circumstances was that of ‘environmentalism’: that humans are shaped by their environment. Change the environment, and one can change human character. Already Rousseau had established the doctrine as an infallible dogma: ‘observations I had collected were beyond all manner of dispute...’ Environmentalism, again, is the basis of the two systems generally assumed to be opposed, yet that originate from the same sources: Liberalism and Communism. In the USSR the science of Mendelian genetics was repressed^[111] because the laws of genetic heredity do not agree with the dogma that human traits, like that of all organisms, are genetically inherited rather than changed at whim by changing a political, economic or social structure^[112] The Liberal West, while more subtle than the Soviet states, continues with the same attitude, where findings on genetic inheritance that show why humans are not – and cannot be – ‘equal’, are suppressed or smeared.^[113]

The observations of Rousseau in regard to his own deficiencies and the way he perceived others were projected on to society, and an entire doctrine was formulated from out of an unbalanced mind.

Rousseau had a self-destructive flaw in his character that guaranteed his failure. He was paranoid and narcissistic. He rationalised his failings by blaming others for his circumstances. Rousseau could only see himself as a victim from birth. He sabotaged all relationships with a paranoid distrust that ended friendships in bitterness.

Rousseau’s Personality Disorders

The assistance that Scottish philosopher David Hume attempted to provide Rousseau is one such example of self-sabotage. In 1766 Hume sailed to Calais to bring Rousseau back to the safety of Britain, Rousseau being threatened with arrest in France for his agitation against the Church. Dr. David Burchell, who lectures at the University of Western Sydney on political and moral thought of the 17th and 18th centuries, comments on Rousseau and the projection onto society of his own deficiencies:

...It was Rousseau, after all, who first combined that burning and sincere love of the people in general with a thoroughgoing detestation of all human beings in the particular; and whose vaulting hopes for some distant

imagined future were matched only by his dissatisfaction with every single detail of the present. As Hume put it, Rousseau's extreme sensibility led him to experience pain far more keenly than pleasure: 'He is like a man stripped not only of his clothes, but of his skin'. And all this grand miserableness of temper transferred itself - as in philosophers it so often does - into a perfectly formulated world philosophy of grand miserableness. Rousseau was happy only under persecution and he was endlessly ingenious in creating it. Hume's discreet attempts at financial generosity were read by Rousseau, inevitably, as humiliations; his efforts at securing Rousseau an income were read as treachery. When Hume rescued Rousseau's letters, Rousseau accused him of steaming them open. Soon Rousseau's grand paranoia had woven together these imaginary petty betrayals into the cloth of his own grand theory of the world, in which the torrent of modern life rushes inexorably down the course of atomisation, fragmentation, selfishness and deceit. If, as Hume suggested, a good deal of philosophy is merely the personality of the author laid over the landscape of the world, we have more than our share of miniature Rousseaus fluttering about us today.^[114] [Emphasis added].

Here in Rousseau, as described by Dr. Burchell, is a primary element of the Leftist character: A feigned love of humanity combined with a detestation of people on an interpersonal basis. Hatred and envy are rationalised as 'love of the people'. Hence, Rousseau's narcissism in abandoning the five children he had to his mistress, Theresa Levasseur,^[115] a feeble-minded seamstress and laundress, to a foundling hospital was rationalised as being for the good of the children since he was unable to properly care for them. Rousseau shifted the major blame onto Theresa's family,^[116] whom he claimed had been turned against him by his former friends, fellow Enlightenment philosophers Diderot^[117] and Grimm.^[118] Hence, Rousseau was able to avoid confronting his own defects. He saw conspiracies all about him to deny him happiness:

Though I saw numerous conspiracies formed on every side, all I complain of was the tyranny of persons who called themselves my friends, and who, as it seemed, would force me to be happy in the manner they should point out, and not in that I had chosen for myself.^[119]

While Hume saw only good in him, despite the warnings of Diderot^[120] and others, he too soon fell out with Rousseau who accused him of intercepting his letters and destroying his papers. On 23 June 1766 Rousseau challenged the mild

mannered, well-meaning Hume:

You have badly concealed yourself. I understand you, Sir, and you well know it. You brought me to England, apparently to procure a refuge for me, and in reality to dishonour me. You applied yourself to this noble endeavour with a zeal worthy of your heart and with an art worthy of your talents.^[121]

Hume, mortified, appealed to John Davenport, who had become Rousseau's wealthy patron in England, referring to 'the monstrous ingratitude, ferocity, and frenzy of the man'.^[122] Hume, like many others, had very quickly discovered the celebrated thinker was a lunatic, writing: 'He is plainly mad, after having long been maddish'.^[123]

To Rousseau friends were seen as seeking to control his life and as conspiring against him, recalling:

...yet this friendship was more tormenting than agreeable to me, by their obstinate perseverance and even by their affectation, in opposing my taste, inclinations and manner of living; and this to such a degree, that the moment I seemed to desire a thing which interested myself only, and depended not upon them, they immediately joined their efforts to oblige me to renounce it. This continued desire to control me in all my wishes, the more unjust, as I did not so much as make myself acquainted with theirs, became so cruelly oppressive, that I never received one of their letters without feeling a certain terror as I opened it, and which was but too well justified by the contents.^[124]

Rousseau lamented that he had never found 'a real friend', despite having 'a heart wholly made up of love'. He could not understand his predicament.^[125] Neither could he understand why he had not succeeded in satisfactorily expressing 'exquisite faculties' with which he had been born, 'which made me consider myself as suffering injustice, was some kind of reparation, and caused me to shed tears which with pleasure I suffered to flow'.^[126]

Rousseau saw himself as a victim since his conception in the womb. In his autobiography he is determined to see his father as having resented him because of the death of his mother a week after his birth. Rousseau was projecting his own sense of guilt onto his father and interpreting this as his father's resentment, yet from what one can read in Rousseau's *Confessions* his father was nothing other than loving and openly affectionate towards his son. Rousseau however

was compelled to interpret this differently, to regard it as the beginning of an illusionary victimisation which for the rest of his life he set about bringing upon himself by sabotaging all relationships with friends and supporters.

Edmund Burke, who interviewed Rousseau when he came to England, opined that the primary characteristic was his ‘vanity’.^[127] Indeed, in the first sentences of his autobiography Rousseau proclaims his extraordinary character above and beyond all other mortals:

I have entered upon a performance which is without example, whose accomplishment will have no imitator. I mean to present my fellow-mortals with a man in all the integrity of nature; and this man shall be myself.

I know my heart, and have studied mankind; I am not made like any one I have been acquainted with, perhaps like no one in existence; if not better, I at least claim originality, and whether Nature did wisely in breaking the mould with which she formed me, can only be determined after having read this work.

Whenever the last trumpet shall sound, I will present myself before the sovereign judge with this book in my hand, and loudly proclaim, thus have I acted; these were my thoughts; such was I.^[128]

Of his birth Rousseau relates that ‘my birth cost my mother her life, and was the first of my misfortunes’, and his father remained ‘ever after inconsolable’.

In me he still thought he saw her he so tenderly lamented, but could never forget I had been the innocent cause of his misfortune, nor did he ever embrace me, but his sighs, the convulsive pressure of his arms, witnessed that a bitter regret mingled itself with his caresses, though, as may be supposed, they were not on this account less ardent. When he said to me, ‘Jean Jacques, let us talk of your mother,’ my usual reply was, ‘Yes, father, but then, you know, we shall cry,’ and immediately the tears started from his eyes. ‘Ah!’ exclaimed he, with agitation, ‘Give me back my wife; at least console me for her loss; fill up, dear boy, the void she has left in my soul. Could I love thee thus wert thou only my son?’

Such were the authors of my being: of all the gifts it had pleased Heaven to bestow on them, a feeling heart was the only one that descended to me; this had been the source of their felicity, it was the foundation of all my

misfortunes.^[129]

Childhood Guilt

Yet Rousseau also relates the ‘extraordinary affection’ that was ‘lavished’ on him by his father and an older brother, and the closeness to an aunt and a nurse. Rousseau writes of his upbringing: ‘...the children of a king could not be treated with more attention and tenderness than were bestowed on my infancy, being the darling of the family’. And further: ‘My father, my aunt, my nurse, my relations, our friends, our neighbours, all I had any connection with, did not obey me, it is true, but loved me tenderly, and I returned their affection’. There seems nothing in his childhood to justify a pervasive feeling of ‘misfortune’, but Rousseau was determined to find it somehow despite being fêted throughout Europe as a novelist and a philosopher.^[130]

Rousseau next alluded to being born with a ‘disorder that has gathered strength with years, and from which I am now relieved at intervals, only to suffer a different, though more intolerable evil.’ Rousseau states that he had no recollection of his life before the age of five, but he does know that he had experienced more than his share of ‘suffering’.^[131] Rousseau alluded cryptically to having while still a child experienced ‘a too intimate acquaintance with the passions’, and writes this in connection with his upbringing by his nurse, Jacqueline.^[132]

While still young Rousseau began to experience attacks, which he described as ‘a sudden and almost inconceivable revolution throughout my whole frame’:

I know not how to describe it better than as a kind of tempest, which suddenly rose in my blood, and spread in a moment over every part of my body. My arteries began beating so violently that I not only felt their motion, but even heard it, particularly that of the carotids, attended by a loud noise in my ears, which was of three, or rather four, distinct kinds. For instance, first a grave hollow buzzing; then a more distinct murmur, like the running of water; then an extremely sharp hissing, attended by the beating I before mentioned, and whose throbs I could easily count, without feeling my pulse, or putting a hand to any part of my body. This internal tumult was so violent that it has injured my auricular organs, and rendered me, from that time, not entirely deaf, but hard of hearing.^[133]

Passive-Aggressive, Bi-Polar and Narcissistic

Interestingly, Rousseau said of the maladies that greatly weakened him: ‘It is certain my disorder was in a great measure hypochondriacal’.^[134] Rousseau then related in length traits of Passive-Aggressive Personality Disorder, which assured him that he should not enjoy life regardless of the circumstances, but which because of an equally prevalent Narcissistic Personality Disorder meant that – despite his ability to recognise his own failings – he was ultimately compelled to blame others for his perpetual discontent and feelings of betrayal and persecution:

The vapours is a malady common to people in fortunate situations: the tears I frequently shed, without reason; the lively alarms I felt on the falling of a leaf, or the fluttering of a bird; inequality of humour in the calm of a most pleasing life; lassitude which made me weary even of happiness, and carried sensibility to extravagance, were an instance of this. We are so little formed for felicity, that when the soul and body do not suffer together, they must necessarily endure separate inconveniences, the good state of the one being almost always injurious to the happiness of the other. Had all the pleasure of life courted me, my weakened frame would not have permitted the enjoyment of them, without my being able to particularize the real seat of my complaint; yet in the decline of life, after having encountered very serious and real evils, my body seemed to regain its strength, as if on purpose to encounter additional misfortunes; and, at the moment I write this, though infirm, near sixty, and overwhelmed with every kind of sorrow, I feel more ability to suffer than I ever possessed for enjoyment when in the very flower of my age, and in the bosom of real happiness.^[135]

The above self-description also indicates symptoms of Bi-Polar Disorder, with a fluctuation of moods, accompanied by ‘the frequent shedding of tears without reason’. Rousseau’s reading on physiology served to increase his hypochondria:

To complete me, I had mingled a little physiology among my other readings: I set about studying anatomy, and considering the multitude, movement, and wonderful construction of the various parts that composed the human machine; my apprehensions were instantly increased, I expected to feel mine deranged twenty times a day, and far from being surprised to find myself dying, was astonished that I yet existed! I could not read the description of any malady without thinking it mine, and, had I

not been already indisposed, I am certain I should have become so from this study. Finding in every disease symptoms similar to mine, I fancied I had them all....^[136]

Rousseau was a conflicted, fractured personality. He referred to these contradictions:

Such were my affections on entering this life. Thus began to form and demonstrate itself, a heart, at once haughty and tender, a character effeminate, yet invincible; which, fluctuating between weakness and courage, luxury and virtue, has ever set me in contradiction to myself; causing abstinence and enjoyment, pleasure and prudence, equally to shun me.^[137]

Even here, in his self-analysis Rousseau must lament that he could not find contentment either in libertinage or austerity, and that he must remain perpetually discontented with his life. He claimed to welcome death as an escape from the woes of his existence, but for the regret that his expiration would deny humanity the full extent of his genius and virtue, writing: 'Far from fearing death, I joyfully saw it approach; but I felt some regret at leaving my fellow creatures without their having perceived my real merit, and being convinced how much I should have deserved their esteem had they known me better'.^[138]

If the *Confessions* were little other than a chronicle of his relationships with women and his betrayal and persecution by friends, Rousseau's *Meditations of a Solitary Walker* is an extended meditation upon the unmerited misery inflicted on the most virtuous of men by a cruel world. His solitary walks in the countryside supposedly gave him time to contemplate the deep questions of life, but they were no more than further self-piteous brooding. Despite the multitude of the rich and powerful who sought to assist him, including even to King Louis, and the high society women who clamoured to fashionably patronise 'Enlightenment' philosophers, despite his success as a novelist, a philosopher, and a music critique, Rousseau was determined to lead the life of a martyr. The question arises as to whether his life was led as self-punishment for the death of his mother soon after his birth? In the opening lines of *Meditations* Rousseau characteristically writes:

So now I am alone in the world, with no brother, neighbour or friend, nor any company left me but my own. The most sociable and loving of men has with one accord been cast out by all the rest. With all the ingenuity of

hate they have sought out the cruellest torture for my sensitive soul, and have broken all the threads that bound me to them. I would have loved my fellow-men in spite of themselves. It was only by ceasing to be human that they could forfeit my affection^[139]

Rousseau imagined that he had ‘become the horror of the human race’, ‘spat upon’ by ‘passers-by’, and that ‘an entire generation’ was with ‘one accord’ in taking pleasure in burying him alive. What he regarded as a bad dream had plunged him into a ‘fever’ for ten years, and ‘lurched’ him from ‘fault to fault, error to error, and folly to folly’, which provided weapons for those who sought to control and destroy him.^[140] He realised he had a ‘fevered imagination’^[141] but would not concede that his paranoia was the cause of his anguish, and thought the best course was now to accept his fate as the world’s most virtuous and yet reviled man. Wisdom had not come with age, but merely a keener sense of the ‘misery’ into which he had been plunged.^[142] His beliefs had ossified with age into dogmas, and his ‘mental lethargy’ had caused him to forget the arguments upon which his views were based,^[143] but which were now fixed. This Rousseau regarded as a strength that came with age and persecution. In his own mind, he had created his own world of dreams and nightmares.

Passive-Aggressive Narcissist

Passive-Aggressive traits displayed by Rousseau included:

- Complains of being misunderstood and unappreciated by others;
- May be sullen, irritable, impatient, argumentative, cynical, sceptical, and contrary;
- Unreasonably criticises and scorns authority;
- Expresses envy and resentment toward those apparently more fortunate;
- Voices exaggerated and persistent complaints of personal misfortune;
- Alternates between hostile defiance and contrition.^[144]

The Passive-Aggressive individual will embark on self-sabotage to guarantee his own failure, as a form of self-abuse for feelings of inadequacy or guilt, generally stemming from childhood experiences. In Rousseau’s case we have seen how he related a feeling of responsibility for the death of his mother during child-birth and projected this feeling on to his father.

Rousseau was also narcissistic. An individual can be both Passive-Aggressive and Narcissistic. Rousseau proclaimed himself as remarkably superior while possessing feelings of guilt and inadequacy since childhood. A significant example was the sending of his five children to a foundling home on the basis that they would receive better care. Rousseau sabotaged all his relationships with those who sought to assist him, while placing the blame onto others.

9 - Sadism and De Sade

It is apt that the man who gave his name to Sadism, Donatien Alphonse François Marquis de Sade, was regarded as a paragon of French Revolutionary virtue.

Sadistic Personality Disorder includes use of cruelty or violence to establish dominance; humiliation of others; amusement at the suffering of others, use of lies for inflicting pain on others; use of intimidation or terror as a control mechanism; restriction on the liberties of others, fascination with violence, torture or injury.^[145] As indicated above, the character of the violence committed during the Bolshevik and Jacobin revolutions are certainly manifestations of sadism, and the ideologues and perpetrators of the 'Terrors' appear to possess the traits of 'Sadistic Personality Disorder'.

While de Sade was imprisoned under both the Old Regime and that of Napoleon Bonaparte, the Jacobin interregnum granted him not only freedom but also recognition as a Revolutionary philosopher and as a state functionary. At the time of the Revolution he had been jailed for physical and sexual abuse of numerous victims, but was released from a lunatic asylum at Charenton, near Paris, in 1790. That year he was elected to the National Assembly, where he represented the far Left, and identified with the Marat faction. His identity with the far Left included the communistic advocacy of the abolition of private property, and he expressed a class struggle doctrine of the 'proletariat' warring against the other classes.^[146] In 1793 he wrote a eulogy to Marat, but fell afoul of Robespierre who had the upper hand for several years. De Sade was consequently imprisoned for a year during 1793-1794, while many other revolutionists were not that fortunate, as the Revolution devoured its own. In 1803, under Napoleon, he was again declared insane for his continuing publication of depraved novels, and returned to Charenton asylum.

Sex and Revolt: Precursor of Frankfurt School

De Sade was a precursor of the Frankfurt School and the New Left gurus who combined sex and revolt; the synthesis of Freud and Marx.^[147] His ideas pre-empted Freud and the Freudian-Marxists such as Wilhelm Reich^[148], and New Left gurus like Marcuse and Fromm, who combined sex with revolution, writing in *The 120 Days of Sodom*: 'Sexual pleasure is, I agree, a passion to

which all others are subordinate but in which they all unite'. His is the communistic doctrine, like that of Rousseau, of atavistic resurgence in the name of 'liberty', of the restoration of the 'primitive' under the guise of returning to 'nature', in the name of 'progress'. He wrote of this in *Aline et Alcour*: 'We are no guiltier in following the primitive impulses that govern us than is the Nile for her floods or the sea for her waves'. De Sade pleaded for the overthrow of all morality in the name of 'Nature', where civilised restraint would become obsolete so that predators such as himself could stalk the earth in liberty, just as he had brutalised poor girls and justified himself by having paid them, while claiming to be the champion of the 'people' in the name of 'liberty, equality, fraternity'. Sex was a means of empowerment, thus: 'What does one want when one is engaged in the sexual act? That everything around you give you its utter attention, think only of you, care only for you...every man wants to be a tyrant when he fornicates'.^[149] Sex and politics became the foundation of the New Left about 180 years later, and is still being called 'progressive'. One might note also the narcissistic basis of de Sade's comment.

In *The Philosophy of the Bedroom*, De Sade condemned 'insipid moralists' in the name of 'Nature'. He called maidenly virtue 'absurd' and the product of 'dangerous bonds' imposed by a 'disgusting religion', and 'imbecile parents'.^[150] Adorno and his team of social scientists came up with something similar over 150 years later, regarding such 'repressive' attitudes as latent 'fascism'.^[151] In the name of 'nature's laws' destruction and murder were justified: 'Destruction being one of the chief laws of nature, nothing that destroys can be criminal... murder is no destruction; he who commits it does but alter forms'.^[152] Child-bearing is a burden and by no means a law of nature. From the viewpoint of nature's laws, avoidance of breeding is preferable.^[153] Even infanticide is a mother's right in nature's laws.^[154] De Sade in 1795 was employing the arguments of the present-day feminists and abortionists: ridiculing the notion that 'immediately an embryo begins to mature, a little soul, emanation of God, comes straightaway to animate it'. According to de Sade such a child is of no consequence, and nobody should be obliged into motherhood or fatherhood.^[155]

Anticipating Marx, de Sade related religion to royalism and calls for the destruction of both.^[156] De Sade's claim that religion sustains kingship is merely echoed by Marx the following century in calling religion 'the opiate of the people'. Under the 'free, republican state' there will be few actions left that will be regarded as punishable crimes: 'there are very few criminal actions in a

society whose foundations are liberty and equality'.^[157] Population growth should be limited, and children destroyed at birth to assure population limits.^[158] Depopulation became an important policy of the Jacobin regime, as did 'amputating the gangrene' of certain undesirable elements. De Sade ended his liberal-communist treatise with: 'I never dine so heartily, I never sleep so soundly, as when I have, during the day, sufficiently befouled myself with what our fools call crimes'.^[159]

During the 1960s and 1970s de Sade provided ideological inspiration for the New Left, and he was quoted along with Marcuse, Che Guevara and Mao.

10 - Jean Paul Marat

The foregoing was the ideological atmosphere among the intelligentsia of Europe that laid the foundations of the French Revolution. As British historian Nesta H. Webster showed, the luminaries of this were what Nordau had described as mattoids. Among the most prominent of these was Jean Paul Marat, with whom de Sade shared a particular affinity. After Marat was assassinated de Sade wrote a eulogy.

Honoured by Jacobins and Bolsheviks

Marat was elevated to sainthood during the Jacobin regime, immortalised by the painter Jacques-Louis David in the painting 'The Death of Marat', and his heart was embalmed. His legacy was also honoured by the Bolsheviks, who renamed a Soviet ship The Marat in 1921. A street in the centre of Sevastopol was named after him (Улица Марата).

Drawing on contemporary accounts, Webster described Marat as being a 'malignant dwarf', with a monstrous head, misshapen nose, and sickly-yellow skin. Harmand de la Meuse, a member of the National Convention, observed that Marat had the burning and haggard eyes of a hyena, furtive, his movements jerky. He had a persecution complex and was in a state of perpetual excitement. Others observed that he would become enraged at the slightest disagreement, and would descend into foaming at the mouth. The traits described by his contemporaries indicate Marat had neurasthenia, observed by Spargo among Bolsheviks^[160].

Like many of the leaders of the Left, Marat fits with Nordau's description of the mattoid, the unbalanced genius who feels alienated from society. Today we observe a similar phenomenon in the youthful spree killer who is often a brilliant underachiever, but alienated from his contemporaries. Marat's position in Jacobin France allowed him to exercise the same type of resentment on a scale vaster than that of the individual spree killer.

Marat was from a Huguenot family, the father having limited opportunities, despite his education, due to his religious affiliation.^[161] Hence like the many Jewish intellectuals who became the most ferocious Bolsheviks, Marat came from an alienated background of another type. Marat also faced rejection. He became a man 'consumed with hatred and envy'^[162]. Nonetheless he attained

success as a self-taught physician in England and the French aristocracy sought his services. However, he had also embarked on revolutionary political journalism. The resentments he held towards anyone of success or wealth that he had acquired as a youth^[163] remained with him and like so many other Leftists, was rationalised as a political doctrine.

Reign of Terror

Marat, more than any of the other Jacobins, was the most avid advocate of the Terror, upping the number of those he desired killed from 600 in 1790 to 260,000 in 1792, to be killed in a day, although occasionally extending the figure to 300,000. However, those Marat wished to see 'hanging at their doors' first were 'the bakers, the grocers and all the tradesmen'.¹⁶¹ Although Marat died before the 'Reign of Terror' started, he had inspired the system.¹⁶² Even Robespierre had recoiled at first at Marat's bloodlust.¹⁶³ Marat, promoted in revolutionary idolatry as 'the friend of the people', although of 'filthy and neglected appearance, lived in great comfort and was never known to make any personal sacrifices for the poor of Paris'. His public persona was one of frugality, and of eating only bread and water, but in reality his daily fare comprised eight dishes.^[164]

11 - Karl Marx

Karl Marx, father of modern Communism and Social Democracy, built upon the ideas of the Jacobins. David McCalden in his psychohistorical study described Marx's mother as a 'possessive, manipulative, stereotypical Jewish mother', who had a 'profound impression on Marx'.^[165] As Rothman and Lichter showed in their psychohistorical analysis of Jews in the New Left, this search for identity and freedom from the embrace of Jewish matriarchs has been a significant factor in the shaping of revolutionaries with Jewish backgrounds. Feuer states that Marx was in revolt from his youth in a search for self-confidence, 'always anticipating rejection'. 'His world was always to be one of struggle because he was never secure in love'. Likewise, his early animosity towards Jewishness was a rejection of the Jewish identity that his mother maintained even after the father had converted to Christianity.^[166] Feuer states that revolt was Marx's 'life plan'. Rothman and Lichter noted that many of the Jewish radicals they studied 'found themselves unable to develop a commitment to a life plan. Yet they were fearful of their mother's criticism because of this lack of direction'.^[167]

Marx's mother was devoted to him, addressing him in correspondence as 'greatly beloved dear Karl' or 'dear darling Karl', and signed 'your eternally loving mother'. Marx in return called her his 'Angel Mother'. As a university student his mother would write to remind him to have his 'weekly scrub with soap and water', advice he seems to have neglected throughout his life.^[168] Upon his father's death when Karl was 23, his mother urged him to take up a job to fend for his family; a plea that he indignantly rejected. While she continued to make investments that increased her fortune, despite her lack of education, Marx kept his family in poverty and debt, apart from subsidies from Engels, dreaming of the day his mother, and other relatives, including his wife's, would die and he would inherit money. Considering the amounts he received from Engels and elsewhere, his continuing poverty seems likely to have been the result of his expensive tastes, causing perpetual indebtedness. a letter to Engels in 1851 shows his attitudes in these respects:

Dear Engels,

While you busy yourself with military history, I am conducting a little campaign in which I am likely to be vanquished by and by, and from which neither Napoleon nor even Willich — the communist Cromwell —

would have been able to extricate themselves.

You should know that I had to pay £31/10 shillings to old Bamberger on 23 March, and £10 to the Jew, Stiebel, on the sixteenth, all on current bills. I first got Jenny to ask my mother-in-law outright. The answer to this was that Mr Edgar [von Westphalen]^[169] had been sent back to Mexico with the remainder of *Jenny's money*, and I couldn't extract a *single centime*.

Then I wrote to my mother, threatening to draw bills on her and, in case of non-payment, to go to Prussia and get myself locked up. I had really intended to take the latter course if such should be the case, but this device ceased to be feasible from the moment the jackasses began to fill the press with their jeremiads about the workers deserting me, my declining popularity and the like. As it was, the thing would have looked like a piece of political histrionics, a more or less deliberate imitation of Jesus Christ-Kinkel. The time-limit I set my mater was 20 March.

On 10 March she wrote and told me they intended to write to our relations; on 18 March she wrote to say the relations had *not* written which was intended to mean the matter was concluded. I at once replied, saying that I stood by my first letter.

On 16 March, with Pieper's help, I paid Stiebel his £10. On 23 March, after I had made a number of fruitless moves, the bill for old Bamberger was inevitably protested. I had a frightful scene with the old man who, moreover, was frightfully abusive about me to the worthy Seiler. Through his banker in Trier the idiot had asked for information about me from the banker, Lautz. This fellow, my mater's banker and my personal enemy, naturally wrote and told him the most absurd things about me and, on top of that, thoroughly stirred up my mater against me.

As regards old [Simon] Bamberger, I had no alternative but to make out two bills for him, one on him in London to run for 4 weeks from 24 March, the other, payable in Trier in 3 weeks, on my mater in order to cover the first. I at once advised my mater of this. Today, at the same time as your letter, one arrived from my mater in which, full of moral indignation, she addresses me in the most *insolent* terms, declaring *positivement* that she will protest any bill I draw on her.

So when 21 April comes round I shall have to expect the very worst from a thoroughly incensed old Simon Bamberger.

At the same time my wife was brought to bed on 28 March.^[170] Though the confinement was an easy one, she is now very ill in bed, the causes being domestic rather than physical. And thereby I have *verbalement* not a farthing in the house, so that tradesmen's bills — butcher's, baker's and so forth — keep mounting up.

In 7 or 8 days' time, I shall have a copy of the will from Scotland. If anything's to be made of it, little [Louis] Bamberger is the one to do so, if only in his own interest. But I can't rely on it.

You will admit that this is a pretty kettle of fish and that I am up to my neck in petty-bourgeois muck. And at the same time one is also said to have exploited the workers! and to aspire to dictatorship! *Quelle horreur!*

Mais ce n'est pas tout.^[171] The manufacturer, who, in Brussels, loaned me money from Trier, is dunning me for it because his iron-works are doing badly. *Tant pis pour lui.*^[172] I can't do as he asks.

But finally, to give the matter a tragicomic turn, there is in addition a *mystère* which I will now reveal to you *en très peu de mots*^[173]. However, I've just been interrupted and must go and help nurse my wife. The rest, then, in which you also figure, in my next. ...^[174]

Narcissistic Personality Disorder

In this letter we can see the outlines of a Narcissistic Personality, devoid of feeling for others, including his mother, concerned only for himself and blaming his irresponsibility with money on his relatives and the tradesmen and bankers who expect Marx to pay his bills and debts like normal people. Like Rousseau and other Leftist luminaries, Marx believed that the world existed to serve his immediate needs, and damned all and sundry when his own failings caught up with him.

Was Marx's hatred of the 'petty bourgeoisie' a projection of his personal financial irresponsibility and his indebtedness to tradesmen? Was Marx's Jewish self-hatred a projection of his own obsession with money matters and his indebtedness to Jewish businessmen such as the banker 'old Bamberger'?^[175] Marx wrote of the 'everyday, world Jew', of which he was one: 'What is the secular basis of Judaism? Practical need, self-interest. What is the worldly religion of the Jew? Huckstering. What is his worldly God? Money'.^[176] In the 'everyday Jew' he saw himself, projected these traits onto 'bourgeoisie society', and vented his hatred against it. Ultimately it was self-hatred and the quest for self-obliteration.

Additionally, was Marx's opposition to the traditional family as a 'bourgeoisie institution' based on commerce, his own projection of how he regarded his family relationships? Marx and Engels had written in the founding document of the modern Left: 'On what foundation is the present family, the bourgeois family, based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form this family exists only among the bourgeoisie...' ^[177] Because Marx's family relationships were based on ongoing efforts to extort money from relatives through moral blackmail, he projected his own money-grubbing mentality onto the entire institution of the family. This anti-family outlook has been one of the primary appeals to the leaders and followers of both Old and New Lefts, among whom there has been a disproportionate amount of familial dysfunction, as we shall see. When it came to the marriage of his daughters however, Marx was just as much a bourgeoisie father as any well-off Victorian gentleman.

Jenny Von Westphalen

Despite the strained economic circumstances of Marx's wife Jenny, whose letters to Karl during their courtship indicate a Bi-Polar disorder (manic-depression), like her husband, she sought to maintain an appearance of affluence in front of the 'high society' into which she had been born. After relating that she adorns and conducts herself in 'society' in a haughty manner, she refers to those who ask when her husband is going to get a job to support his family and the expensive tastes of both Jenny and himself:

I think to myself, too, what would be the good of behaving humbly; it does not help anyone out of a difficulty, and people are so happy if they can express their regret. Despite the fact that my whole being expresses satisfaction and *affluence*, everyone still hopes that you will decide after all to obtain a permanent post. O, you asses, as if all of you were standing on firm ground. I know that we are not exactly standing on rock, but where is there any firm foundation now?^[178]

Jenny rationalises her husband's aversion to regular employment by stating that since the economic situation is uncertain for everyone, nobody should be presumptuous enough to question her on Karl's affairs. Perhaps this rationalisation was an effort to mask her own self-consciousness about her husband's irresponsibility? At any rate, Jenny von Westphalen conducted herself in a manner of haughtiness that betrays an underlying sense of insecurity and self-abasement. Karl's father, Heinrich, who wrote of Jenny to his son, noticed what seems to be an indefinable sense of foreboding:

But I note a striking phenomenon in Jenny. She, who is so wholly devoted to you with her childlike, pure disposition, betrays at times, involuntarily and against her will, a kind of fear, a fear laden with foreboding, which does not escape me, which I do not know how to explain, and all trace of which she tried to erase from my heart, as soon as I pointed it out to her. What does that mean, what can it be? I cannot explain it to myself, but unfortunately my experience does not allow me to be easily led astray.^[179]

The Marx's were clearly contemptuous of all those about them, including bourgeois 'high society'. But they certainly spurned a simple life to 'keep up appearances' before those whom they held in contempt. Indeed, one might ask whether there was any part of humanity, any 'class' towards which they did not

feel disdain? There seems to be a rationalisation for feelings of alienation from any class of society; feelings of inadequacy, projected, as is often the case, with a mask of superiority and haughtiness.

Jenny and Karl were assured that these fools of ‘society’ who ask when Karl would get a job to pay his bills and support his family, would themselves soon fall with the collapse of capitalism. Jenny writes assuring Karl:

Can one not see everywhere signs of earthquake and the undermining of the foundations on which society has erected its temples and shops? I think that time, the old mole, will soon stop burrowing underground -- indeed in Breslau there have been thunderstorms again. If we can only hold out for a time, until our little one has grown big. [\[180\]](#)

While awaiting the revolution Jenny must keep up the appearance of affluence before high society, a pretence to mitigate Karl’s refusal to get a job:

Dearest heart, I am often greatly worried about our future, both that near at hand and later on, and I think I am going to be punished for my exuberance and cockiness here. If you can, do set my mind at rest about this. There is too much talk on all sides about a steady income. I reply then merely by means of my rosy cheeks, my clear skin, my velvet cloak, feather hat and smart coiffure. That has the best and deepest effect, and if as a result I become depressed, nobody sees it. [\[181\]](#)

Relatives as a Source of Money

The debts to shopkeepers and trades people for the sake of a stereotypically bourgeois vanity seem to have been a constant feature of the lives of both. Jenny writes to Karl: ‘Only one big vital question, the one of the tailor’s and dressmaker’s bills, still awaits a favourable solution, which I hope will soon be forthcoming’. [\[182\]](#)

Writing to Engels in 1848, Marx suggested a means of extracting more money from Engel’s father:

I have devised an infallible plan for extracting money from your old man, as we now have none. Write me a begging letter (as crude as possible), in which you retail your past vicissitudes, but in such a way that I can pass it on to your mother. The old man’s beginning to get the wind up. [\[183\]](#)

Writing to Engels in 1852 Marx was hopeful about the death of Jenny’s uncle: ‘The only good news we have received came from my bossy sister-in-law,

the news about the illness of my wife's indestructible uncle. If the dog dies now, I'm out of trouble'.^[184] Marx related to Engels 'the very happy event' of the death of Jenny's uncle:

Yesterday we were informed of a very happy event, the death of my wife's uncle, aged 90. As a result, my mother-in-law will save an annual impost of 200 talers and my wife will get almost £100; more if the old dog hasn't made over to his housekeeper such of his money as is not entailed.^[185]

Note that this champion of the proletariat expresses hope that no part of Jenny's inheritance will be wasted upon the deceased uncle's housekeeper.

Marx wrote to Engels in 1861 congratulating himself on extracting money from an uncle:

First, then, to business. For a start, I squeezed £160 out of my uncle so that we were able to pay off the greater part of our debts. My mother, with whom any discussion about cash is out of the question, but who is rapidly nearing her end, destroyed some I.O.U.s I had given her in the past. That was the distinctly pleasant result of the two days I spent with her.^[186]

What is notable here is that apart from the money 'squeezed out' of his uncle, Marx cares nothing about his mother's 'rapidly nearing end', (assuredly apart from what his inheritance will be) but had some satisfaction that visiting her had resulted in her having written off some loans.

Marx to Engels in 1861 displays a marked lack of regard for his mother and her health, dismissing her 'tender expressions' and well-being as meaningless in comparison to his needs. The narcissism is pronounced: 'I got a reply from the old lady yesterday. Nothing but "tender" expressions, but no cash. She also tells me something I already knew, that she is 75 years old and feeling a lot of the infirmities of old age'.^[187]

The following year (1862) Marx wrote to Engels that Jenny was feeling continually suicidal, and of his wife's severe depression in regard to the lack of money and constant debt, and the worry of the children that their friends might discover that they are living in poverty. Marx ended on a positive note, however, again with the self-absorption of a narcissist, that so long as his writing was going to plan the distress of his wife and children were of secondary concern:

...Every day my wife says she wishes she and the children were safely in their graves, and I really cannot blame her, for the humiliations, torments

and alarms that one has to go through in such a situation are indeed indescribable. As you know, the £50 went on debts, more than half of which remain to be paid. The £2 on gas..... I feel all the more sorry for the unfortunate children in that all this is happening during the Exhibition Season, when their friends are having fun, whereas they themselves live in dread lest someone should come and see them and realise what a mess they are in. For the rest, I myself, by the by, am working away hard and, strange to say, my grey matter is functioning better in the midst of the surrounding *misère* than it has done for years.^[188]

Engels writing to Marx indicated the same narcissistic traits in regard to relatives as nothing other than sources of money: ‘But all this is marginal stuff and, unless we can discover the art of shitting gold, there would hardly seem to be any alternative to your extracting something from your relations by one means or another’.^[189]

When Marx’s mother died in 1863 the large inheritances made little difference, as most went to pay loans from his banker uncle, while he soon squandered the rest.^[190]

Vain, Intolerant, Vengeful

Marx’s clothes and body were typically of a dirty appearance.^[191] According to his rival in the Internationale, the anarchist Bakunin, Marx was ‘nervous... to the point of cowardice’. Indeed, unlike Bakunin, he never manned a barricade. ‘Extraordinarily ambitious and vain, quarrelsome, intolerant and absolute... vengeful to the point of madness. There is no lie or calumny that he is not capable of inventing against anyone who has had the misfortune of arousing his jealousy... or his hatred’.^[192]

Marx’s father Heinrich regarded his son egocentric, and as ‘negligent’ towards his doting mother, writing to Karl in 1835:

Dear Karl,

More than three weeks have passed since you went away, and there is no sign of you! You know your mother and how anxious she is, and yet you show this boundless negligence! That, unfortunately, only too strongly confirms the opinion, which I hold in spite of your many good qualities, that in your heart egoism is predominant. Your mother knows nothing of this letter. I do not want to increase her anxiety still more, but I repeat, it

is irresponsible of you. For my part, I can wait - but I expect you to set your mother's mind at rest by return of post.

Your father,

Marx^[193]

Heinrich Marx's second letter was cordial, having received a barely legible reply from his son. His mother added a postscript reminding 'Carl' to be mindful of hygiene:

Here allow me to note, dear Carl, that you must never regard cleanliness and order as something secondary, for health and cheerfulness depend on them. Insist strictly that your rooms are scrubbed frequently and fix a definite time for it -- and you, my dear Carl, have a weekly scrub with sponge and soap.^[194]

His father had during Karl's student days wondered whether his son was keeping himself afloat by 'cadging', hoped that this was not so, and forwarded him 50 talers.^[195] These student days were the beginning of Karl's lifelong cadging and financial irresponsibility. Heinrich hoped for much from his son in following the profession of law. However, Marx had no intention of pursuing such a bourgeois existence, even if it meant reducing his wife and children to the slums of London, while he cursed the world, his relatives, his comrades and trades-people for his own failings. Heinrich complained that Karl was vague as to how he was spending the money he was being sent, despite Heinrich's own heavy family responsibilities:

I have just received your letter, and I must confess that I am somewhat surprised at it. As regards your letter containing the accounts, I already told you at the time that I could not make head or tail of them. This much I did see, that you need money, and therefore I sent you 50 talers. With what you took with you, that makes 160 talers. You have been away five months in all, and now you do not even say what you need. That, at all events, is strange. Dear Karl, I repeat that I do everything very willingly, but that as the father of many children - and you know quite well I am not rich - I am not willing to do more than is necessary for your well-being and progress.^[196]

With the letter of 19 March Heinrich made it clear that he considered Karl was throwing money away, and that he could not afford to send more.^[197]

However, by the next letter, Heinrich had apparently been persuaded otherwise and sent a further 100 talers, with the hope that Karl would spend more wisely, with the promise that there would be 20 talers more within a few days.^[198]

Heinrich's correspondence with Karl swings on the one hand between fatherly affection, with assurances as to how admired his son will be by the world once they realise his talents, his soundness of character and sensitivity, and on the other hand to a deep disquiet as to Karl's real character. While the letters of Jenny von Westphalen to Karl during his student days show her to be mentally fragile, they indicate also that Karl was intent on controlling her and keeping her in a state of imbalance. Heinrich and the rest of the Marx family were close to Jenny, and Heinrich tried to gently castigate Karl for his treatment of her, even before their marriage. Heinrich asks of Karl in relation to Jenny:

Will you ever - and that is not the least painful doubt of my heart - will you ever be capable of truly human, domestic happiness? Will - and this doubt has no less tortured me recently since I have come to love a certain person like my own child - will you ever be capable of imparting happiness to those immediately around you?^[199]

Karl was never to 'impart happiness to those around him'. He never attempted to fulfil his father's hopes of entering a profession, and chose, despite all the advantages of his upbringing, to 'cadge' all his life, reduce his family to poverty, ill-health and suicide, and betrayed the ever-faithful Jenny by fathering a child to her ever-faithful maid.

In the midst of his own ill-health, the serious ill-health of a son, Eduard, the illness of a daughter Sophie, and worries about Jenny, Heinrich asked Karl whether all these worries have made him at times write too harshly to his 'sensitive' son? It is evident that Karl thought only of himself, regardless of the problems of his parents and his fiancé. Heinrich, asked, at last, some pertinent questions of his son:

However much I love you above everything - except your mother - I am not blind and still less want to be so. I do you justice in many matters, but I cannot entirely rid myself of the thought that you are not free from a little more egoism than is necessary for self-preservation, and I cannot always dispel the thought that were I in your position I would show greater consideration for and more self-sacrificing love towards my parents. I received nothing from my parents apart from my existence - although not to be unjust, love from my mother - and how I have fought

and suffered, in order not to distress them as long as possible.

Do not put forward your character as an excuse. Do not blame nature. It has certainly treated you like a mother. It has given you strength enough, the will is left to man. But to abandon oneself to grief at the slightest storm, to lay bare a shattered heart and break the heart of our beloved ones at every suffering, do you call that poetry? God protect us from the most beautiful of all nature's gifts if that is its immediate effect. No, it is only weakness, over-indulgence, self-love and conceit which reduce everything to their own measure in this way and force even those we love most into the background!^[200]

Incapable of Empathy

Young Marx turned on the suffering poet routine as a means of morally blackmailing his parents for money, while his parents bestowed nothing but affection. Relationships for Karl were there to be used: the primary characteristic of a sociopath. These traits of Marx as a student were more than merely an adolescent phase: they are traits that remained with Marx his whole life. Despite his best hopes, the deeply Christian Heinrich seems to have admitted to himself and very occasionally expressed forebodings, that there was no love, no normal humanity, no empathy, in his son:

The first of all human virtues is the strength and will to sacrifice oneself, to set aside one's ego, if duty, if love calls for it, and indeed not those glamorous, romantic or hero-like sacrifices, the act of a moment of fanciful reverie or heroic feeling. Even the greatest egoist is capable of that, for it is precisely the ego which then has pride of place. No, it is those daily and hourly recurring sacrifices which arise from the pure heart of a good person, of a loving father, of a tender-hearted mother, of a loving spouse, of a thankful child, that give life its sole charm and make it beautiful despite all unpleasantness.

You yourself have described so beautifully the life of your excellent mother, so deeply felt that her whole life is a continual sacrifice of love and loyalty, and truly you have not exaggerated. But what is the good of beautiful examples if they do not inspire one to copy them? But can you, with your hand on your heart, pride yourself on having done this up to now? [\[201\]](#)

This outpouring of honest opinion, even though even now Heinrich was concerned that Karl would be 'offended', was compelled by Karl's forthcoming marriage to Jenny. Heinrich recognised that his son, with the temperament he was then expressing, would offer no solace to a wife or children:

I do not want to press you too hard, certainly I do not want to offend you, for as a matter of fact I am weak enough to regret having offended you. But it is not merely that I, and your good mother, suffer from it, perhaps I would let that pass. In no one's heart is there so little selfishness as in that of good parents. But for your own good I must not and will not ever abandon this text until I am convinced that this stain on your otherwise so noble character has disappeared. Quite soon you will and must be the

father of a family. But neither honour nor wealth nor fame will make your wife and children happy; you alone can do that, your better self, your love, your tender behaviour, the putting behind you of stormy idiosyncrasies, of violent outbreaks of passion, of morbid sensitivity, etc., etc., *etc.* I am hardly speaking any longer on my own behalf, I am calling your attention to the bond that is to be tied.^[202]

Heinrich occasionally alluded to what he regarded as Karl's – what we might call – moodiness – his griping and outrage at the least drawback, or perceived drawback. It is classic narcissism. Karl's character did not change with age in this regard either. Might we not see here, like Rousseau and others, the origins of Karl's grievances against the world, against society, against anyone and everyone he perceived to be acting against him? In brief: might not we see here the origins of 'Marxism' as the doctrine of mattoid revenge? Heinrich wrote to Karl, stating with increasing clarity, his misgivings about his son's character:

Frankly speaking, my dear Karl, I do not like this modern world, which all weaklings use to cloak their feelings when they quarrel with the world because they do not possess, without labour or trouble, well-furnished palaces with vast sums of money and elegant carriages. This embitterment disgusts me and you are the last person from whom I would expect it. What grounds can you have for it? Has not everything smiled on you ever since your cradle? Has not nature endowed you with magnificent talents? Have not your parents lavished affection on you? Have you ever up to now been unable to satisfy your reasonable wishes? And have you not carried away in the most incomprehensible fashion the heart of a girl whom thousands envy you? Yet the first untoward event, the first disappointed wish, evokes embitterment! Is that strength? Is that a manly character?^[203]

Heinrich's final letters to Karl become increasingly frank. This seems to have been primarily because of the concern that his n'er-do-well son was about to marry a noble woman whom he would drag down to an abyss. Heinrich asked at the end of 1837: 'What have been so far the fruits of your magnificent natural gifts, as far as your parents are concerned? What have been these fruits as far as you yourself are concerned?' Heinrich, again turning to his concern for Jenny, asked Karl what he has to offer a woman of noble birth who is willing to sacrifice so much: 'The simple and practical solution is to procure her a future worthy of her, in the real world, not in a smoke-filled room with a reeking oil-

lamp at the side of a scholar grown wild'.^[204] Heinrich even wondered to his son whether Jenny would have been better off had her parents refused to consent her marrying Karl. Heinrich hoped that Karl's new responsibilities would turn him from 'an uncivilised stripling into an orderly human being, a negating genius into a genuine thinker, a wild ringleader of wild young fellows into a man fit for society...'; 'to exorcise all evil spirits'.^[205] An 'uncivilised stripling', a 'negating genius', a 'wild ringleader'; all these Heinrich saw in his son: typical mattoid or sociopathic traits, that arise time and again in the leaders of the Left.

Heinrich foresaw the course Karl had set for himself indicating the dysfunctional reactive responses of his son:

That, in short, was the problem. How has it been solved?

God's grief!!! Disorderliness, musty excursions into all departments of knowledge, musty brooding under a gloomy oil-lamp; running wild in a scholar's dressing-gown and with unkempt hair instead of running wild over a glass of beer; unsociable withdrawal with neglect of all decorum and even of all consideration for the father. - The art of association with the world restricted to a dirty work-room, in the classic disorder of which perhaps the love-letters of a Jenny and the well-meant exhortations of a father, written perhaps with tears, are used for pipe-spills, which at any rate would be better than if they were to fall into the hands of third persons owing to even more irresponsible disorder. - And is it here, in this workshop of senseless and inexpedient erudition, that the fruits are to ripen which will refresh you and your beloved, and the harvest to be garnered which will serve to fulfil your sacred obligations!?^[206]

Finally, Heinrich was honest with his son. He was telling Karl what we might call home-truths he had kept to himself or only alluded to in passing for fear of offending his son:

'I will not become soft-hearted, for I feel that I have been too indulgent, given too little utterance to my grievances, and thus to a certain extent have become your accomplice. I must and will say that you have caused your parents much vexation and little or no joy'.^[207]

Heinrich referred to Karl's 'estrangement' from his family, his failure to keep in communication through correspondence or to take any trouble to visit during vacations, and the lack of real content of those letters he did write. Further on Heinrich returned to Karl's lack of familial bond. Even Jenny is only

thought of when needed:

I must add, too, the complaints of your brothers and sisters. From your letters, one can hardly see that you have any brothers or sisters; as for the good Sophie, who has suffered so much for you and Jenny, and is so lavish in her devotion to you, you do not think of her when you do not need her.^[208]

The next passage points to further traits of sociopathy, to Karl's total lack of humanity even towards his parents and siblings. Again the lack of empathy remained with Marx even in his relationship with Jenny, as Heinrich feared, and the hell to which he would consign her and his children:

On several occasions we were without a letter for months, and the last time was when you knew Eduard was ill, mother suffering and I myself not well, and moreover cholera was raging in Berlin; and as if that did not even call for an apology, your next letter contained not a single word about it, but merely some badly written lines and an extract from the diary entitled *The Visit*, which I would quite frankly prefer to throw out rather than accept, a crazy botch-work which merely testifies how you squander your talents and spend your nights giving birth to monsters; that you follow in the footsteps of the new immoralists who twist their words until they themselves do not hear them; who christen a flood of words a product of genius because it is devoid of ideas or contains only distorted ideas.^[209]

The contempt Marx had for the masses was casually expressed in his correspondence. To Adolf Cluss^[210] he wrote: 'There are no bigger donkeys than these workers.... Look at our "craftsmen"; Sad that world history should be made with such people'.^[211] And to his closest friend and patron, Friedrich Engels: 'When this morning we inquired at the Hotel de l'Europe, fortunately it so happened that 60 Frenchmen were preparing to leave, while on the other hand the steam ships loaded with fresh human debris had not arrived yet'.^[212] This contempt for humanity that had been expressed in the poems of his youth, which so concerned his father, never left Marx even as he forged his name as the most famous champion of 'the people'. It was a destructive contempt that expressed the lack of empathy characteristic of a sociopath.

Heinrich saw the madness in his son, and in the destructiveness in his son's inane prose.^[213] Despite the lack of wealth of the family, the Marx's gave 700

talers a year to Karl, Heinrich asking why this was necessary when the sons of wealthy families live on 500 talers? Heinrich asked what Karl has done other than to build one day and destroy the next, even his own works, without assimilating the ideas of others. 'In the end the body is ailing and the mind confused'. Nothing tangible is achieved, 'while the ordinary little people' proceed to worthier lives. For all that Heinrich assured Karl that 160 talers will be sent, and that he hoped his son will visit at Easter.^[214]

Heinrich died in 1838. In February, while ailing, he wrote to Karl, and assured him still of his love. He died three months later. Karl did not make the journey for an Easter visit.^[215]

Heinrich's abiding worry that Karl would not be a good husband or father due to deep character flaws transpired to be correct. A Prussian police spy described Marx as a filthy drunkard, whose marriage and parenthood did not alter the same traits that his parents had observed in regard to the drinking and careless attitude toward hygiene in his student days:

Washing, grooming and changing his linen are things he does rarely, and he likes to get drunk. Though he is often idle for days on end, he will work day and night with tireless endurance when he has a great deal of work to do. He has no fixed times for going to sleep and waking up. He often stays up all night, and then lies down fully clothed on the sofa at midday and sleeps till evening, untroubled by the comings and goings of the whole world.^[216]

Lack of Personal Hygiene

The condition of the Marx household was just as filthy. While Marx was self-absorbed his wife, children and maid subsisted in degradation. Through his family's ill-health and his wife's depression Marx remained 'untroubled by the comings and goings of the whole world', until his expensive tastes in cigars and wine and demands from shopkeepers for the payment of bills would return him to reality long enough for him to rant to Engels against those trying to make a modest living. Wheen describes the Marx quarters as a two-room apartment where all the furniture and fittings were broken and torn, 'with a half-inch of dust over everything'.

In the middle of the front living room, overlooking Dean Street, was a big table covered with an oil cloth, on which lay Marx's manuscripts, books and newspapers, as well as the children's toys, rags and scraps from his wife's sewing basket, several cups with broken rims, knives, forks, lamps, an inkpot, tumblers, Dutch clay pipes and a thick veneer of tobacco ash. Even finding somewhere to sit was fraught with peril. 'Here is a chair with only three legs, on another chair the children have been playing at cooking – this chair happens to have four legs,' a guest reported. 'This is the one which is offered to the visitor, but the children's cooking has not been wiped away; and if you sit down, you risk a pair of trousers.'^[217]

Marx's Children

Freddy Demuth

The paternity of Freddy Demuth, the son Marx had to his wife's servant Lenchen, was imputed to Engels in order to maintain Marx's marriage. Freddy was sent to live with an East London labouring family.^[218] There have been attempts to undermine the credibility of Marx's paternity. Francis Wheen writes that Jenny Marx had agreed that the news would provide lethal ammunition to Marx's enemies should it ever get out. So began one of the first and most successful cover-ups ever organized for the greater good of the communist cause. There were plenty of rumours that Marx had fathered an illegitimate child, but the first public reference to Freddy's true paternity did not appear until 1962, when the German historian Walter Blumenberg published a document found in the vast Marxist archive at the International Institute of Social History, Amsterdam. It is a letter written on 2 September 1898 by Louisen Freyberger, a friend of Helene Demuth and housekeeper to Engels, describing her employer's deathbed confession:

'I know from General [Engels] himself that Freddy Demuth is Marx's son. Tussy [Marx's youngest daughter, Eleanor] went on at me so, that I asked the old man straight out. General was very astonished that Tussy clung to her opinion so obstinately. And he told me that if necessary I was to give lie to the gossip that he disowned his son. You will remember that I told you about it long before General's death.

'Moreover this fact that Frederick Demuth was the son of Karl Marx and Helene Demuth was again confirmed by General a few days before his death in a statement to Mr Moore [Samuel Moore, translator of the *Communist Manifesto* and *Capital*], who then went to Tussy at Orpington and told her. Tussy maintained that General was lying and that he himself had always admitted he was the father. Moore came back from Orpington and questioned General again closely. But the old man stuck to his statement that Freddy was Marx's son, and said to Moore, "Tussy wants to make an idol of her father."

'On Sunday, that is to say the day before he died, General wrote it down himself for Tussy on the slate, and Tussy came out so shattered that she forgot all about her hatred of me and wept bitterly on my shoulder.

'General gave us...permission to make use of the information only if he

should be accused of treating Freddy shabbily. He said he would not want his name slandered, especially as it could no longer do anyone any good. By taking Marx's part he had saved him from a serious domestic conflict. Apart from ourselves and Mr. Moore and Mr. Marx's children (I think Laura knew about the story even though perhaps she had not heard it exactly) the only others that knew that Marx had a son were Lessner and Pfander. After the Freddy letters had been published, Lessner said to me, "Of course Freddy is Tussy's brother, we knew all about it, but we could never find out where the child was brought up".

'I am just reading over again the few lines you wrote me about the question. Marx was continually aware of the possibility of divorce, since his wife was frantically jealous. He did not love the child, and the scandal would have been too great if he had dared to do anything for him'.^[219]

It has been questioned whether Jenny would have retained a close relationship with her maid Lenchen Demuth, had she become pregnant by Marx. However, Jenny was long-suffering and she would have forgiven Lenchen and Karl anything. Characteristically, she did however go into a deep depression at the time of Demuth's pregnancy.

We know from Jenny's memoir that she was depressed during the early summer of 1851, and Marx's letter of 31 March confirms this: 'My wife was brought to bed on 28 March. Though the confinement was an easy one, she is now very ill in bed, the causes being domestic rather than physical.' By the beginning of August, with two nursing mothers sharing the cramped quarters at Dean Street, other *emigres* were beginning to gossip about old father Marx. 'My circumstances are very dismal,' he confessed to his friend Weydemeyer. 'My wife will go under if things continue like this much longer. The constant worries, the slightest everyday struggle wears her out; and on top of that there are the infamies of my opponents who have never yet attempted to attack me as to the substance, who seek to avenge their impotence by casting suspicions on my civil character and by disseminating the most unspeakable infamies about me.

'I, of course, would make a joke of the whole dirty business,' Marx wrote. 'Not for one moment do I allow it to interfere with my work but, as you will understand, my wife, who is poorly and caught up from morning till night in the most disagreeable of domestic quandaries, and whose nervous system is impaired, is not revived by the exhalations by the pestiferous democratic cloaca daily administered to her by stupid tell-tales. The tactlessness of some

individuals in this respect can be colossal.’ What was all that about if not the mysterious conception of little Freddy Demuth? It is noteworthy that Marx doesn’t actually deny the ‘unspeakable’ rumours while deploring the tactlessness of those who broadcast them.^[220]

However, Marx’s acknowledged children did not fare well either. Three of six children died in infancy, while Freddy, luckily given to the care of a working class family, lived a long and satisfactory life.

Eleanor

Eleanor, Marx's youngest daughter, was emotionally stunted by the excessive dominance of Marx's personality. She wrote: 'It is overmuch to have Karl as my father. I do not have my own life'. While engaged in politics and in the theatre, she did not have the emotional stability to see her tasks to fruition. After her father's death she formed a similar emotional dependency on her common-law husband, a morally unscrupulous socialist eminence, Dr. Edward Aveling.

Of Eleanor, H M Hyndman, founder of the Social Democratic Federation, who knew the Marx family well and knew Eleanor since her childhood, stated that she was a tireless promoter of her father. Hyndman writes of Aveling that prior to finding Socialism in 1884 he had been one of the primary Secularists in England. Aveling became a member of the Executive of the Social Democratic Federation, but was not trusted by anyone, including those of his Secularist colleagues who had also joined the Federation. Hyndman stated:

I am bound to say I did not like the man from the first. 'Nobody can be so bad as Aveling looks' was a remark which translated itself into action in my case. In spite of the most unpleasant rumours about his personal character, alike in regard to money and sexual relations, I put compulsion on myself and forced myself to believe that I was prejudiced unduly by his personal appearance, and that his forbidding face could not in truth be an index to his real character. So he became an influential member of our body and had a seat on its Executive, though several old Secularists, who were then with us, distrusted him utterly. Precisely when he and Eleanor Marx decided to live together as man and wife, without the inconvenient restrictions, as they both considered them, sanctioned by modern bourgeois society and its prevailing creed, I do not know; but it is certain that it was widely and strongly felt that Eleanor's friends and relations should have done their utmost to prevent the alliance which ended so terribly for her.^[221]

Aveling had the sociopath's ability to talk persuasively. He was unscrupulous in regard to money and the trust of his colleagues. Hyndman states of these traits:

As to his influence over Eleanor Marx, it can only be said that Aveling was one of those men who have an attraction for women quite

inexplicable to the male sex. Like Wilkes, ugly, and even repulsive to some extent, as he looked, he needed but half an hour's start of the handsomest man in London; and Eleanor, capable and brilliant as she was, could not be spoken of as by any means the only attractive person who had come under his fascination. Some of the scandals arising from this faculty of his were very serious. His proceedings with regard to money entrusted to him were likewise very objectionable. Notably so in the case of the sum subscribed for a cablegram to the Governor of Illinois, signed by a number of very well-known men in different departments of politics and literature begging that functionary at the last moment to pardon Parsons and his co-defendants. Aveling pocketed the money and the cablegram was never sent at all!^[222]

Like Karl Marx, Aveling was a tireless promoter of Socialism, but neglected Eleanor while assuring his own comforts: 'their existence had become exceedingly trying in consequence of his extravagance'.^[223] Despite attempts by the Executive of the Social Democratic Federation to prevent him rejoining the body after he and Eleanor had briefly left to join the short-lived (1884-1885) Socialist League, he was permitted to return due to the support of Socialist luminaries such as 'Liebknecht, Kautsky, Bernstein, Motteler, Lessner, Lafargue, Guesde', who attested to Aveling good character. At the Federation conference in 1886 he received the highest vote of any candidate for the executive.^[224] This seems to indicate what indifference the Socialist leadership and cadres had in regard to soundness of character, Aveling being referred to by Hyndman as a 'downright scoundrel'. Hyndman for his part was clearly embittered to the extent of stating: 'The whole episode increased my own contempt for uneducated and undisciplined democracy'.

Karl Marx's old mentor Engels bequeathed 'a substantial legacy' to Eleanor, but Aveling 'continued his loose life, extravagance, and addiction to strong liquor, and at length, naturally enough, his health gave way seriously'. While recuperating from major surgery, Hyndman asked his wife to visit the Avelings. Eleanor confided in Mrs Hyndman a 'tale she told of the misery and humiliation'. The Hyndmans tried to persuade Eleanor to leave Aveling, but 'she stuck to her consort; took him down to Margate, nursed him, waited upon him, read to him, petted him – when all the time she knew perfectly well that he was only waiting for his convalescence to go off with another woman!',^[225] the actress Eva Frye, whom he had secretly married in 1897.^[226] However, Aveling

persuaded Eleanor that he had been ‘forced to marry another woman’, and that the only way out was suicide. Hyndman relates:

Aveling told Eleanor that the marriage with another woman, of which she had heard, had been forced upon him. There was nothing for it but that they should commit suicide together. How Aveling persuaded Eleanor to adopt this mad course no one has ever been able to understand. She was in perfect health, and, as the post-mortem examination proved, her body with its organs was so sound in every way that she might well have lived to the age of 90 or 100. Not only so, but the very last time I talked with her, before I saw her corpse, apparently asleep and quite unlike death, lying on her bed, she had spoken enthusiastically of the coming time in which she hoped to be more useful to the movement than she had ever been before. She must have been subjugated by some strange hypnotic influence. However that may be, the end came in this tragic way quite unnecessarily.

Aveling, it may be added, had acquired at this time the power of writing so exactly like his wife that it was extremely difficult even for one who knew them both to tell the handwriting of one from that of the other. Personally, I could not distinguish them. Who actually wrote the order for the poison, therefore, nobody can now say. Aveling always declared he did not. But there can be no doubt whatever that Aveling himself took the message to the chemist for the prussic acid and chloroform, which poor Eleanor thought she and he were both to take. At any rate the poison was bought. Eleanor swallowed her fatal dose and died immediately. Aveling did not touch his. He rushed off immediately to the train, went straight to the office of the Social-Democratic Federation in Bolt Court, Fleet Street, and called Lee the Secretary’s attention to the exact time of his visit.

The funeral, which was largely attended, gave Aveling the opportunity for displaying an amount of histrionic grief and real callousness which disgusted everybody; and none were more bitter against him – for the circumstances of Eleanor’s suicide were now generally known – than the foreign Socialists, who had made him out to be a man of the very highest character.

... Aveling inherited what was left of the Engels’ legacy, and within a month or so after having taken up with his new wife he was dead himself.

[\[227\]](#)

Aveling, by all accounts a brilliant man, translator (with Engels) of Karl Marx's magnum opus *Das Kapital* and other works, quickly became an eminence in the Socialist movement through his connection with Eleanor Marx. He was an executive member of the Social Democratic Federation. Splitting from the Federation he and Eleanor with William Morris founded the Socialist League, from which he and Eleanor split to form the Bloomsbury Socialist Society. Aveling was also a founder of the Independent Labour Party, and auditor for the Glassworkers' Union. He and Eleanor toured the USA in 1886 on behalf of the Socialist Labor Party. Despite what was said by those who knew him as to his physical appearance, he had the glibness typical of a sociopath that allowed him to readily manipulate women. Another notable characteristic was his habit of borrowing meagre sums from all and sundry, no matter what their own circumstances, without repaying the debt. Avleing's first marriage had been to an heiress, Isabel Campbell Frank, in 1872, which lasted until 1874. Eleanor was perhaps the most tragic of his victims, persuading her to commit suicide in order that he might go to his secret wife, while also inheriting the remainder of the Engels legacy that had come to Eleanor. Such traits made little difference to most of the Socialist eminences around the world, until the fateful end of Eleanor.

Laura (and Lafargue)

Laura Marx had three children to Paul Lafargue, a French Creole, whom Marx detested because of his Negroid heritage, a detestation briefly restrained when there was a possibility of inheritance from Lafargue's wealthy parents. As a father Marx was as puritanical as any bourgeoisie gentleman of the Victorian era. Writing to the enthusiastic suitor, Marx advised, with an allusion to racial matters that was characteristic of him:

My dear Lafargue,

Allow me to make the following observations:

If you wish to continue your relations with my daughter, you will have to give up your present manner of 'courting'. You know full well that no engagement has been entered into, that as yet everything is undecided. And even if she were formally betrothed to you, you should not forget that this is a matter of long duration. The practice of excessive intimacy is especially inappropriate since the two lovers will be living at the same

place for a necessarily prolonged period of severe testing and purgatory ... To my mind, true love expresses itself in reticence, modesty and even the shyness of the lover towards his object of veneration, and certainly not in giving free rein to one's passion and in premature demonstrations of familiarity. If you should urge your Creole temperament in your defence, it is my duty to interpose my sound reason between your temperament and my daughter. If in her presence you are incapable of loving her in a manner in keeping with the London latitude, you will have to resign yourself to loving her from a distance.^[228]

The couple had three children who all died in infancy. In 1911, at sixty-five years old, 'she and her husband agreed they had nothing to live for and committed suicide'.

On the deaths of Laura and Paul Lafargue, Hyndman wrote:

Strange to say, a few years later, in 1911, [Eleanor's] sister Laura, the wife of Paul Lafargue, came to her end under circumstances almost equally tragic. When *Mme.* Lafargue inherited her share of Engels' fortune, amounting to about £7,000, Lafargue, then an old man, divided it up into ten equal portions – the idea of purchasing a good annuity apparently never occurred to him – and decided that when these came to an end, having reached the age of seventy, he would commit suicide. His wife was determined she would not survive him. So the pair of them went out of the world by their own volition, and were found, both of them, lying fully dressed quite dead in their bedrooms. Lafargue died because, as he said, he could not bear to face the coming period of decrepitude and senility. But he really seems to have prepared poverty quite unnecessarily for himself and his wife, and did not care to live in it. Curiously enough, Lafargue, with all his very considerable ability, never produced a deep impression in Paris.^[229]

Despite the miserable existence to which Marx subjected his family, it was the father to whom the daughters were attached, and his refusal to seek employment did not prevent him from living beyond his means and leeching off Engels. He recounted to Engels how he lived too expensively for his circumstances, but it was the only way his daughters could 'make connections and enter into relations that will ensure their future'. 'You yourself will be of the opinion', wrote Marx to Engels, 'that merely from the business point of view a

purely proletarian arrangement would be unfitting'.^[230] To pay for his daughters' piano lessons, he had pawned the long-suffering Lechen Demuth's shoes.^[231] There was money to be found for the most expensive wines, however, a taste which his daughters had inherited.^[232]

As for the character of Engel's, Hyndman remarked that 'He was a very arbitrary and malignant person was Friedrich Engels, and Mrs Marx, a woman of great ability and charming character, herself told my wife she deeply lamented the influence he had had upon her husband'.^[233]

Necrophilous Personality Disorder

From an early age Marx had exhibited symptoms of Necrophilous Personality Disorder. Among the traits of the disorder are: inability to relate to living people, language that includes numerous death-related words, the belief that resolving conflict necessitates force or violence, and insensitivity to tragedy involving loss of life.

Another of the symptoms of the disorder was Marx's frequent recourse to 'scatological words' in his correspondence with Engels. Dr Nathaniel Weyl, American economist and ex-Communist, writing of Marx states that 'his favourite expression in his correspondence with Engels is "shit"'. His typical description of those he disliked was 'that shit'. His youthful poetry, which so perturbed his father, is characterised by death, decay and destruction:

I shall build my throne high overhead,
Cold, tremendous shall its summit be.
For its bulwark-- superstitious dread,
For its Marshall - blackest agony.^[234]

Till heart's bewitched, till senses reel:
With Satan I have struck my deal.
He chalks the signs, beats time for me,
I play the death march fast and free.^[235]

The hellish vapours rise and fill the brain,
Till I go mad and my heart is utterly changed.

See this sword? The prince of darkness
Sold it to me.

For me he beats the time and gives the signs.
Ever more boldly I play the dance of death.^[236]

To clench and crush you [humanity] with tempestuous force,
While for us both the abyss yawns in darkness.
You will sink down and I will follow laughing.^[237]

'To clench and crush you with tempestuous force' was the aim that the young Marx had for humanity. His ideological rationalisations for this destructive compulsion were manifested several decades after his death in the form of Bolshevism.

Of Marx's character there was general agreement, whether from Marx's

father or from those who observed him closely in politics, such as the Anarchist leader in the Internationale, Mikhail Bakunin, who wrote of Marx:

I eagerly sought his conversation, which was always instructive and witty when it was not inspired by petty hate, which alas! was only too often the case. There was never any frank intimacy between us - our temperaments did not permit it. He called me a sentimental idealist, and he was right; I called him vain, perfidious, and cunning, and I also was right.^[238]

Bakunin observed of Engels in comparison to Marx, that he was 'no less adept at political calumny, lying, and intrigue'.^[239] In a situation of 'like attracts like' Marx evidently formed about him a coterie that possessed the same traits as himself. Bakunin writing of the foul atmosphere of the socialist organisations wherever Marx and his followers entered:

The German workers, Bornstadt, Marx, Engels - especially Marx, poison the atmosphere. Vanity, malevolence, gossip, pretentiousness and boasting in theory and cowardice in practice. Dissertations about life, action and feeling - and complete absence of life, action, and feeling - and complete absence of life. Disgusting flattery of the more advanced workers - and empty talk. According to them, Feuerbach is a 'bourgeois', and the epithet BOURGEOIS! is shouted *ad nauseam* by people who are from head to foot more bourgeois than anyone in a provincial city - in short, foolishness and lies, lies and foolishness. In such an atmosphere no one can even breathe freely. I stay away from them and I have openly declared that I will not go to their *Kommunistischer Handwerkerverein* [Communist Trade Union Society] and will have nothing to do with this organisation.^[240]

12 - Leon Trotsky

Marx's Necrophilic drama was enacted in Russia in 1917, one of the seminal leaders and theorists being Leon Trotsky, whose enthusiasm for terror makes him the Marat of Bolshevism, despite the blame generally being accorded to his nemesis, Stalin. It was Trotsky, like Marat, who laid the ideological groundwork for the Red Terror, and like Marat (who was designated 'friend of the people') Trotsky is generally looked upon as a grandfatherly figure who would have avoided the excesses for which Stalin is held accountable.

Narcissistic Personality

Of Trotsky's character, 'coldness' was a trait remarked upon by his early Marxist comrades, 'the cold glint of his eye... the cold timbre of his voice; the cold correctness and sharpness of his voice'. He spoke not in a conversational manner but as if giving pronouncements. His manner was alienating; he gave 'the pathos of distance'.^[241] His arrogance did not allow room for introspection or admission of personal error. 'He was intensely self-righteous. And he calmly dispensed with people once they had ceased to be of use to him or his cause.'^[242] He was without sentimentality or empathy, commenting when a comrade was imprisoned that he could never feel distress. Grisha Ziv, an early comrade, observed that Trotsky's love for his friends could not go beyond a peasant's love for his horse. He can love his horse and care for it, but as soon as it can no longer work, 'he will unhesitatingly and without a shred of conscience send it to the knacker's yard'.^[243]

Trotsky's lack of interpersonal empathy, as we have seen a common trait among Socialists whose 'humanity' is entirely abstract, extended to his own family. Indeed, given Trotsky's belief that one of the primary aims of Communism is the elimination of the family^[244], his ideology and his personal life were in accord. With the news of his daughter Zina's deteriorating mental condition, and a diagnosis of schizophrenia, he threatened her with 'a complete and final break', while she was receiving treatment in Germany. Zina worshipped her father and longed to be his comrade in the struggle. When she gassed herself in 1933 Trotsky blamed everything on Stalin and attempted to politicise her death.^[245] Zina had written to her mother, Trotsky's first wife Alexandra, whom he had abandoned in Siberia in 1902, blaming her mental ills

on estrangement from her father, whom she ‘adored’. To Alexandra, Trotsky had written attempting to detract attention from his own guilt.^[246] Such a man would have no compunction in dispatching to death anyone who got in the way of his cause.

Trotsky’s psychological traits were those of Narcissistic Personality Disorder: arrogance, conceit, haughtiness, and belief that criticism is a personal attack, exploiting others for personal gain, a self-image of superiority.

Even as an exile in Mexico with few followers in the world let alone within the USSR, Trotsky sought to portray himself as the saviour of the USSR, without whom the Soviet edifice would come crushing down. When the American intellectuals Professor John Dewey and Sidney Hook contrived an official-sounding ‘Commission’ to look into Stalin’s charges against Trotsky, with the view to exonerating Trotsky, one of the Commissioners, Carleton Beals, who did not share the other commissioners’ zeal for Trotsky, observed of him in Mexico:

... above all, his mental faculties are blurred by a consuming lust of hate for Stalin, a furious uncontrollable venom which has its counterpart in something bordering on a persecution complex - all who disagree with him are bunched in the simple formula of GPU agents, people ‘corrupted by the gold of Stalin’^[247].

Indicative of Trotsky’s delusional megalomania and overwhelming narcissism, while powerless and with few supporters, he issued an ultimatum to the Soviet Politburo in 1933, demanding that he and his followers be accepted back into the Bolshevik Party as a separate ‘tendency’:

I consider it my duty to make one more attempt to appeal to the sense of responsibility of those who presently lead the Soviet state. You know conditions better than I. If the internal development proceeds further on its present course, catastrophe is inevitable... ^[248]

Trotskyism, regardless of its meagre following, has through its ideological twists and turns, maintained its presence in both the Old and the New Lefts. In the West is often exists alongside Anarchism as the dominant faction of the Left. However, because of the prevalent Narcissism of its leaders, it is the most factionalising of Leftist currents, as we shall see in the chapter on Britain’s Gerry Healy.

13 - Vladimir Lenin

The physiology of the human brain was of significant interest to the early Soviet leadership. A collection of brains was preserved, with a focus on that of Russians remarkable in the arts and sciences. The Institute of the Brain that was created for the primary purpose of studying Lenin's brain, comparing it to that of Russian geniuses, with the intention of declaring that Lenin was the greatest genius of them all. Lenin's brain was not compared to the brains of ordinary folk, such as proletarians or peasants, but that of the culturally and academically accomplished.

Lenin's Brain Abnormalities

The task to prove that Lenin was an innate genius ran into major difficulties because, at the beginning, the German Oskar Vogt, an internationally eminent scientist, was asked to head the examination, and it was therefore placed uncharacteristically outside of Soviet hands.

The preliminary step was the creation of the V I Lenin Institute, shortly after Lenin's death in 1924.^[249] The Institute was to collect material for the elevation of Lenin to Soviet godhood, which would be symbolised with the embalming of his body^[250] and its display in a stepped pyramid in Red Square.^[251]

With the direction of the study being given to a non-communist German scientist, there were problems insofar as the Soviet apparatus could not control his findings and make them conform to their political requirements. The report on the brain, issued under the auspices of the Institute of the Brain, was not released to the Politburo until 1936, citing indices that show Lenin's supposedly remarkable neuro-physiology behind his genius.^[252] However, Vogt had the year before been citing different conclusions.

The first error in the matter was for Nikolai Semashko, Soviet minister of health, and Ivan Tovstukha, deputy director of the Lenin Institute, to jointly propose that Lenin's brain be sent to Berlin for study to prove Lenin's genius. Vogt worked with the Neurobiological Institute of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Berlin, and he was described by Semashko and Tovstukha as 'the only world expert on this question'. Vogt, who had met with Soviet scientists in February 1924, had stated that it was possible for such studies to 'provide a material basis for determining the genius of Lenin'.^[253] Rather than the entire brain, Vogt was

sent a single preliminary sample. Two ‘communist-physicians’ (sic) were selected to study under Vogt. In 1926, studies also took place under Vogt-trained communist scientists at the Institute of the Brain.^[254] Over the course of several years, Vogt’s predominate role was slowly shifted to the Soviet researchers, and by 1932 the Soviet regime was declaring its antagonism towards Vogt. A Stetskii, not a scientist or a physician but the head of Soviet propaganda, directed the criticism of Vogt on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. In his report on 10 April 1932, Stetskii condemned Vogt, stating:

Vogt’s presentations are of a questionable nature; he compares Lenin’s brain with those of criminals and assorted other persons. Professor Vogt has a mechanical theory of genius using an anatomic analysis based on the presence of a large number of giant cortical pyramidal cells. In the *German Encyclopaedia of Mental Illness*, a German authority (a Professor Spielmaier) claims that such pyramidal structures are also characteristic of mental retardation. In this connection, a number of evil remarks about comrade Lenin have been placed in the bourgeoisie press.^[255]

Stetskii recommended that contact be severed with Vogt and that the specimen of Lenin’s brain be returned to the USSR.^[256] While having problems with the Hitler regime, and no longer holding his position with the Neurobiological Institute in Berlin, Vogt was pushed aside.

Cells of Betz

On 27 May 1936 the Brain Institute in Moscow issued its 153 page report to the Politburo confirming what the party had demanded, that Lenin’s brain showed ‘exceptionally high functioning of the nervous system’, as shown by the large pyramidal cells from the third layer of the cerebral cortex.^[257]

In regard these pyramidal neurons, they were discovered by the Ukrainian anatomist and histologist, Vladimir Betz (*cells of Betz*).

Although the Soviet scientists heralded the finding of these cells in Lenin’s brain as proof of genius, such large neurons are related to mental diseases, such as schizophrenia, where large cell density occurs on both hemispheres of the brain,^[258] and focal cortical dysplasia in epileptics.^[259]

Polish psychiatrist A M Lobaczewski considered Lenin to be a paranoid personality, ‘most probably due to diencephalic^[260] brain damage’.^[261] These

personality traits included Lenin's ruthlessness towards opponents, and his inability to recognise he might be minimally wrong (pathological egotism) with no tendency to attempt to persuade his opponents, but rather to ridicule them before others.^[262]

Neurosyphilis

Lenin was treated for syphilis as early as 1895, at the age of 25, although it is still debated as to whether neurosyphilis was the cause of his death.

In 1923 Lenin was treated with salvarsan, which was the only medication specifically used to treat syphilis at that time. Prof. Witztum writes: 'The trial was successful, but it was stopped because of severe side effects'. Potassium iodine was used with salvarsan; then the usual method of treating syphilis.^[263]

Chief pathologist, Alexei Abrikosov, was ordered to prove that Lenin had not died of syphilis. Abrikosov did not mention syphilis in his autopsy. However, the blood-vessel damage he cites in the autopsy and the paralysis are symptomatic of syphilis. Of the 27 physicians who treated Lenin, only eight signed the autopsy report, despite the tremendous pressure they must have been under. A second report was issued, which does not cite any of the organs, major arteries, or brain areas usually affected by syphilis.

Lertner et al, state:

Lenin's personality clearly changed years before more obvious illness. Early on, he found loud noise unbearable, a symptom I have heard many Lyme (or toxic mold) people report. He also became quick-tempered, irritable and sometimes lost self-control (a norm in spirochete infection).^[264]

Post Traumatic Stress Disorder: Death of Brother Shaped Lenin's Life

Lenin's family upbringing does not include the dysfunction that often marks the background of sociopaths. However, a trauma in Lenin's youth did provide the catalyst for his life's course.

Born Vladimir Ulyanov to a close-knit, middle class, liberal family,^[265] yet one in which the parents were neither radicals nor antagonistic towards the Czar, the man who became Lenin was as a youth apolitical, and proudly described himself as a 'squire's son'.^[266] Despite the closeness and adulation he held towards his eldest brother, Alexander, neither Vladimir nor anyone else in the family knew that Alexander was involved in revolutionary activities until he was

hanged for plotting the assassination of Czar Alexander III, in 1887.^[267]

Dr. James D. White writes of the impact of Alexander's execution on Vladimir and his sister Olga:

Anna Ulyanova records that Sasha's^[268] arrest and execution served to revolutionize both Lenin and – more noticeably – Olga. The actions of Lenin and Olga in the period following Sasha's execution suggest that they had resolved that their brother's death would not be in vain and that they would serve the cause for which he had sacrificed himself – just as soon as they could discover what that cause had been. ...

The task facing Lenin and Olga was to piece together what the ideas were that had inspired Sasha to become a revolutionary. Some light would be thrown on this by Sasha's friend Mark Elizarov, who had also become Anna's fiancé. Both Mark Elizarov and Ivan Chebotarev had been expelled from the university. Chebotarev recalls that when he returned to Simbirsk at the beginning of June 1887 he went to visit the Ulyanov family and was questioned by them, especially by Lenin, about the last days he spent in Sasha's company. Chebotarev says that Lenin was especially interested to know about what had made his brother a revolutionary. We know what Chebotarev thought about this question because he wrote about it in his memoirs published in 1927. In those memoirs he gave prominence to Sasha's membership of the economics study group, and must certainly have mentioned this to the Ulyanovs forty years earlier. What he said could be supplemented by Mark Elizarov, who had also been a member of the study group. From these sources it would be possible to establish Sasha's programme of reading and what the direction of his thinking had been. These were the tracks that Lenin and Olga were to follow.^[269]

From the contemporary accounts White shows that the only revolutionary in the Ulyanov family had been Alexander, and that it was only due to his execution that Vladimir and Olga, who knew nothing of radical politics, sought out those ideas with the intention of redeeming their brother's death. White states further:

The Ulyanovs were a family that had flourished under the tsarist regime, and the Ulyanov children could look forward to careers which would build on their father's success. After the death of Alexander Ulyanov his sister Anna went over in her mind for many years what it could have been in his early life that had inclined Sasha towards terrorism, but could find

nothing of significance. Neither Sasha nor Lenin became revolutionaries through any personal grievance. Sasha became a revolutionary through his sense of loyalty to friends, and Lenin became a revolutionary through his loyalty to his brother. From the time of Sasha's death Lenin tried to model himself on his brother. He had associated with the same people as Sasha, had read the same books as Sasha, joined the same revolutionary organizations as Sasha. He could not be a terrorist like Sasha, because the revolutionary organisations that he joined had rejected terrorism, largely as a result of Sasha's unsuccessful attempt. It cannot be any coincidence that Lenin took the same approach to the future of the Russian economy as Sasha had as conveyed to him by Chebotarev, Elizarov and Bartenev. He knew that Sasha had been impressed by Plekhanov's arguments and that he shared Plekhanov's views on the imminent disintegration of the peasant commune and the prospective development of capitalism in Russia. Lenin's first major theoretical work, his study of the development of capitalism in Russia, would adopt these views and give them a polemical edge.^[270]

Nothing had impelled Lenin to become a revolutionary, neither in terms of his family circumstances, which were comfortable and stable, nor in terms of an analysis of Czarist society. Dr. Figes states that the suggestion that the liberal father exerted influence on his sons and daughters to become revolutionaries is erroneous. Anna Ulyanova recalled that her father was a religious man who admired the reforms of Alexander II during the 1860s and, as a provincial school inspector, sought to keep the young from radicalism.^[271]

The rest of the life of the once apolitical youth who became 'Lenin' was fanatically devoted to avenging his brother's death, and 'Lenin' was the persona that was adopted for the purpose. Lenin had an entire state, and even the prospect of an entire world, upon which to inflict the compulsion to exact a bloody vengeance, projecting the responsibility of his brother's execution onto entire social classes that had to be executed as his brother had been. In Marxism Lenin found a ready-made doctrine of revenge, hatred and destruction, which had been formulated precisely for that purpose by Karl Marx as vent for his own personal 'demons' (to use his father Heinrich's term).

Lenin was suspended from the University of Kazan in 1887 for involvement in a student riot, briefly jailed along with several other students, and expelled from the university several days later. He spent the next few years attempting to

get back into university, but was known as the bother of Alexander Ulyanov, and kept under police surveillance. However, he was able to resume studies at St. Petersburg University in 1890. Such circumstances could only have reinforced Vladimir's feelings of alienation, persecution, martyrdom and resentment, and would further identify him with the martyrdom of his brother.

Hatred, Anger, Revenge

How these factors shaped Lenin's personality is indicated from a reliable source, Peter Struve, originally a seminal influence in Russian Marxism although later rejecting the doctrine. Struve knew Lenin well and observed that the most prominent traits of Lenin's personality were hatred, anger and the need for revenge. He wrote:

The terrible thing in Lenin was that combination in one person of self-castigation, which is the essence of all real asceticism, with the castigation of other people as expressed in abstract social hatred and cold political cruelty. ^[272]

As has been seen with the other Leftist ideologues that have been previously considered, including Marx and Trotsky, and here, Lenin, the concern with humanity is as an abstract concept. There is no personal empathy, and therefore classes and individuals are consigned to death, torture and famine in the interests of an idealised future society that can only be achieved by the destruction of hated normative conventions that have somehow oppressed the matted personality. The masses of victims are given impersonal labels such as 'bourgeois' and 'kulak' and are identified as social pathogens for elimination. Even the sufferings of those who are at the lowest end of the socio-economic scale should not be alleviated, as such reformism would only interfere with the dialectical processes necessary for revolution. Hence in regard to the famine of the Volga peasantry in 1891, Lenin opposed any suggestion within the socialist movement that the peasants should be assisted. In fact, unlike his father, he cared nothing for the peasantry, and according to Figs:

He once even signed himself before the police as 'Hereditary Nobleman Vladimir Ul'ianov'. In his private life Lenin was the epitome of the heartless squire whom his government would one day destroy. In 1891, at the height of the famine, he sued his peasant neighbours for causing damage to the family estate. And while he condemned in his early writings the practices of 'gentry capitalism', he himself was living

handsomely on its profits, drawing nearly all his income from the rents and interest derived from the sale of his mother's estate.^[273]

This discrepancy between Lenin's personal views and life, and his public persona was a trait also possessed by Marx, who, as considered previously, treated his maid in an exploitive manner, and looked upon relatives as sources of inheritance. As a political doctrine Lenin regarded mass suffering as an impersonal historical necessity, stating in regard to the peasantry and the 1891 Volga famine:

By destroying the peasant economy and driving the peasant from the country to the town, the famine creates a proletariat... Furthermore the famine can and should be a progressive factor not only economically. It will force the peasant to reflect on the bases of the capitalist system, demolish faith in the tsar and tsarism, and consequently in due course make the victory of the revolution easier... Psychologically all this talk about feeding the starving and so on essentially reflects the usual sugary sentimentality of our intelligentsia.^[274]

In Lenin we see a trait that is frequently evident among the Left: the lack of personal empathy for humanity including even one's own family, that allows the Leftist to inflict mass suffering in an impersonal manner in the name of 'humanity'.

Post Traumatic Embitterment Disorder

It is only in recent years that a category of mental dysfunction has been identified which traces embitterment caused by perceived personal injustice: Post Traumatic Embitterment Disorder (PTED).^[275] Dr. M. J. S. Wong,^[276] writes:

'This type of reaction is thought to be universal and frequently seen in patients who have had to cope with events of personal injustice, humiliation, frustration, and helplessness'.^[277]

Feeling embittered is a prolonged emotional state of hate and anger caused by the belief that one has been treated unfairly. Emotional embitterment exists in a dimension similar to depression and anxiety, and therefore, when it is most intense, it can become pathological and lead to devastating personal, social, and occupational impairment.^[278]

This is termed 'post-traumatic' because a 'single precipitating life stressor' leading to feelings of unfair treatment instigates it.^[279] PTED, as distinct from life-threatening stressors that cause Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD), occur when an event causes disruptive life changes. PTSD causes feelings of fear; PTED causes feelings of revenge.

The execution of Vladimir's brother is the type of stressor that could cause PTED. While PTED would seem to be an apt description for those lone killers who, for example, undertake multiple killings in revenge for being bullied at High School or dismissed from employment, Vladimir Ulyanov found in Marxism both a rationalisation and a method of satisfying his impulse for revenge and destruction against a whole society that he had regarded since he was a teenager as the cause of his brother's death.

14 - Louis Althusser

One of the pre-eminent Marxist theorists emerging during the 1960s, having joined the French Communist Party in 1948, Louis Althusser sought to update Marxism. His theories have formed the basis for a postmodernist Marxism. He was a founding figure of 'Structuralist Marxism'^[280] or what has been called Althusserianism Marxism,^[281] with the publication of his first essays on Marx in *Le Pen* and *La Nouvelle Critique*, which were collected into his seminal *Pour Marx* in 1965. 'Though this influence is not always explicit, Althusser's work, and that of his students, continues to inform the research programs of literary studies, political philosophy, history, economics, and sociology'.^[282] He has been described by Douglas Johnson, who knew him well since their student days,^[283] and who wrote the 'Introduction' to Althusser's memoirs, as the 'most influential of western thinkers on Marxism' next to the Italian Communist theorist Gramsci.^[284] For New Left youth during the 1960s in particular, 'Althusserianism was the highest stage of Marxism'.^[285]

POW Experiences

Althusser came to Communism via the need for an identity during his incarceration by the Germans for the duration of World War II, mainly at Schleswig, Stalag XA.^[286] He affiliated with the Communists in the concentration camp. The affiliation might be seen as a survival mechanism that extended its duration for the rest of his mentally troubled life. His affiliation prior to this crisis had not been Communism but Catholicism. As a matter of sheer self-interest, affiliation with the Communists, who were the best-organised faction among prisoners-of-war and concentration camp inmates,^[287] would seem the best course. A biographical outline of Althusser states of this period:

Later he said that he found life easy because he enjoyed the comradeship of men and behind barbed wires he felt well protected. After the war Althusser started his studies at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, where, with his sense of coming from a 'different world', he felt of being a complete stranger.^[288]

Here can be seen a sense of alienation and insecurity so deeply felt that Althusser found more security in the ordered and closed life of a German POW camp. Althusser found in Communism the means of recovering a sense of

identity, order and security that he had found as a prisoner. Althusser found freedom after the German prison alienating. Again, as in the prison camp, he sought out Communism as a means of belonging. A few years later he found in Hélène Rytman a mother-figure who could give him security through total dependence.

Upbringing

Lewis states ‘cycles of deep depression’ had afflicted Althusser since 1938. ^[289] He had been born into a Catholic family where the father, Charles Althusser, a bank manager, was seen by Louis as ‘an authoritative, distant figure, whose nightmares and shrieks and occasional violent outbursts terrified him’; ^[290] those nightmares presumably being a legacy of World War I.

For Althusser allegiance to Communism might also be seen as the projection of a conflict between father and son rationalised into an ideology of class struggle: the struggle between the father as the archetypal bourgeoisie, a bank manager, authoritarian, aloof and volatile; representative of capitalism. This family scenario fits Marxian doctrine, which sees the family as inherently repressive. Louis was the downtrodden victim in revolt against patriarchal authoritarianism symbolised by his father. He related in his autobiography that he regarded himself since childhood as ‘constantly the victim’ ‘whose work is his escape from this “tombstone of the non-lieu, of silence and public death”’. ^[291] His Marxism, which was not activated until several years after the war, was his means of projecting his angst onto an entire social order. Althusser’s literary output in his manic periods was his method of therapy in seeking a meaning and an identity.

Interestingly, like the Marxist émigrés of the Frankfurt School who fled from Germany to dominate sociology in the USA during and after World War II, ^[292] a theme of Althusser’s neo-Marxism was its combination with the psychoanalysis of Freud:

His dependence on psychiatry was enhanced by his interests in Freud, and as he embarked on his textual examination of Marx he was struck by its similarity to the work that Jacques Lacan ^[293] was carrying out on Freud. The renowned seminars that the two men held emphasised this parallelism. ^[294]

His ideological biographer, Gregory Elliott, writes of this Freudian-Marxian synthesis proposed by Althusser and Lacan:

Althusser, then, believed that the cause of Marxist materialism could best be defended in the early 1960s in conjunction with aspects of structuralism. That he turned to contemporary French philosophy, as well as to the Marxist classics, for aid in the construction of a post-Stalinist Marxism, is readily apparent from the affiliations he announced to Lacan's anti-humanist re—reading of Freud and especially to Bachelardian 'historical epistemology'. While Althusser was proposing a return to Marx, Lacan was conducting a return to Freud. In an essay dating from 1964 – '*Freud and Lacan*' – which reopened the dialogue between Marxism and psychoanalysis proscribed by Zhdanovism,^[295] Althusser endorsed both Lacan's construction of Freud and his representation of it as a rejoinder to revisionism.^[296]

Immediately after the war Althusser met Héléne Rytman.^[297] She was a Lithuanian-Jew who had been in the French Resistance and had joined the Communist Party during the 1930s. She was later expelled from the Communist Party for Trotskyite tendencies.

Althusser's first sexual connection with Rytman was immediately followed by the first of Althusser's depressive episodes and his admittance to Saint-Anne's Hospital where he was given the first of the electric shock treatments that he was to receive for the rest of his life.^[298] Althusser was for most of his life subjected to what has been described as 'the most aggressive treatments post-war French psychiatry had to offer such as electroconvulsive therapy, narco-analysis, and psychoanalysis'.^[299]

In 1961, the year of Khrushchev's famous repudiation of Stalinism, Althusser became influential as a Communist philosopher, with the publication of his essay '*On the Young Marx*'. He sought a 'de-Stalinization of the Left' that was hard-line rather than what he regarded as the deviation from the Left by the USSR under Khrushchev. This brought him closest to Maoism. He led the pro-China faction within the French Communist Party.^[300]

Murders Wife

During the 1970s and 1980s Althusser's depression became more severe, and after release from hospital he strangled Rytman, whom he had married. Lewis writes of this:

Before he could be arrested for the murder, he was sent to a mental hospital. Later, when an examining magistrate came to inform him of the

crime of which he was accused, Althusser was in so fragile a mental state that he could not understand the charges or the process to which he was to be submitted and he was left at the hospital. After an examination, a panel of psychiatrists concluded that Althusser was suffering at the time of the murder from severe depression and iatrogenic hallucinations. Citing a French law (since changed), which states that ‘there is neither crime nor delict where the suspect was in a state of dementia at the time of the action’, the magistrate in charge of Althusser’s case decided that there were no grounds on which to pursue prosecution.^[301]

Althusser strangled Rytman in their rooms at the École Normale Supérieure, and on 16 November 1980 at 8 or 9 am ran into the courtyard in his pyjamas and dressing-gown, shouting repeatedly, in a confused and demented state: ‘my wife is dead’. He had strangled her while massaging her neck, and then had a mental blackout.^[302] By the time the police arrived university colleagues had already taken him to Sainte-Anne’s mental hospital, where he had been previously treated.^[303]

After a two-month enquiry by a panel of three psychiatrists, Althusser was sent to Sainte-Anne’s, where he experienced ‘confusion’ and ‘hallucinations’.^[304] Althusser stayed at Saint-Anne’s hospital until 1983, when he was released and permitted to live by himself, walking the streets of northern Paris, shabbily dressed, and confronting strangers with outbursts.^[305]

The last ten years of Althusser’s life were spent in frequent hospitalisation and heavily medicated. He died of a heart attack in 1990 at La Verrière, west of Paris.^[306]

Oedipus-Type Conflict as Basis of Althusserian Marxism

Despite his ongoing mental state Althusser continued to be widely discussed as a ‘fashionable Marxist’ with ‘powerful connections’.^[307] He was often disputatious even within the Communist Party, partly due to his adherence to Maoism.^[308]

Althusser’s symptoms, including his moments of creative output together with his frequent episodes of severe depression, hallucinations and finally the murder of his wife, indicate manic-depressive (Bipolar I) psychosis.

In his autobiography *The Future Lasts Forever*, written several years after his release from Sainte-Anne’s hospital, Althusser returned to the theme that shaped his life, a feeling of depersonalisation. As previously noted, Althusser

came out of a World War II German POW camp with a sense of alienation and of being one of a ‘missing’ generation. His release from Saint-Anne’s left him with the same feeling as ‘those victims of world wars and disasters who are reported missing’:

If I speak of this strange situation it is because I have experienced it and to a certain extent experience it still. Even though I have been out of psychiatric hospital for two years, I am still a missing person for the public who have heard of me. I am neither alive nor dead and, though I have not been buried, I am ‘bodiless’. I am simply missing which was Foucault’s splendid definition of madness.^[309]

This sense of ‘bodilessness’ however was not a symptom that was caused by either the POW experience or the release from Saint-Anne’s. Althusser traces it back to his birth. He had been named after his father Charles’ brother, Louis, whom his mother had intended to marry. In contrast to Charles, Althusser speaks of uncle Louis – whom he could not have met - as a man of much warmth. However, when the two brothers went to war, Louis did not return,^[310] and she married Charles instead. Whereas his mother’s relationship with Louis had been a platonic intellectual idyll, and Althusser was to later remark about the burden of sexual organs,^[311] Charles returned to war, and left Althusser’s mother ‘robbed, raped, and shattered; physically brutalised, deprived of the savings she had patiently accumulated...’^[312] He was to always regard his mother as a ‘martyr, bleeding like a wound’. He also saw his mother not only as suffering for her husband ^[313]and for the home, but also as both ‘a masochist’ and ‘dreadfully sadistic’. Althusser’s perception was that she wanted both her husband dead – despite Charles’ ‘worshipping’ her - hardly the tyrant Althusser conjures - as well as himself, as Charles was ‘associated’ with his brother’s death, and ‘she could not help wanting me dead, as the Louis she loved was dead’.^[314]

Althusser’s predicament is reminiscent of Rousseau’s insistence that his father resented him because of the death of his wife soon after Rousseau’s birth, despite the affection that young Rousseau received from his father. Likewise, Althusser baselessly assumed that his mother must have wanted him dead because he was not the ‘Louis’ she wanted.

Althusser’s *Oedipal* castigation of his father as a tyrant seems to be based on Charles’ having insisted on the normative gender roles between husband and wife which placed her at the centre and organiser of the home, children, education, and holidays, in which Charles would seldom interfere.^[315] Althusser

alludes to this as ‘the role to which he [Charles] had confined her’, albeit one which did not preclude her playing an outspokenly assertive role even in the public company of her husband.^[316] ‘Confronted with her terrible pain’, Althusser had regarded his mission in life as devotion to his mother, ‘body and soul’, to relieve his enormous sense of anguish and guilt; ‘an unshakable conviction’ that this was the meaning of his life.^[317] To Althusser, his father would remain an unbearable authoritarian given to occasional violent outbursts.^[318] However, it was not the ‘occasional outbursts’ that Althusser ‘feared’ from his father but his being a man of few words.^[319] Nonetheless, he was also a witty conversationalist among friends,^[320] and it seems that Charles was to his son many things, none of which Althusser could find to be acceptable.

Charles was the great scapegoat for Althusser’s lifelong angst. Jacques Lacan (who collaborated with Althusser in the formation of a Marxian-Freudian doctrine) insisted on the primary importance of the Oedipus complex.^[321] Ideologically, the father becomes the symbol of the State, patriarchy or capitalism, which must be overthrown. The mother is symbolic of the oppressed, who must be saved by the son. This became an unconscious motive of some elements of the New Left, which adopted a combination of socialism and psychiatry, while for Jewish elements the mother was seen as the oppressor.

Althusser detested his Christian name, Louis, as being too short and as suggesting the meaning ‘yes’, ending with a sharp ‘ee’.^[322] Louis, being the name of the dead uncle, also ‘above all, contained the sound of the third person pronoun (“lui”) which deprived me of any personality of my own, assuming as it did an anonymous other... it was him my mother loved, not me’;^[323] ‘a dead man’s name’.^[324]

If he hated his father, his attitude towards his mother was ambivalent: the feeling of trying to redeem himself before her for being the wrong Louis, and yet one of disgust when his mother commented with pride on his having reached manhood when he began to wet-dream at thirteen. The mother’s prideful discovery filled young Althusser with ‘shame’, ‘degradation’ and ‘a sense of rebellion’, and a feeling of being ‘raped’, feelings that stayed with him his entire life:

It was truly a form of rape and castration. I had been raped and castrated by my mother, who felt she had been raped by my father (but that was her affair, not mine). Family fate was indeed inescapable. But the horror of what happened was intensified by the fact that my mother pattered this

obscenity and behaved so unnaturally in considering it to be her duty (whereas it should have been my father who did it).^[325]

Althusser's ambiguous attitude towards his mother included erotic feelings, yet it was the dead Louis whom she loved through her son.^[326]

Being raised in early childhood in Algeria where his father managed a bank, Althusser longed for friends but his mother forbade it. He arrived at school with his Moorish maid, young Louis dressed 'prim', but feeling ashamed for appearing rich and privileged (despite the family's poor circumstances).^[327] Yet when he attended the high school at Algiers he was conscious of his being among rich boys being taken to school in chauffeured cars.^[328] Again, there was the feeling of self-inflicted isolation, this time based on class, and a perception that he did not fit anywhere; neither among rich nor poor.

It has been objected by Althusser apologist Gregory Elliott that Althusser's philosophy should not be judged on ad hominem depictions of its creator as a madman:

'I am one thing, my writings are another', proclaimed Nietzsche in his putative autobiography.^[329] The point applies to Althusser, as to any other thinker: the genesis, the structure, the validity, and the effectivity of a body of thought are analytically distinct issues for any inquiry that aims at something other than ad hominem incrimination or exculpation of ideas.^[330]

Elliott criticises the headlines of the Western press at the time of Althusser's murder of his wife, such as 'Marx and Murder' and 'A Marxist Murderer', with the general tenor of 'Marxism=Madness=Murder'.^[331]

Yet an entire school of Leftist sociological and psychoanalytical interpretation has been formulated around the concept of the Right and even of normal, 'conservative' values, such as loyalty to family and affection for parents, being interpreted as symptoms of mental ill-health, and of latent 'Fascism'. 'Lunatic fringe' is routinely used to label anything broadly non-Left, Nazism is portrayed as a manifestation of psychopathy,^[332] and anything of the 'Right' as a manifestation of Nazism, or as being latently Nazi. Hence for example even the Conservative Member of Parliament, Enoch Powell, made 'infamous' for his 'rivers of blood' speech when trying to warn of the dangers of alien immigration into Britain, was compared to the Nazis by the Labour Party stalwart Tony Benn, who stated: 'The flag of racialism which has been hoisted in Wolverhampton is

beginning to look like the one that fluttered 25 years ago over Dachau and Belsen'.^[333] Such comparisons are essential components of Leftist smear tactics, yet there is indignation when, as Gregory Elliott protested in regard to the murder by Althusser of his wife, some of the press equated Marxism with murder and madness, although the approximately 100,000,000 victims of Communism^[334] attest to Marxism as an intrinsically psychopathic creed.

The question to be asked is whether Althusser's personality can be detached from his ideology? Was his neo-communist doctrine formulated through empirical evaluations of history, or as a projection onto the world of his Oedipal struggle rationalised as class struggle? The fact that, like the Frankfurt School of Adorno et al, Althusser synthesised Freudianism with Marxism indicates that he saw in Marxism a therapeutic working-out for his own mental torments. Althusser's strangulation of his wife, who served as a proxy for his mother, was his individual act of revolutionary liberation, yet one in which the supports of his very existence were self-destroyed.

15 - Mao Zedong

Mao Zedong has often been accorded relatively good media in the West, even during the Cold War era. His early days were portrayed in heroic terms by Western journalists such as Edgar Snow, whose *Mao Tse-tung Autobiography* and *Red Star Over China*, became the standard texts on the subject.^[335] Mao regarded Snow's *Red Star Over China* as one of his most significant propaganda victories.^[336]

When Mao broke with the Kremlin he was heralded by anti-Stalinist Leftists and particularly by the youth-based New Left, who saw in him the romantic revolutionary hero that had been portrayed by Snow. His portrait appeared among the New Left alongside other romanticised revolutionaries such as Che Guevara and Ho Chi Minh. Robert Service states of this that, 'In the late 1960s if a popularity poll had been taken among the [French student] protestors Lev Trotsky, Mao Zedong, Ho Chi Minh and Che Guevara would probably have headed the list', while there was widespread disgust with the USSR from the time of Stalin.^[337]

An added attraction among the deracinated youth of the New Left was that Mao, like Ho and Che, could be portrayed as part of a Third World revolt against White imperialism led by the USA, while the USSR was too 'White' for the purpose. Indeed, that was an image that Mao's China cultivated among Communists and the Third World^[338] after very few Communists in the Western states broke with the USSR to follow Mao.^[339]

Yet if few of the Western Communist parties were willing to reject the USSR and follow Mao, there were plenty of Establishment Leftists who were willing to sing the praises of Mao, and being a Maoist in academia has never had the stigma of being, for example, a Conservative. When Mao died Australian Labor Party luminaries memorialised him as a great and humane statesman. Australian Labor leader Gough Whitlam said: 'Under Mao's leadership, the Chinese people found the strength for a prodigious effort of revolutionary struggle.... he was the authentic father of his people and the new China'. Australian Labor Party deputy leader Tom Uren said: 'Mao was a great leader, a brilliant revolutionary thinker.... an outstanding patriot... by the people of China he was not only respected, he was loved'. Liberal party and later Independent Member of Parliament, Billy Wentworth, on the other hand, was more precise in

his estimation of Mao:

Maoism has subjected the Chinese people to an alien ideology and has denied them all their traditional life and culture. It has demanded the rejection of all family ties and accepted decencies, culminating in its assault on Confucianism. For religion it has substituted the ritual nonsense of the *Little Red Book*...^[340]

Mao's Early Years

What type of being was Mao, who has enjoyed, until recently,^[341] a relatively idealised image? What were the traits that attracted Mao to Communism and to exterminating one-tenth of the population of China^[342] in decades of famines and purges?

Mao from his youth possessed the traits of sociopathy. He was born into a 'relatively well off'^[343] peasant family in 1893.^[344] At eight he went to live briefly with his dotting maternal grandmother. He did 'a little light farm work'.^[345] A trait that already emerges is Mao's lifelong abhorrence of physical labour, which he successfully avoided.^[346] Mao went so far as to say to his father Yi-chang that the old man should do more menial work than his son, 'an unthinkable insolent argument by Chinese standards'.^[347]

Hatred of Father

Although excelling at studies, from this young age he quarrelled with tutors, and ran away from his first school at 10. He was expelled or asked to leave four schools. This caused much tension with his father.^[348] Mao had a hatred of his father, who was a hard working peasant, expecting diligence from his son in his studies.^[349]

Mao's hatred of his father was redirected in the sadism that was to be inflicted on his opponents. Chung and Halliday write:

In 1968, when he was taking revenge on his political foes on a vast scale, he told their tormenters that he would have liked his father to be treated just as brutally: 'My father was bad. If he were alive today he would be "jet-planed"'. This was an agonising position where the subject's arms were wrenched behind his back and his head forced down.^[350]

Mao's adoration of his mother and hatred for his father never left him. While payment for Mao's tuition was the only means old Yi-chang had of trying to influence his son, Mao used more dramatic means to rebel against paternal

authority. Mao recounted much later a row he and his father had in front of guests. His father called him 'lazy and useless'. Mao called him names and left the house, his father pursuing him, demanding that he return.

'I reached the edge of a pond and threatened to jump in if he came nearer... My father backed down'. Once, as Mao was retelling the story, he laughed and added an observation: 'Old men like him didn't want to lose their sons. This is their weakness. I attacked at their weak point, and I won!'^[351]

What emerges in Mao's youth is a conflict between father and son and the contempt for the fatherly figure that is a feature of other Leftist psychopaths. Given that Confucianism made the family the foundation of the Chinese social structure, Marxism provided the means of destroying that foundation, as it has for many others of both the Old and New Lefts.

When Mao turned sixteen, as soon as his first wife through an arranged marriage, had died, he left home to pursue his education, rather than that of his father's wish for him to be apprenticed at a rice store.^[352] As for many in the Western world, the life of a perpetual student afforded someone with an aversion to menial labour the opportunity to spend many years loafing.

Mao later claimed that when he was a boy in his birthplace of Shaoshan he had been stirred by the plight of the poor peasants. He formulated a legend that he had come to a social conscience under the influence of P'ang the millstone Maker, who had been beheaded after leading a local peasant revolt. Attempts by Communist Party researchers to identify P'ang have been unsuccessful.^[353] Mao as the heralded leader of the biggest peasant rebellion in history under the banner of the Communist Party, is pure fantasy. Rather, Mao had nothing but contempt for the peasantry. Chang and Halliday write:

There is no sign that Mao derived from his peasant roots any social concerns, much less that he was motivated by a sense of injustice. In a contemporary document, the diary of Mao's teacher, Professor Yang Changichi, on 5 April 1915 the professor wrote: 'My student Mao Tse-tung said that... his clan... are mostly peasants, and *it is easy for them to get rich*' (our italics). Mao evinced no particular sympathy for peasants.^[354]

Mao made few references to the peasantry even as a Communist. His reference to the peasantry in 1917 was to express admiration for the suppression

of the Taiping Rebellion of 1850-64, and the way by which a commander, Tseng Kuo-fan ‘finished [them] off’.^[355] Here we see an expression by Mao of admiration for power *per se*. In 1919 Mao wrote a student essay about people from different classes, with only a blasé reference to peasantry, but a focus on the supposed plight of students, whose lives were lived as ‘a sea of bitterness’. It is typical adolescent angst and self-pity for imaginary suffering, giving a privileged youth a sense of martyrdom where none existed, a trait also typical of the youthful foundation of the New Left in the West and of current protest movements composed mainly of petty bourgeoisie youth who ‘suffer injustices’ vicariously by taking up the causes of others. The same year, when drafting a list for research comprising at least 71 items, only one involved labour, and with that only one of 15 subheadings mentioned the peasantry.^[356]

Entry into Revolutionary Politics

Mao only began mentioning peasantry and labour as abstract concepts after he joined the Communists in 1920.^[357] He evinced no empathy towards peasants, menial workers, or anyone else. In 1921, a year after he had affiliated with Communism, Mao was in famine stricken Changsha. A friend wrote in his diary of the beggars who looked like skeletons wrapped in yellow skin. Mao, despite his claims of concern for the suffering peasants, made no mention of this famine.^[358] For someone to have been living amidst such conditions, and to have never recounted it as of any significance, indicates the absence of empathy typical of the sociopath, which we see as a significant trait among leading Leftists.

As a student of 17 Mao got caught up with the Republican revolution of 1911, in keeping with the student trend, and wrote his first political essay, which he posted up at his school.^[359] However, his experience as a volunteer of the Republican army was brief, as he did not like drilling or chores such as carrying water, ‘which he hired a water vendor to do for him’.^[360]

After a few months with the army Mao briefly attended another high school. Like Marx, instead of pursuing an occupation, he intended to wile away hours at the provincial library. His father threatened to cut off Mao’s allowance unless he returned to school. Mao entered a teacher-training college. It was here, in a college based on Western ideas that Mao first heard of Communism.^[361] It provided the means by which he could destroy the things he detested. A fellow student related that Mao proposed burning all prose and poetry collections after the Tang and Sung dynasties ‘in one go’.^[362] Chang and Halliday comment, ‘This is the first known occasion when Mao mentioned one theme that was to

typify his rule – the destruction of Chinese culture’. This was a time when everything was being questioned, including the very existence of nations, families, marriage, and private property.^[363]

Sociopathic Ideology

During 1917-1918 Mao began studying German philosopher, Friedrich Paulsen.^[364] Mao’s marginal notes in his copy of Paulsen’s *A System of Ethics* express the amorality of a sociopath being intellectualised. Halliday and Chang write:

Mao’s attitude to morality consisted of one core: the self, ‘I’, above everything else: ‘I do not agree with the view that to be moral, the motive of one’s action has to be benefiting others. Morality does not have to be defined in relation to others... People like me want to... satisfy our hearts to the full, and in doing so we automatically have the most valuable moral codes. Of course there are people and objects in the world, but they are all there only for me’.

Mao shunned all constraints of responsibility and duty. ‘People like me only have a duty to ourselves; we have no duty to other people’. ‘I am responsible only for the reality that I know’, he wrote, ‘and absolutely not responsible for anything else. I don’t know about the past, I don’t know about the future. They have nothing to do with the morality of my own self’. He explicitly rejected any responsibility toward future generations. ‘Some say one has a responsibility for history. I don’t believe it. I am only concerned about developing myself... I have my desire and act on it. I am responsible to no one’.

Mao did not believe in anything unless he could benefit from it personally. A good name after death, he said, ‘cannot bring me any joy, because it belongs to the future and not to my own reality.’ ‘People like me are not building achievements to leave for future generations’...^[365]

Mao was only concerned with the instant and how he lived in it. Hence, he did not even make pretence as to idealism and concern for future generations. That façade would come on a colossal scale with his leadership of the Communist Party and of China. The ‘Great Heroes’ of history, he wrote, of whom he assumed himself to be one, were not constrained by morality, which ‘must be swept away by the great impulse in their nature’. The power of these

‘Great Heroes’ is ‘like a hurricane arising from a deep gorge, and like a sex-maniac on heat and prowling for a lover... there is no way to stop them’.^[366]

This is the mentality of the sociopath rationalised as a philosophy, which Mao approvingly compares with the will-to-power of a rapist. In Marxism, which aims at the destruction of all normal morality, Mao and masses of other Leftists, found the creed of the compulsive liar, the thief, the murderer, and the rapist elevated to philosophical justification. Such Leftist sociopaths have more than individuals or immediate communities upon which to prey: they had entire nations and populations of millions upon which to wreak suffering for their own gratification, in the name of ‘liberty, equality, fraternity’, or ‘the dictatorship of the proletariat’.

In rejecting the ideal of Harmony (*da tong*) of Confucianism, Mao regarded ‘giant wars’, and destruction as not only natural but also desirable; something to be admired. Reading about wars makes history ‘great fun’; the periods of peace are ‘boring’. Again, Communism was to provide Mao with the means of enacting periods of great destruction and death in China through ongoing purges and campaigns such as the ‘Great Leap Forward’ and the ‘Cultural Revolution’.

Aversion to Labour

Despite the propaganda legends about Mao and his struggles, he always tried to keep himself a safe distance from not only menial labour but also from danger. Even during the ‘Long March’ (1934) heroically eulogised in Maoist propaganda, Mao was carried most of the distance.^[367] Mao was a hedonist who knew nothing of struggle or suffering other than to delight in inflicting it upon others.

Hedonism

Mao’s lifestyle, despite humble appearances for the public, was typical of a megalomaniacal potentate, showing the traits of Narcissistic Personality Disorder. He led a life of ‘royal self-indulgence, practised at tremendous cost to the country’, ‘as soon as he conquered China’.^[368] Over his 27-year rule, over 50 estates were created for him, many of which were never used. They were set in sumptuous locations. Entire areas such as Jade Spring Hills outside Peking or the Western Lake in Hangzhou, and the enormous seaside resort at Beidaihe, were closed off for his personal use. His swimming pools were kept heated all year at tremendous cost and waste of valuable fuel, in case he should decide to swim.^[369]

Often historic buildings were torn down to make room for constructions that were bullet-and bomb-proof, some with nuclear shelters.^[370] All the buildings were single storey, as Mao feared being trapped upstairs, although these were constructed sometimes as high as 50 feet, reflecting Mao's sense of grandeur.^[371] Such was Mao's fear for his own safety that when he flew all other planes in China were grounded, and when he took his trains, all other trains were stopped within the area.^[372] This attests to Mao's obsessive fear of death that went beyond rational security measures, in contrast to his eagerness in inflicting suffering on others.

His gastronomic demands likewise went to the grandiose. A special fish from Wuhan had to be couriered alive 1,000 km in a plastic bag filled with water and kept oxygenated. Rice membrane between the husk and the kernel had to be meticulously saved, and once when claiming that he could not taste the membrane he thought he had developed beriberi. A farm was established to grow Mao's rice, as he thought the water in the area, which had supplied the imperial courts, was the best. Other farms and plantations were established especially for Mao's taste in milk, poultry and tea. All food was tested and tasted. Stir-fried dishes had to be served immediately, but since the kitchen was located at a distance so that the cooking smells would not waft toward Mao, the servants had to hurry to his table from the kitchen with each dish.^[373]

Yet throughout Mao's 27 year reign the peasantry existed on subsistence rations, Mao having stated that peasants only need '140 kg of grain, and some only need 110'. The peasants starved regardless of the success of harvests. Peasants were given the option of buying grain back from the state, but Mao was constantly berating officials for allowing 'too much' to be sold back, and urging them to cut the amount 'enormously'. Mao's answer to peasant starvation was to educate them to eat less, 'to have more thin gruel', and to eat sweet potato leaves, which were traditionally used only for pig feed. This bloated tyrant, who insisted that rice membrane was extracted for his palate, instructed that 'the State should try its hardest ... to prevent peasants eating too much'.^[374] During the mid-1950s State requisitioning of produce resulted in famine, with reports of peasants eating tree bark and abandoning their babies, and many committing suicide. Mao's attitude was that people were only without food for 'six... or four months' of the year so there was no justification for complaint. Mao demanded that State response against complaints or resistance should be brutal. To those Communists who suggested leniency, Mao stated that they had 'too much mercy, not enough brutality, which means they are not so Marxist'. 'On this

matter we indeed have no conscience. Marxism is that brutal'.^[375]

Mao, despite his love of swimming, did not like getting into baths or showers, and did not have a bath for a quarter of a century. Instead, servants rubbed him daily with a hot towel.^[376] He did not like dressing in new clothes, and had his bodyguards wear in new shoes. His bathrobe, face towel and quilt were heavily patched. However, such quirks were not emblematic of a simple life but the life of 'the hedonistic super-powerful', as the patching was undertaken by the best craftsmen, costing more than new items.^[377]

Mao established an ultra-Puritanical state in sexual matters. Being caught masturbating could result in the culprit being publicly humiliated. Couples separated through the demands of work were only permitted a few days leave a year to see one another. From 1953 Mao, however, had his own female elite guard selected from the Red Army entertainment troupes, which army chief Peng De-huai termed 'selecting imperial concubines'.^[378] Mao's philandering had begun in the 1940s, much to the distress of his wife, who brutally redirected her distress on her staff.^[379]

Cultural Revolution: China Gripped by Mass Sociopathy

Mao's repudiation of past or future for only the present, and only his own present, could be achieved via the Communisation of China, where the destruction of the traditional Confucian ethos with its veneration of ancestors and family could be intellectualised as part of some great ideal for the benefit of humanity. This repudiation of the past and of tradition implies repudiation of culture itself. It is a 'revolt against civilisation' in a precise sense. In China the destructive impulse was unleashed via the youth of the Red Guards during the late 1960s. Again the motive was Mao's sociopathy, imposed on an entire people. On the ruins of Chinese culture, including the primary historical figures such as Confucius, was built the cult of Mao elevating him to godhood.

In August 1966 the newly created Red Guards were unleashed to destroy the culture and beliefs of their elders. The first atrocity was the killing of a fifty-year-old mother of four who headed a girl's school in Peking. She was kicked and trampled by the girls and had boiling water tipped over her. She was compelled to carry bricks while she was beaten with heavy leather army belts with brass buckles, and with nail studded sticks. 'Red August' proceeded accordingly.^[380]

One of the girls who had led the sadism against the headmistress of the girl's

school was honoured by Mao, who counselled the girl: ‘Be violent’, and the girl whose name Song Bin-bin meant in part ‘Gentle’, changed her name to ‘Be Violent’. The girl’s school was renamed ‘The Red Violence School’. [\[381\]](#)

In the schools fellow pupils set upon children in a junior class struggle.[\[382\]](#) These youngsters were Mao’s army against their parents. On 23 August Mao declared that ‘Peking is too civilised’. The Red Guards, with their symbolic weapons of sticks and brass buckled belts, fell upon their first victims; several dozen of China’s leading writers at the courtyard of the Peking Writers Association.

Additionally, the Red Guards were used as looters for Mao and his entourage. Here again we can see that common criminality, albeit on a mass scale, was masked behind the pretext of idealism. Thousands of houses were raided by the Red Guards, and their occupants tortured and murdered. Tons of looted gold, silver, platinum, jewellery and millions of dollars in hard currency, priceless antiques, paintings and ancient books were stolen. Mao’s entourage could take their pick of the valuables. ‘Madame Mao selected an 18-carat gold French pendant watch, studded with pearls and diamonds, for which she paid the princely sum of 7 yuan’. Kang Sheng, one of the primary architects of the Red Terror, sent some of his hand picked Red Guard looters to steal rare books, and these lined the walls of his mansion.[\[383\]](#)

Apart from being a façade for theft, the ‘Cultural Revolution’ was intended to destroy all remnants of traditional culture. It was considered dangerous to have books or anything of a cultural nature in one’s home. Many public monuments associated with China’s past were destroyed, including 4,922 of Peking’s 6,843.[\[384\]](#) On 24 August the first statue was smashed: a Buddha in the summer Palace in Peking. The home of Confucius in Shandong, which had been turned into an impressive museum over the centuries, was wrecked by the Red Guards, after locals showed lack of gusto for the work. Chung and Halliday comment that Mao hated Confucius because the great sage ‘enjoined that a ruler must care for his subjects’, and as Mao himself put it, “Confucius is humanism... that is to say, People-centred-ism”.[\[385\]](#)

The head of this destruction of culture was Madame Mao, who ensured until Mao’s death in 1976 that the only art, theatre, music and books that existed were propaganda devices extolling Mao.[\[386\]](#)

Mao’s Death Mania

In his notes on Paulsen, Mao claimed to be indifferent to death, as it is part of nature, the greatest adventure, ‘the strangest thing’, ‘wonderful, drastic change’. Such an outlook, with the lack of human empathy typical of the sociopath, was enacted with the deaths of around 70,000,000 during Mao’s reign.^[387] However, Mao was most averse to dying and tried whatever he could to delay it. As his health drastically dissipated over several years his thoughts were on his mortality and he would cry pitifully.^[388] Even as his life ebbed, he still feared being overthrown by a coup and hung on to power,^[389] and therefore did not appoint an heir apparent.^[390] He had written as a 24 year old of his concern only for his own greatness in the present, and the manner by which he conducted himself until the end shows that he had always been guided by the misanthropic doctrines he had formulated in his youth.

From 1950-1953^[391] cadres in every province were ordered to execute anyone suspected of ‘counter-revolution’.^[392] Mass executions were undertaken in public, as a means of inducing mass terror among the population. In Peking 200 people were brought before a crowd, and were shot in the head so their brains splattered over the bystanders.^[393]

A feature of the purges under Mao was the public display of torture and execution. The first senior minister tortured to death was the minister of coal, on 21 January 1967. He was brought before crowds, and had his arms twisted back – ‘jet planed’. On another occasion he was put onto a bench, shirtless in below freezing temperature, while he was rushed at and pierced with small knives. A huge iron stove was hung about his neck, dragging his head down to the floor, where ‘his skull was bashed in with heavy brass belt buckles’. During these tortures photographs were taken which were shown to Chou En-lai and ‘doubtless to Mao’.^[394]

Mao derived personal satisfaction from the torture of his enemies, ‘laughing heartily’ at descriptions of the widely used ‘jet plane’ torture.^[395]

Thirty-eight million died during ‘The Great Leap Forward’ and the famine. Mao’s attitude towards the deaths and sufferings of others remained constant since his student days. At the 1958 Party congress that inaugurated ‘The Great Leap’ Mao declared that the party should celebrate death. Here he also said that a world war would not be disastrous for China, even if half the population were annihilated; there would still be sufficient survivors. He had previously stated that 300 million Chinese deaths (about half the population) would be acceptable. Later the same year Mao stated that deaths of peasants fertilise the ground, and

orders were given to plant crops over burial grounds, causing much distress among the peasant folk.^[396]

In 1958 Mao stated that 50 million might die in the mass labour projects, but told his entourage: 'I could be fired, and I might even lose my head... but if you insist, I'll just have to let you do it, and you can't blame me when people die'.^[397] As always, Mao thought only of Mao, and warned that if there was a reaction against his homicidal policies, it would be his underlings who would be scapegoated.

16 - Trotskyism in Britain:

Healy's Sex Cult

Trotskyism, while never having attained a popular following anywhere, including in Bolshevik Russia, has nonetheless been able to sustain itself as a constant element in both the Old and New Lefts by its accommodation to new trends. Hence, the Left in general long having given up on the proletariat as a revolutionary force, has focused on agitating for the 'rights' of sundry minorities, and has attached itself to feminism, gay politics, 'green', immigrant and 'indigenous' campaigns, ad infinitum, in what is called 'identity politics'.^[398] The strategy is no longer that of 'class struggle' but of recruiting alienated groups.

Trotskyism however is weakened as much by the narcissism of its current leaders, as Trotsky himself was incapable of working with other Bolshevik leaders. Therefore, factionalism among Trotskyites is acute, and ego-based grouplets sprout up continually, each claiming the sole mantle of the real Trotsky. For decades one of the primary ideologues and organisers of Trotskyism was Gerry Healy who turned Trotskyism into a personal cult for the gratification of his libido and his ego.

Gerry Healy (1913-1989) began his political career in the Communist Party of Great Britain, left to join the Trotskyite 'Militant Group' in 1937, and left that to help establish the Workers International League. This joined with the Revolutionary Socialist League to form the Revolutionary Communist Party (RCP), with the encouragement of the American Socialist Workers Party. Healy formed a faction within the Labour Party. In 1950 the RCP voted itself out of existence and joined Healy to form The Club. In 1953 Healy sided with the American Trotskyite faction of James Cannon, and became a leader of the International Committee of the Fourth International. In 1959 The Club was reorganised as the Socialist Labour League, which became the Workers' Revolutionary Party in 1973.^[399] The following year a faction of several hundred led by trades unionist Alan Thornett were expelled by the WRP and formed the Workers Socialist League. While Healy's faction was minuscule, it maintained influential contacts within the Labour Party, such as Ken Livingston (later Mayor of London) and George Galloway (Member of Parliament, and now leader of the Respect Party), and was subsidised by Middle Eastern sources, and

wealthy supporters such as the actors Vanessa and Corin Redgrave.

Gerry Healy's Trotskyite Career

In 1985 the WRP factionalised amidst revelations that Healy had been a serial rapist, who had imposed himself on dozens of female acolytes over the course of decades. A minuscule Healy faction formed the Marxist Party with the support of the Redgraves. The remainder of the WRP formed what is now the Socialist Equality Party.

Healy maintained a cult following within Trotskyism, which says something about the psychological makeup of rank-and-file Trotskyites, and the self-effacing mentalities of the many woman Trotskyites who were raped by Healy and said nothing, despite the vociferous support Trotskyism gives to feminism. Also typical of a cult leader, Healy maintained a lavish lifestyle while demanding financial sacrifices by his followers. Matgamna writes:

At the centre of a machine where no-one could make him take account of anything he wanted to ignore, Healy slowly went mad — or, if you like, retreated into such a childish, me-centred solipsistic view of the world that it came to the same thing. For example, by the late 1960s the SLL was turning up at 100,000-strong anti-Vietnam-war demonstrations with leaflets asserting that the marches were a conspiracy by the press to boost the march organisers at the expense of great Marxists like Healy! ...

Healy was always, even in his best days, given to paranoid self-importance and paranoid fear of the State, and now his derangement got completely out of control. A terrible panic seized him during the 1974 miners' strike that led, on February 28th, to the dismissal of the Tory Government by the electorate. At one stage members of the organisation were instructed to hide their 'documents' because a military coup was only days away. Living the life of a millionaire if not a pasha, while members of the SLL/WRP often went short so that they could finance the organisation, and it was not unknown for full-time workers for the organisation to go hungry, Healy concentrated more and more on expounding a pseudo-Marxist, pseudo-Hegelian goobledook ...

In appearance, Healy was extraordinary. Small—perhaps 5 feet 2, or 3, inches — and pudgy, he had an enormous, disproportionately large (or so it seemed), high-coloured head, with only thin strands of hair on it, looking like they had been painted on with an eyebrow pencil. [\[400\]](#)

Paranoia and Narcissism

What the Marxist commentator is describing above is the typical cult leader personality, complete with paranoia and narcissism. The tactics used by Healy to impose his form of communist discipline were those of group criticism and self-criticism, a brainwashing technique perfected especially in Maoist China to maintain group conformity, and also used widely among the New Left, as described below: Matgamna writes of the cultic control mechanisms used by Healy to maintain his authority, which seem little different from those of another Marxist, Reverend Jim Jones:

[Healy] dominated his organisation by uninhibited brute force. The ‘cadre’ of the group came to be the product of ‘selection’ — survival— through a never-ending series of savage sado-masochistic rituals, involving the pillorying, hounding, denouncing, then self-denouncing and self-prostrating at one time or another of most of the hard core.^[401]

What is apparent is what the Freudian-Marxist social scientists of the Frankfurt School, termed the ‘authoritarian personality’. Ironically, these Freudian-Marxists applied the term to those with conservative morals, whom they regarded as latent ‘Fascists’. Social scientist John Ray however provides an alternative model, distinguishing between ‘irrational authority’ and ‘rational authority’. Given the slapstick factionalism that continuously occurs among the Left, particularly among Trotskyites, the group dynamics at work are predominantly:

The narcissism of the leaders, without the ability to compromise for the sake of unity.

The ‘irrational authoritarian personalities’ of the rank-and-file. The extent of the neurosis within Leftist movements is indicated by the compliance of dozens of women followers in allowing themselves to be raped by Healy, while others permitted themselves to be subjected to his violence.

Sexual Abuse of Women Comrades

In 1985 Healy’s corruption was finally exposed. It had been of long duration. A detailed biography on Healy states:

The final nail in Healy’s political coffin was the eruption of a sexual scandal centring on his corrupt relations with women comrades. Again,

there was nothing new in this. Back in the early 1950s, Healy had been in trouble after propositioning the daughter of a prominent figure in the Fourth International. In 1964 an SLL control commission had been held over Healy's relationship with a leader of the Young Socialists. And one of the background issues to the 1974 split in the WRP was the rejection of Healy's advances by a woman supporter of Thornett. All of this, however, had been kept from the membership, the majority of whom reacted with shock and outrage after Healy's corruption was exposed in a letter by his long-time secretary Aileen Jennings.^[402]

What is of particular interest is the recognition that Healy had been running his organisation along cultic lines where his female comrades felt obliged to submit to Healy as a revolutionary duty. This says as much about the mentalities of the rank-and-file as it does about Healy.

What was the character of this sexual abuse? It was later stated that the women Healy pressurised into having sexual relations with him 'mistakenly believed that the revolution – in the form of the "greatest" leader demanded this, the most personal sacrifice of all. They were not coerced ... physically, but every pressure was brought to bear on them as revolutionaries'. The situation was 'not so much rape but ... sexual abuse by someone in a position of power and trust'. It was, Dave Bruce comments, 'wholesale sexual corruption in a manner analogous to these religious sects. There's a very close parallel'.^[403]

Redgrave biographer Tim Adler also commented on the cultic nature of Healy's movement:

Like all leaders of cults, [Healy] maintained his personal domination by isolating members from their families and the outside world. ... At the age of 73, the squat and unattractive Gerry Healy had been accused of 'gross sexual misconduct' and expelled by the Party he'd founded. It turned out that he'd had sex with at least 26 comrades, and — in the words of the West Croydon branch — had 'turned women into his sexual slaves'. As trades unionist Roy Lockett revealed: 'He told the girls it was their revolutionary duty.' ... It also transpired that he'd slept with the daughter of two of his closest friends and then beaten her up, leaving her almost crippled.^[404]

Vanessa Redgrave, starting as a typical middle class liberal, had been brought to Trotskyism by her brother Corin. Both, like Healy, had a paranoid-

delusional view of politics, and were convinced that Britain would become a fascist state after a military coup:

...The actor Simon Callow remembers Corin screaming that Heathrow airport was about to be surrounded by tanks as a prelude to a military coup', while Vanessa 'was warning Britain that it was being prepared for dictatorship and concentration camps, and calling on workers to take power through armed insurrection'... Former trades unionist Roy Lockett recalls that the WRP 'thought troops were being mobilised. I remember Waterloo Bridge was closed for repairs and this was believed to be the first move to seal off London'.^[405]

Vanessa's sister Lynn considers her to have had a martyr complex from a young age. She began reading Lenin at the suggestion of Corin. He introduced her to the WRP at a time when she was suffering depression from her break-up with Franco Nero.^[406] Adler writes:

Meanwhile, Vanessa became perhaps the only person to have been driven to drink by industrial relations policy. In 1972, when Ted Heath imposed statutory wage controls, she started drinking cheap wine in the mornings. Its 'fuzzy obliteration', she said, helped her cope with her despair.^[407]

Adler comments on another important aspect of the psychology at work in the Healy movement: 'Aside from its radical politics, part of the appeal of the WRP for the Redgraves was its leader, Gerry Healy, who became a kind of father figure'.^[408] The cult leader will typically act as a substitute father. The People's Temple members called Jim Jones 'Dad'. The cult recruit often comes from a background where parental relationships are dysfunctional. However, according to the Marxian-Freudian social scientists of the Frankfurt School, we are assured that close attachments between parents and children are 'unhealthy' and lead to 'fascism'. Hence, the Marxist assault on the family as a 'bourgeois institution' leaves the Marxist State or the Marxist leader to fill the void and command total emotional dependency beyond the purely political. In this context it is interesting that the WRP Women's Commission later contended that Healy's abuse was 'a form of incest'. 'To accuse Healy of criminal rape, one of his victims pointed out, was 'to denigrate and patronise the large number of women cadres ... who were persistently sexually abused by Healy. It is to say they accepted being raped – some for 20 and more years'.^[409]

Women victims insisted that they had been abused by Healy as a father

figure, in an incestuous relationship, not as a ‘criminal rapist’. Rape implied that the women were helpless victims, which as supposedly liberated feminist Marxists, they could not accept. They rationalised their dependency upon Healy in terms of his fatherly authority, while he reinforced this authority by instilling them with a sense of ‘duty’ to aid the revolution by fulfilling his needs. The Women’s Commission adopted this rationalisation as the Party line.

Vanessa and Corin Redgrave: Healy Devotees

While the Redgraves sought out a substitute father in Healy, Vanessa’s own connection with her children for the sake of her cause, suffered. The careless attitude towards one’s children is a notable feature of Leftists. We have seen it since the time Rousseau dumped his children, when Marx cared more for his writings than for the misery in which his wife and children lived, and as will be seen, the way New Leftists readily disposed of their children to pursue the revolution.

Adhering to ideologies that claim children are better looked after by the State or by the group is an intellectualisation for reneging on one’s parental responsibility by those who are not really capable of parental bonding. As State policy, once Marxists achieve power, the answer is to demolish the traditional family and raise the children as State wards, enabling the mother to work. The Left regards this as ‘women’s liberation’. Vanessa’s children, like many other ‘orphans’ of Leftist parents, were sacrificed for the sake of the revolution. Adler writes:

Her small daughters, Joely and Natasha, would cling to her as she tried to get out of the front door. When she was six, Natasha asked her mother to spend more time at home. Vanessa tried to explain her political struggle was for the future of her daughter and other children. ‘But I need you now. I won’t need you so much then,’ said Natasha^[410].

In a scenario reminiscent of Karl Marx himself, ‘...she gave so much of her money away to the WRP that the family was short of cash. Their house in West London began to look unloved, the garden overgrown’.^[411]

With the demise of Healy and the further splintering of Trotskyism, Vanessa has returned to the typically middle-class liberal causes from which she began. Assessing her attitude toward others Vanessa cogently describes a fundamental hypothesis of this book, that the Leftist’s humanity is abstract and impersonal. As she once confided to Lynn: ‘My paradox is that though I care a great deal for

the masses — the orphans in Vietnam, the starving in India — I seem to care little about the individuals around me. I've resisted that accusation. But, quite bluntly, it's me.'^[412] The quote has been cited previously, but merits repeating. It says much about the Leftist.

Healy's Expulsion

Healy's decades of exploitation and abuse of women were only exposed because of a factional dispute between himself and WRP assistant general secretary Sheila Torrance (who nonetheless ended up supporting Healy). She was heard screaming at Healy before a meeting of the Political Committee: 'You're twisted, this time you're going to come unstuck, I'll take it to conference and then you'll see'. To head off expulsions from the WRP by Healy, rivals named 26 women whom he had abused. The reaction of the Healy faction indicates further mental disturbance. Healy devotee Vanessa Redgrave 'was screeching at the top of her voice that this was the work of the Black Hundreds', according to WRP organiser Richard Price, who remarked in an interview: 'That's a memory I cherish'.^[413] The 'Black Hundreds' were an anti-Jewish organisation operating in Czarist Russia during the late 19th century. The allusion by Redgrave indicates how delusional Marxists become. Vanessa called a press conference and raged: 'These allegations are all lies and the women who are supposed to have made them are all liars. I don't care whether it's 26, 36 or 236 — they're all liars.'^[414] So much for The Sisterhood. Vanessa's brother reacted just as bizarrely as his sister, Corin exclaiming at a Party meeting: 'We are neither for nor against corruption, we are for the socialist revolution.'^[415]

Torrance, who had made the original charges, now regarded Healy's escapades as a strictly personal matter; and she worried that her own faction, associated with the Healy faction, would be weakened by Healy's expulsion.^[416] At this London headquarters meeting, despite Healy's victims and their relatives being present, he received a majority vote in his favour. After the meeting WRP Secretary Mike Banda, stomped around the yard of the premises raging: 'Everyone in the country supports me except this rubbish in London'.^[417] Throughout the meeting, Banda's supporters had been shouting 'Rape, Rapist, Pol Pot', 'and all of them were red in the face, they were wild'.^[418]

Healy considered his exposure to be a 'provocation' and quipped that he had 'many friends'. Like Jim Jones, prior to the suicide of 900 of his followers,^[419] it is the reaction of a sociopath who cares nothing for others and cannot see any blame attached to himself.

The party was narrowly split, Healy still commanding just under half the membership. Thereafter, physical attacks occurred against Healy supporters, and Healy was well guarded, one Healy supporter being partially blinded in an assault by a WRP Central Committee member.^[420]

In late 1986, with Healy coming to the conclusion that Mikhail Gorbachev should be supported because of his 'de-Stalinisation' of the USSR,^[421] Torrance and her faction moved to expel Healy from their WRP rump. The Healy-Redgrave faction left with about 40 members, leaving about 150 in the WRP. The Redgraves with Healy founded the Marxist Party in 1987, while another faction left the WRP to form the Workers International League. After Healy's death in 1989, a faction broke away to form the Communist League.^[422] The constant factionalising of the Left is itself indicative of the group dynamics of narcissists, whether in minuscule grouplets or as leaders of Marxist states.

17 - New Left: New Psychosis

Maoism, as discussed above, provided the new generation of the Left with a romanticised alternative to Stalinism, which seemed dangerously close to ‘Fascism’.^[423] In particular the USSR had emerged like a new White empire rather than as the citadel of world revolution, while Trotskyism was able to manoeuvre itself into the New Left with its anti-Stalinist credentials. The Vietnam War galvanised privileged White and Jewish American youth into the ‘New Left’, and with Mao were added as the new revolutionary icons Ho Chi Minh, Che Guevara, and even North Korea’s Kim Il Sung.^[424] These White Gentile and Jewish middle class youngsters were primarily acting up against their parents; which was intellectualised into a political ideology. This aberration seems akin to self-flagellation and submissive masochism, to the extent that the children of wealthy White Christian and Jewish families eagerly sought the company of Black militants, such as the Black Panther Party. They shouted, along with their new-found brothers and sisters from the ghettos, slogans about killing white children, whom they called ‘pigs’, and ‘white motherfuckers’. To be seen with tough ghetto Negroes gave the children of the privileged – among whom there were a disproportionate number of Jewish nerds with domineering mothers - a sense of machismo.

White Panthers

The White Panther Party explained the doctrine of the New Left in a manner free of the intellectualisation of Tom Hayden’s *Port Huron Statement* of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS).^[425] The White Panthers were founded in 1968 as a white support group for the Black Panthers. The White Panthers issued a manifesto that is worth citing in full:

Our program is Cultural Revolution through a total assault on the culture, which makes us use every tool, every energy and any media we can get our collective hands on. We take our program with us everywhere we go and use any means necessary to expose people to it. Our culture, our art, the music, newspapers, books, posters, our clothing, our homes, the way we walk and talk, the way our hair grows, the way we smoke dope and fuck and eat and sleep — it is all one message, and the message is FREEDOM!

We are the mother country madmen in charge of our own lives and we are taking this freedom to the people of America, in streets, in the ballrooms and teen clubs, in their front rooms watching TV, in their bedrooms reading underground newspapers, or masturbating, or smoking secret dope, in their schools where we come and talk to them or make our music, in their weird gymnasiums — they love it! We represent the only contemporary life-style in America for its kids and it should be known that THESE KIDS ARE READY! They are ready to move but they don't know how, and all we do is show them that they can get away with it. BE FREE, goddamnit, and fuck them old dudes, is what we tell them, and they can see that we mean it.

The only influences we have, the only thing that touches them, is that we are for real. We are FREE. We are a bunch of arrogant motherfuckers and we don't give a damn for any cop or any phony-ass authority control-addict creeps who want to put us down. For the first time in America there is a generation of visionary maniac white motherfucker country dope fiend rock and roll freaks who are ready to get down and kick out the jams — ALL THE JAMS — break everything loose and free everybody from their very real and imaginary prisons — even the chumps and punks and honkies who are always fucking with us.

We demand total freedom for everybody! And we will not be stopped until we get it. We are bad. There's only two kinds of people on the planet: those who make up the problem and those who make up the solution. WE ARE THE SOLUTION. We have no problems. Everything is free for everybody. Money sucks. Leaders suck. School sucks. The white honkie culture that has been handed to us on a silver platter is meaningless to us! We don't want it! Our program of rock and roll, dope and fucking in the streets is a program of total freedom for everyone. We are totally committed to carrying out our program. We breathe revolution. We are LSD driven total maniacs of the universe. We will do anything we can to drive people crazy out of their heads and into their bodies.

ROCK AND ROLL music is the spearhead of our attack because it is so effective and so much fun. We have developed organic high-energy guerrilla bands who are infiltrating the popular culture and destroying millions of minds in the process. With our music and our economic genius we plunder the unsuspecting straight world for money and the means to

carry out our program, and revolutionize its children at the same time. And with our entrance into the straight media we have demonstrated to the honkies that anything they do to fuck with us will be exposed to their children. We don't need to get rid of all the honkies, you just rob them of their replacements and let the breed atrophy and die out.

We don't have guns yet — not all of us anyway — because we have more powerful weapons — direct access to millions of teenagers is one of our most potent, and their belief in us is another. But we will use guns if we have to — we will do anything — if we have to. We have no illusions. Knowing the power of symbols in the abstract world of Americans, we have taken the White Panther as our mark to symbolize our strength and arrogance.

We're bad.

White Panther Party 10-Point Program

1. Full endorsement and support of Black Panther Party's 10-Point Program.^[426]
2. Total assault on the culture by any means necessary, including rock 'n' roll, dope and fucking in the streets.
3. Free exchange of energy and materials — we demand the end of money!
4. Free food, clothes, housing, dope, music, bodies, medical care — everything free for everybody!
5. Free access to information media — free the technology from the greed creeps!
6. Free time and space for all humans — dissolve all unnatural boundaries.
7. Free all schools and all structures from corporate rule — turn the buildings over to the people at once!
8. Free all prisoners everywhere — they are our brothers.
9. Free all soldiers at once — no more conscripted armies.
10. Free the people from their "leaders" — leaders suck — all power to

all the people! Freedom means free everyone!

— John Sinclair,
Minister of Information, White Panther Party
November 1st, 1968^[427]

The White Panther program is marked by infantile references and the adoption of ghetto jargon, such as the word ‘motherfuckers’. The appeal is to a generation war rather than the class war of the Old Left because the guilt-ridden middle and upper class white Gentile and Jewish youths who formed the majority of the New Left regarded the white proletariat as part of the ‘white power establishment’, and later, with the rise of feminism, as part of the ‘white patriarchy’. The focus is on sex, drugs and music. The program is one of nihilism rather than Marxism, and reflects Immature Personality Disorder,^[428] combined with sociopathic references to guns, violence and the death of ‘honkies’. There is a self-conscious realisation of mental disorder, rationalised as rebellion, with self-descriptions such as ‘LSD driven total maniacs of the universe’, and ‘visionary maniac white motherfucker country dope fiend rock and roll freaks’.

Supporters of White Panthers founder John Sinclair, included John Lennon, Yoko Ono, and Stevie Wonder, who held a rally for the release of Sinclair on marijuana charges in 1971. After his release that year Sinclair dissolved the White Panthers, and formed a Communist group, the Rainbow People’s Party,^[429] which continued to focus on Sinclair’s predilection for marijuana.^[430]

Adolescent Temper Tantrum

The New Left was a post-pubescent generation having a temper tantrum at their parents, and like the Old Left, was rationalised with an ideological façade. Typical of teenagers and those who are older but still struggling with maturity, the New Left was focused around two primary elements:

An adolescent tantrum to show one’s independence from parental authority, which was rationalised, generalised and redirected into rebellion against the ‘white male middle class’ ‘Establishment’. It was therefore, like many who have turned to both Old and New Left’s, indirect aggression against parent(s).

Typically adolescent attitudes towards sex, intellectualised as an ‘ideology’ of ‘sexual liberation’, which usually meant the freedom of males to prey upon females within the ‘movement’ in the name of

repudiating middle class, parental morality.

These two features of the New Left were given legitimacy by academics such as those of the Frankfurt School who had sought to portray Leftist beliefs as 'healthy' and the conservative values associated with one's parents as repressive and neurotic. Additional to the Frankfurt School were academics such as Professor Abraham Maslow, in particular, whose 'humanistic psychology' taught that the youth revolt was an essential part of one's 'self-actualisation'.^[431] These social scientists portrayed the 'New Left' as a mass form of psychotherapy against the 'repression' of one's parents and their 'Establishment' politics and morals.

'Rational' and 'Irrational Authority'

The latent 'Fascist' traits of the 'authoritarian personality' described in the seminal study, *The Authoritarian Personality* by Adorno et al, are actually the normal values of any healthy society, such as respect for parents. However, other psychologists and social scientists, albeit less well publicised and funded, have raised the question of there being a 'rational authoritarianism' such as in the 'teacher-student relationship, the rejection of which indicates psychopathy and sociopathy'. Martin^[432] and Ray^[433] write that in 1961 Rudin^[434] sought to distinguish between rational and irrational authoritarianism, however:

The Rudin scale seems to have generated little interest within psychology, perhaps because the *Zeitgeist* of the postwar decades has been actively in favour of conceiving permissiveness versus authoritarianism as the dominating factor distinguishing different types of socialization and social organisation. In this worldview special approval is reserved for anti-authoritarianism which is regarded as a distinguishing mark of the liberal mind.^[435]

Authority is a many-faceted element in experience however, and it is not conceptually satisfying to regard acceptance of any and every form of authority (without distinction as to time, place or situation) as indicative of incipient Fascism and necessary prejudice. There seems to be a reasonable basis for Rudin's argument that acceptance of the authority of people judged to have greater competence than one's self in a particular area is different from the tendency to accept authority indiscriminately.^[436]

The surveys of Martin and Ray of heads of households (male and female) in Perth, Australia, in 1962, showed 'that little or no relationship exists between

tendency to agree with items expressing “rational authoritarianism” and indices of psychopathology or social disadvantage’. Conversely, ‘We may conclude that agreement with items that express attitudes antipathetic to “rational authoritarianism” is related to a variety of characteristics known to occur with psychopathy and sociopathy’.^[437]

Psychopathic traits were found in those who were both pro-authoritarian and anti-authoritarian, in regard to ‘rational’ and ‘irrational; ‘authority. ‘Rejecting the right kind and’, state Martin and Ray, ‘accepting the wrong kind of authority appear to be equally indicative of social and personal inadequacy’.^[438]

What can be said in regard to the New Left, and to the youthful sections of the Left today, is that they were rebelling against ‘rational authority’, specifically in terms of the parent-child relationship and the teacher-child relationship. Specific examples of psychopathy among the New Left will be considered here, in terms of the ideology, actions and personality traits of the main players.

Rebelling Against Jewish Mothers, WASP^[439] Fathers

As has been shown previously, Mao Zedong and his leading apologist within the French Communist Party, Louis Althusser, both had dysfunctional relationships with their fathers; and Karl Marx was indifferent towards the feelings of his doting parents. All expressed a sociopathic lack of empathy towards even those who were close to them. The New Left politicised hatred of one’s parents to the point of some factions advocating patricide and matricide. The disproportionate number of young male Jews within the New Left has been studied as a symptom of feelings of male emasculation among Jewish boys in families typically ruled by domineering mothers.

The New Left phenomenon began with the foundation of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) by Alan Haber and Tom Hayden in 1962. Hippies, Yippies, and Black militants from the ghettos soon joined these originally rather conservative-looking students. Added to affronting the norms of their parents by promiscuous sex and drugs were increasingly strident calls for violence, for killing the ‘pigs’ (police), riots against the property of ordinary shopkeepers and in the end what amounted to 5,000 bombings across the USA (1968-1970), and the killing of public officials. This was what the New Left called in reference to the Vietnam War, ‘bringing the war home’.

From the clean-cut and well-dressed youth of the original SDS the New Left

within several years became synonymous with filth. Lack of personal hygiene is marked trait of mental illness, which was noted in Karl Marx throughout his life. To the New Left hippies and Yippies it was a conveniently lazy form of 'rebellion' against conventions.

All through the Left we have witnessed a hatred of at least one parent that is intellectualised as an ideology that claims the family is a control mechanism of the bourgeois class. Trotsky regarded the two primary aims of Communism as the destruction of religion, and of the family. The New Left was the most extreme expression of a rebelling against one's parents, and more abstractly against the perceived 'values' of one's parents that were or are supposedly maintained by the political, moral, social, economic and religious 'Establishment'.

Sections of the New Left became increasingly self-marginalized, reminiscent of cults such as that of Jim Jones, as actions against the 'Establishment' became more extreme. Groups such as the Weather Underground in the USA and the Red Army Faction (Baader-Meinhof Gang) in Germany became collectively psychotic. These were the precursors of the youthful anarchists of the present, such as the Black Blocs in Europe and North America, although the urban terrorism of the Red Army Faction and Weathermen are seldom matched.

Differentiating Separatist from New Left Terrorism

The 'New' Left is a form of rebellion that is distinct from other forms of rebellion, again with the difference being centred on the perception of one's family. While the young White Gentiles and Jews in the New Left deprecated their parents and aimed to overthrow any sense of tradition as a legacy of parental values, to the extent of chanting about killing one's parents, their allies among the Black militants had motivations that were quite different. Blacks, Muslims, Palestinians, and separatist radicals such as the Basque ETA and the Irish Republican Army, claim to be fighting to honour their parental legacy. White Gentile and Jewish youths in the Left, on the contrary, want to repudiate history, to destroy tradition, and custom as the legacy of their parents. Whatever else might be said for or against separatist militants, their motivations are the opposite of those of the deracinated and rootless activists in the Old and New Lefts. The contrast is striking when one compares the manifestos of the previously mentioned White Panthers with their supposed 'brothers' in the Black Panthers.

Psychologist Jerrold M. Post draws this distinction between ‘anarchist-ideologues’ such as the Italian Red Brigades and the German Red Army Faction or Baader-Meinhof Gang and ‘nationalist-separatists’ such as the ETA or IRA. Studies have been undertaken that enable a comparison between ‘anarchists’ and ‘separatists’:

Post points out that the social dynamics of the ‘anarchic-ideologues,’ such as the RAF, differ strikingly from the ‘nationalist-separatists,’ such as ETA or the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA). From studies of terrorists, Post (1990) has observed indications that terrorists, such as those of the ETA, who pursue a conservative goal, such as freedom for the Basque people, have been reared in more traditional, intact, conservative families, whereas anarchistic and left-wing terrorists (such as members of the Meinhof Gang/RAF) come from less conventional, non-intact families. In developing this dichotomy between separatists and anarchists, Post draws on Robert Clark’s studies of the social backgrounds of the separatist terrorists of the ETA. Clark also found that ETA terrorists are not alienated and psychologically distressed. Rather, they are psychologically healthy people who are strongly supported by their families and ethnic community.^[440]

The separatists see their mission as the legacy of their fathers, while the ‘anarchists’ are retaliating against the imagined hurts against the society of their parents. Post regards this distinction as reflecting more psychopathy among the ‘anarchist’ factions than among the ‘separatists’. Post states that:

There would seem to be a profound difference between terrorists bent on destroying their own society, the ‘world of their fathers,’ and those whose terrorist activities carry on the mission of their fathers. To put it in other words, for some, becoming terrorists is an act of retaliation for real and imagined hurts against the society of their parents; for others, it is an act of retaliation against society for the hurt done to their parents.... This would suggest more conflict, more psychopathology, among those committed to anarchy and destruction of society....^[441]

Post bases his conclusions on an analysis of a socio-psychological study of 250 terrorists (227 left-wing and 23 right-wing) undertaken by a group of West German social scientists sponsored by the Ministry of Interior during the 1980s. The West German report on the Red Army Faction and June Second Movement terrorists found that 25% of the Leftist terrorists had lost one or both parents by

the age of fourteen and 79% indicated severe conflict with other people, particularly with parents (33%). Post concludes that 'nationalist-separatists' such as ETA are loyal to parents who are at odds with their government, whereas 'anarchic-ideologues' are disloyal to their parents' generation, which is identified with the 'Establishment'.^[442]

Projection as a Political Doctrine

The New Left added war against a generation to the Old Left's class struggle. Since most of both the leaders and the followers of the New Left were from privileged backgrounds, they intellectualised their revolt against the white middle class by perceiving their youth as giving them a sense of alienation from the privileged position of their parents. In this way, white middle class youths could convince themselves that they are just as much 'victims' of the white, middle class 'Establishment' as ghetto Blacks and could join with the Black Panthers in expressing hatred of their own race and class. They sought to consciously alienate themselves from their origins and project their feelings of adolescent angst against parents onto a political system.

The defence-mechanism known as projection, where the individual shifts blame for unadmitted shortcomings onto others, including institutions, was politicised by the Left to create a generation of revolutionaries. The method had been intellectualised by the University professors who taught the doctrines of the Frankfurt School and of humanistic psychology, that the ethics, morals and authority of one's parents were repressive, passé and outright unhealthy. Adolescent tantrums and infantile grievances were turned into political grievances. The New Left expressed the adolescent demand for immediate ego-gratification. The normal phenomenon of an infant or adolescent temper tantrum was intellectualised as 'rebellion' against the 'Establishment' that had been erected and sustained by one's parents. Psychologist Harry Walker Hepner observed projection as a foundation of the Left:

The process of ascribing to another person or institution the burden of our own repressions is commonly referred to as projection. The person who perceives in other people the traits and motives that he cannot admit in himself is probably using the mechanism of projection.

This is exemplified in the student protests that reflect a youthful insistence that the behavior of others should be completely consistent with the highest ethical standards. It is much easier for the student who is

disillusioned with himself to point out the shortcomings of others than to examine his own failures and the extent that he should be blamed for his failures. The individual whose adjustment patterns are more balanced puts the expressions of his efforts into constructive programs, not into merely more condemnations.^[443]

Dr Hepner observed of the Left in general, which he refers to as ‘liberal’, as comprising a significant number of maladjusted individuals who projected their own inadequacies in political guise:

The fanatical reformer and chronic accuser are often unpopular among intelligent people, and the unpopularity is partly deserved. If one has a normal desire to improve the world, he will tend to do it in a quiet and tactful manner rather than by beating his chest and crying his aims from the housetops. The clinical psychologist who visits so-called liberal clubs is often amused by the large percentage of members who have not grown up emotionally and are projecting their own maladjustments upon a conjectured monster, such as the economic or political system. Many of these club members are so maladjusted that they are unable to analyze modern problems objectively. Some prate glibly about cooperation and sharing with others when they themselves are rank individualists who emotionally could not cooperate even though they might individually wish to do so. We can rest assured that when our economic or political system does evolve into a better stage, its evolution will have been brought about by balanced personalities, and not by the self-styled projecting liberals.^[444]

As we shall see, the reminiscences of Left-wing luminaries such as Tom Hayden show that Hepner’s observations were correct. Hayden, in relating his marriage to actress Jane Fonda, states that ‘intimacy had been fleeting at best with my parents, my friends, my lovers. My history was one of broken connections’.^[445] He feared losing control over himself to another. Hayden, in comparison to individuals such as Abbie Hoffman, Jerry Rubin, et al was relatively balanced, yet even he recognised his inadequacies, as one of a leadership coterie who lived for an ideal that was supposedly based on intimate connections among the whole of humanity. Again, we see the distance between the ideal and the real, among the individual spokesmen of the Left: love for the whole of humanity is sufficiently abstract to not require specific individual intimacy. The Leftists can ‘love humanity’ as a theory, but not connect

intimately with individuals in real life. This is why Leftists have for several hundred years, if we take the time from the French Revolution, sought to exterminate entire classes in the name of 'humanity' and have a clear 'conscience', or 'revolutionary conscience'.

Hence the Leftist will also project his own perversity onto his ideological opponents. Leftists routinely condemn the brutality of capitalism, or of 'fascism', 'nazism', 'racism', 'imperialism', the 'Right', etc., while legitimising the seldom paralleled brutality of Jacobinism, Bolshevism, Maoism, Khymer Rouge, *etc.* The enemy is demonised and becomes an abstraction that can be subjected to any brutality or vilification. Projection is a key means of demonising 'the enemy'.

Leftist Histrionics

Leftist personality types – marked most commonly by narcissism to greater or lesser degrees - are prone to histrionics and exhibitionism. Considering that the New Left is a collective and rationalised temper tantrum against the normative values that are associated with the 'older generation' the analogy between the average Leftist protester and a toddler stamping his feet because ego gratification is not satisfied instantly has been noted by observers. The degrees of severity of personality disorders will determine the importance of an individual in a movement, the more severe the disorder the more likely the individual will be in a leadership position due to excessive zeal. Hence, the leadership cadre of a Leftist movement is likely to be sociopathic, psychotic or include extreme narcissism, which explains why Leftist groups factionalise so easily over minor issues. The rank and file membership will have a high proportion of neuroses, and histrionic personality disorder (seeking attention through excessive emotional reactions).

The following are particularly evocative comments by several conservative sources observing the New Left of the 1960s. Although the descriptions are politically biased, the reader is invited to compare them with their own observations of the Left, whether directly or via television news footage, one recent example for comparison being the 'Occupy movement':

The Classics Professor Revilo P. Oliver, a conservative academic among the many 'progressive' academics who applauded the sit-ins, riots and vandalism of their students on campus, described the student riots during the 1960s:

... You will not have failed to recognize in them rabid beasts grown

insolent with long impunity. You saw also the rioting swarms of young creatures that had crawled out from the woodwork of the University of California and other tax-supported institutions of 'higher learning'. You had an opportunity to study their hate-contorted faces.

...It will be instructive to observe how many are deformed in body or feature as well as mind, and, if you approach near enough, you can see the hatred glistening in beady eyes. (For a close approach, a handkerchief sprinkled with ammonia will minimize the discomfort.)

You can see the species wherever you look. And with just a little patience and dexterity, you can make all but the most hardened and experienced disclose their inner emotions - perhaps in a spate of verbiage, but at least for a moment in an unguarded word or glare in the eyes; and you will feel like a swimmer who has glimpsed, six fathoms down, the flat, greenish flicker of a turning shark.

You can see them on television, on the floor of Congress, and in their pulpits; you can read them in the Press. And you need have no doubts. ... You can no longer fancy that they are just ignorant 'intellectuals' with mixed-up ganglia. They are lying. They are lying with conscious calculation. They are lying with murderous intent.

You cannot mistake them when, in your very presence and with breathtaking effrontery, they discharge the diseased hatreds and homicidal lusts that fester in their gangrenous little minds.

From direct observation, you, as an American, can now recognize your enemy and know what he is. And if ever you are tempted to doubt the evidence of your own eyes and ears, remember that such monsters are no novelty—that in the brief span of man's sad and dolorous history one can find almost innumerable instances of recrudescing savagery and of the frenzied and exacerbated rage of anthropoid beasts that cannot bear to be dragged toward civilization and humanity.^[446]

Here we find in Oliver's description of what he was witnessing on campuses first-hand the presence of what Dr Max Nordau called 'mattoids' during the 19th century, to identify a class of unbalanced minds who agitated for revolutions to overthrow the norms of civilised society.

A conservative youth magazine called *Trud* reported an eye-witness account

of the riot at Columbia University, which was a seminal event in the founding of the New Left:

Here were droves and herds of people who had lost almost all similarity to recognizable humanity... They were in one way or another, all abortions. The physical and psychological deformities they exhibited with so much perverse glee, in retrospect, became almost diabolical. ... Nor are we speaking of mere filth with which they were encrusted, nor their generally unheroic and unkempt appearance, but rather the excruciating display of structural abnormalities and incongruities. Over these walking miscarriages hung an aura of decomposition like some fetid miasma rising from out of the darkest and dankest district of hell... the crooked-backed little troll with the harelip, squatting in front of Hamilton Hall, clutching his eczematous girlfriend while both howled obscenities that would have made a drunken whore blush. ... Every back was hunched over to one degree or other. Bizarre nasal formations and red, watery, reptilian eyes were everywhere. ... Compared to the Columbia Campus, a leper colony was a place of infinite beauty.

Many were wracked with putrid diseases including syphilis, hepatitis and gonorrhoea. Their obsession with filth is evidenced by their appearance, the stinking tenements in which they voluntarily cluster, the actual joy they take in wallowing in offal are eloquent proof that the Left is not a political or economic phenomenon but a definite retrogressive trend having its origin in a process of malign eugenics.

The predominance of nervous diseases, the hysteria and extreme restlessness, of radical students is heavy with significance ... [\[447\]](#)

The physiological and mental traits observed among the Leftist revolutionaries over the past several hundred years seem constant regardless of time and place. It seems reasonable to conclude that several types are drawn to the Left.

New Left Movements

The Vietnam War served as the primary catalyst for the rise of the New Left in the USA during the 1960s and 1970s. The previous 'civil rights' protests in the American South against segregation had provided a foundation. White Gentile and Jewish middle class youths from the Northern states for the first

time mixed freely among Blacks in a cause that was heralded as righteous by the 'Establishment' against the vestiges of the traditions of the South. This 'passive resistance', which often resulted in rioting, provided a training ground for later New Left cadres, and a preliminary meeting of Blacks and White Gentile and Jewish activists, which was to metamorphose into the violent coalition between the New Left and Black Separatists during the 1970s.

The first significant manifestations of the New Left were the Yippies and the Students for a Democratic Society.

18 - Jerry Rubin

The Yippies,^[448] founded by Jerry Rubin and Abbie Hoffman, were the most histrionic of the New Left. Rubin and Hoffman were among the so-called ‘Chicago Seven’ tried for inciting riots at the 1968 Democratic National Convention, where the Left was supporting the nomination of Eugene McCarthy as Democratic Party presidential candidate. The 1968 riots were the defining moment for the beginning of the New Left.

Both Rubin and Hoffman, as the most iconic of the New Left leaders, provide insights into the nature of the movement leadership.

Matricidal

Rubin had matricidal feelings that resulted in a life-long search for therapy, in which we can include participation in the New Left as a cathartic release of tensions. Writing of a ‘psychic therapy’ session in which participants sought liberation from their ‘childhood deprivation’, Rubin stated:

I started shouting at my mother for the specific messages she gave me. ‘Thanks, Mommy. You white-skinned no-good sexless asshole captoothed cancerous venom of a snake who destroyed me from birth... You taught me to hate myself, to feel guilty, to drive myself crazy,... to hate my body, to hate women... I have your self-righteous right-wrong should-should-not programming... with that stupid JUDGE inside me that I got from you. I don’t see people as they are, but as they fit my standards, my self-righteous beliefs... Oh, it is so liberating for me to tell the truth. MOMMY I AM GLAD THAT YOU DIED. IF YOU HAD NOT DIED OF CANCER, I WOULD HAVE HAD TO KILL YOU... You taught me to compete and compare, to fear and outdo. I became a ferocious achievement-oriented, compulsive, obsessive live-in-my-head asshole... Well fuck you, Mommy, fuck you in the ass with a red hot poker.’^[449]

Here are the traits of matricidal fantasy, self-inflicted guilt for being ‘white-skinned’ (sic), privileged, being imbued with a sense of right and wrong that the sociopath finds enchaining, and fantasies of sadistic incest. The traits of Rubin’s mother as repressively moralising are projected onto the ‘Establishment’, which requires overthrowing violently. Aggression towards the ‘Establishment’ or

'Establishment' figures such as police was a form of redirected aggression against his mother. Matricide is vented upon the 'Establishment', which represents mother's values, 'repression', and morals. By overthrowing the 'Establishment' or 'capitalism', individuals such as Mao or Rubin, representing both the Old and the New Left, are overthrowing the feelings of hate towards parents, whether father, mother or both.

After his time in the New Left, Jerry Rubin spent the rest of his life as a high flying businessman married to a well-known socialite, hosting parties for facilitating business contacts, and searching for a means of gaining mental stability; dabbling with an ongoing series of alternative therapies. He was eventually a victim of his rebellious character: he was struck by a car and killed while jaywalking.

Rubin transformed from one of the most outrageous New Left radicals to respectable stockbroker because his actions, whether as a 'Yippie' or as a 'Yuppie', were impelled by narcissism, yet with his ongoing search for therapy he was sufficiently introspective to realise that there was something wrong with him. Many other New Left leaders sought to fill the emotional void in the aftermath of the Vietnam War by turning from socialism to psychotherapies, mysticism and transcendentalism, gravitating from the New Left to the New Age in realising that their socialist ideologies were too banal to provide meaning for their lives. The New Left was a working through of Rubin's psychopathy but failed.

19 - Abbie Hoffman

With Abbie Hoffman we find psychosis leading to suicide, having failed to come to terms with the meaninglessness of anonymity in a post-Vietnam existence. Hoffman was severely histrionic and is considered even by other New Leftists to have been the clown of the New Left, his antics being the most effective, however, in gaining publicity. Like many comedians, he was manic-depressive.

Jonathan Rieder,^[450] *in reviewing the biography of Hoffman*^[451] *by Jonah Raskin,*^[452] *the latter being a notable New Left veteran, has some pertinent observations to make on the New Left phenomenon and on Hoffman:*

In Hoffman's case, the political often was personal. There was a manic quality (in a clinical sense, it turns out) to his overspilling charm. Mr Raskin shows that his taunting of authorities, like his charged battle against Judge Hoffman,^[453] fused with his struggle against his overbearing father: 'When he urged kids to dismantle the "parent culture," burn down their parents' homes . . . and "kill parents," he was magnifying and projecting the anger that had its origins in his own turbulent boyhood'.^[454]

Here we see in Hoffman the primary traits of the sociopath and the narcissist. Again, there is a projection of anger with one's parents onto society generally, and the playing out of one's anger against parents projected onto the 'Establishment' which, significantly, is often termed by the Left the patriarchal Establishment. We have seen these matricidal and/or patricidal traits in luminaries of the Old Left, from Marx to Althusser, culminating in the New Left as a nihilistic rebellion against the Father/Mother/State.

Upbringing

Rieder continues with his depiction of Hoffman again with the classic symptoms of narcissism and sociopathy; in his personal relations including family life, exhibiting the same type of narcissistic personality disorder that Karl Marx inflicted upon his long-suffering wife and children:

Born in 1936, Hoffman was a product of lower-middle-class Worcester, Mass.; his father beat him but could never still his defiant resolve. Despite a brief stint as the dutiful bar mitzvah boy, he became a teen-age rebel with an immense hunger for attention; he managed to get thrown out of

school, to steal cars, to rumble with gangs, to flee to the poolroom. He was, in his own rendering, ‘the ultimate in Jewish nightmares’. However much it jibed with the culture of celebrity (on which Hoffman was always parasitic), his unbounded narcissism had other consequences. Mr. Raskin writes, ‘I wasn’t sure when he was acting, when he was for real and when he was acting for real’. Most likely Hoffman couldn’t tell either. He was a liar who told tall tales of his civil rights escapades in Mississippi. Despite hippie talk of love, Hoffman had a determined incapacity for intimacy: he neglected his three children and emotionally starved his lovers and wives.

[455]

Here we see in Hoffman, as described by Rieder and Raskin, the traits of the sociopath, namely:

Trouble with authority starting from a young age.

Play acting to create a public persona.

Lying.

Incapacity for intimacy and lack of empathy on a personal basis.

Stealing as a Revolutionary Act

Hoffman, the juvenile delinquent turned revolutionary, rationalised his sociopathy into New Left ideology that justified as a supposedly higher social purpose, killing, assault, and theft. His experience at ‘rumbling with gangs’ and stealing as a youth was sublimated into social revolt. Hoffman’s best-selling *Steal This Book* [456] is a manual for urban guerrilla warfare with no pretence of peaceful protest. His aim was to bring about a violent revolution with youth and Negroes in the vanguard. His discussion of weapons included ways to knife the ‘pigs’ (police):

Probably one of the most favored street weapons of all time is the good old ‘shiv,’ ‘blade,’ ‘toe-jabber’ or whatever you choose to call a good sticker. Remembering that today’s pig is tomorrow’s bacon, it’s good to know a few handy slicing tips’. [457]

There is also advice on making several types of bomb, and street fighting techniques. Much of *Steal This Book* offers advice on common criminality rationalised as ‘surviving in Amerika’ [sic]. Hence, the petty bourgeoisie, *i.e.* the common shopkeeper, is treated with as much contempt as the corporate banker, but is easier prey for the criminal/revolutionary thief, romanticised as a modern Robin Hood. Here Hoffman demonstrates the same contempt for small-scale

traders as Marx who despised those who demanded payment of bills. Under a section entitled 'shoplifting' Hoffmann counsels: 'This section presents some general guidelines on thievery to put you ahead of the impulse swiping. With some planning ahead, practice and a little nerve, you can pick up on some terrific bargains'. Details are given as to dress and behaviour, *etc.* [\[458\]](#)

It is notable that the usual victims of New Left rioting were the small shopkeepers. Tom Hayden, New Left leader, mentions for example, how after Martin Luther King was shot, Bernadine Dohrn, a future leader of the Weathermen terrorists, crying hysterically in typically histrionic manner, participated in the rioting in 1968, 'trashing store windows aimlessly in Times Square.' [\[459\]](#) Like old Marx railing against tailors who expected payment, shopkeepers bore the immediate brunt of New Left/Black rioting. Indeed, this continues to be the case, as seen by riots in Athens and London, for example, organised by the 'Next' Left anarchists, who rationalise that they are rebelling against capitalism by vandalising and looting appliance stores.

Hoffman rationalises petty theft from one's employer as a revolutionary act against the 'system'. Apparently one's employer can be identified as part of the capitalist class whose 'wealth' deserves 'expropriating'. The section entitled 'On the Job' states:

By far the easiest and most productive method of stealing is on the job. Wages paid to delivery boys, sales clerks, shippers, cashiers and the like are so insulting that stealing really is a way of maintaining self-respect. If you are set on stealing the store dry when you apply for the job, begin with your best foot forward. Make what employment agencies call a 'good appearance'. Exude cleanliness, Godliness, sobriety and all the other WASPy [\[460\]](#) virtues third grade teachers insist upon. Building up a good front will eliminate suspicion when things are 'missing'.

Cashiers and sales persons who have access to money can pick up a little pocket change without too much effort, no matter how closely they are watched by supervisors. Women can make use of torn hems to stash coins and bills. Men can utilize cuffs. Both can use shoes and don't forget those secret little pockets you learned about in the last section. If you ring up items on a cash register, you can easily mistake \$1.39 for 39¢ or \$1.98 for 98¢ during the course of a hectic day. Leave pennies on the top shelf of the cash register and move one to the far right side every time you skip a dollar. That way at the end of the day, you'll know how much to pocket

and won't have to constantly be stuffing, stuffing, stuffing.^[461]

Hoffmann makes no distinction between working for a transnational corporation and working for your local grocery shop. Both are employers and are therefore legitimate targets for theft, in the name of 'revolution', despite that theft evincing nothing more than personal gain like any other common criminal.

Bi-Polar

As well as being a Narcissistic Personality, Hoffman was Bi-Polar, a 'chronic manic-depressive' who committed suicide in 1989, at the age of 52, with a 'huge dose of barbiturates' combined with alcohol.^[462] Although Hoffman was able to make a minor comeback in local protests and on the lecture circuit during the 1980s, he longed for a return to the 1960s and to his youth, according to Tom Hayden. This regressive personality trait is confirmed by Hoffman's statement to the press in 1987 when he said that he had moved to Pennsylvania to help a protest group oppose the diversion of the Delaware River to cool a nuclear reactor. He commented 'that he was happy to "live and die here fighting the Philadelphia Electric Company – it's just like the '60s for me.'"^[463]

From 1984-1986 Hoffman teamed up with his old comrade Jerry Rubin, then a Wall Street marketing director, to entertain campus audiences with Yippie versus Yuppies debates, the two sharing the \$5,000 per appearance fee.^[464] It was symbolic of the phoniness of New Left 'rebellion'.

Shortly before his suicide, Hoffman attempted to become a stand-up comedian at a New York club but, according to a friend, 'it was almost pitiful'.^[465] Jonathan Silvers, who assisted Hoffman in writing his last book *Steal This Urine Test*, stated of Hoffman: 'He didn't have major goals worked out for the future. He was going day by day. He was busy, but he wanted more order in his life'. Hoffmann acted out the frenetic activity typical of the manic-depressive. An acquaintance commented at the time of Hoffman's death: 'Every time I called him on the phone I got the feeling he had thousands of things going on. It was like dealing with a short-order cook'.^[466]

Suicide

Hoffman's manic-depression become acute in 1974, when he went underground, after being caught by undercover police trying to sell cocaine; a less than idealistic activity. Although Hoffman had much to advise criminals/revolutionists on how to successfully live underground, for Hoffman,

the histrionic narcissist, no longer being the centre of public attention led to his mental breakdown. His wife Anita commented that suddenly Hoffman 'had to learn to be alone, not to be famous, not to be the centre of attention. His letters were so desolate'. The anonymity was unbearable, and even although a fugitive, an incident at a Las Vegas hotel room, recalled New Left veteran Paul Krassner, shows the extent of his narcissism: 'He freaked out and screamed, "I'm Abbie Hoffman! I'm Abbie Hoffman!"'^[467]

Kunen et al write of Hoffman's mental state:

Family and friends learned to expect these 'periodic breakdowns' while he was a fugitive, says Andrew Hoffman, his son by his first marriage. At 16, Andrew was suddenly dispatched to Canada because his father was in no shape to be left alone. 'In typical Abbie fashion, everything came to a halt, and I got on a plane,' says Andrew, now 28. 'When I got to the hotel, he was very hyper and wanted to go out. We went to this bar and these two French-speaking gentlemen were buying me expensive drinks. I said, 'Dad, what's going on?' 'Oh,' he said, 'I told them you were the most famous rock star in Mexico.' So even when he was underground, he would figure out some way to draw attention and get people excited'.^[468]

The narcissistic and bi-polar disorders were severe, and the lack of public attention was unbearable. The New Left nihilism of the 1960s and 1970s, which Hoffman brought to histrionic levels, which continue to manifest today among the post-New Left, albeit in far less charismatic manner, provided Hoffman with an exciting outlet for his narcissism. According to his friend and landlord, Hoffman would practice his speeches by yelling at two llamas.^[469] In other circumstances, he might have chosen a career as a Hollywood actor or a stand-up comedian, and probably with the same suicidal ending.

20 - The Weather Underground

The Weather Underground, broke away from the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS) in 1969 to become an outlaw organisation espousing urban guerrilla warfare in the USA. One of the primary leaders was Bernadine Dohrn, who issued the Weather Underground's first public statement, a 'Declaration of War' on the USA. An indication of the sociopathic mentality can be seen from the 'Days of Rage' Weatherman riot in Chicago in 1969, when District Attorney Richard Elrod was seriously injured and paralysed for life. Dohrn led her Weathermen comrades in singing a spoof of a Bob Dylan song, which they entitled 'Lay, Elrod, Lay', rejoicing in Elrod's paralysis.

Charles Manson – New Left Superstar

At a 1969 'war council' held in Flint, Michigan, Dohrn praised the murders committed by the 'Family' of Charles Manson, upholding this as a revolutionary act. In honour of this Dohrn introduced the three-fingered Weathermen salute, called the 'fork salute', symbolising the fork used to split open pregnant Sharon Tate's stomach. Dohrn jocularly referred to the eight victims as the 'Tate Eight'. Dohrn said of the murders, 'Offing those rich pigs with their own forks and knives, and then eating a meal in the same room, far out! The Weathermen dig Charles Manson!' Dohrn and her husband Bill Ayres, both now comfortably ensconced in academia, have attempted to make light of Dohrn's 1969 Manson comments, stating that they were not meant seriously, which presumably means that it is more acceptable to joke about the atrocity. Nonetheless, at the time, those who heard and knew Dohrn were in no doubt as to her genuine admiration for Manson and his homicidal sycophants. Tom Hayden writes:

Many people, including several underground papers, fell into the illusion that Manson was a persecuted and misunderstood hippie. Jerry Rubin was one. He and Phil Ochs^[470] went to see Manson in prison. Manson told them that he wanted to conduct himself defiantly like the Chicago seven in his upcoming trial. Jerry was fascinated.^[471]

Hayden states that Rubin (by that time a Wall Street stockbroker), told him that,

in my mind I wanted to believe that the charges against Manson were an FBI frameup. I was so into romanticizing outlaw behavior that I looked

for any possible explanation to find something good in the outlaw. If society had made Manson mad, then I thought that society was to blame for Manson's crimes, not Manson. And that attitude was part of the madness of the times.^[472]

Manson biographer Bugliosi writes that Rubin exclaimed, 'I fell in love with Charlie Manson the first time I saw his cherub face and sparkling eyes on TV. His words and courage inspired us'.^[473]

As for Dohrn, Hayden writes:

Far more unbelievable was the attitude of Bernadine Dohrn, who called Manson's act 'far out'. At the last Weathermen meeting before they went underground, Bernadine stood on a stage in a miniskirt and high leather boots, raising her hand in the air, her fingers making the sign of Manson's fork, a symbol of the brutality that the Weathermen had decided to inflict on bourgeois society. The Weathermen had concluded that white babies were 'pigs'...^[474]

Sale writes of this period:

The Weather analysis held that whites were virtually useless in the world-wide confrontation going on, and except for a few brave streetfighters like the Weathermen, they were all corrupted, bought-off tyrants. Logically, then, the death of a white baby is a positive revolutionary action, and indeed the Weathermen actually held abstract debates at the [1969 Flint] 'war council' about whether killing white babies is 'correct', a Weatherman at one point shouting out to the audience, 'All white babies are pigs'. From there it was only a step to Dohrn's ecstatic speech about the Charles Manson gang...^[475]

Other seminal influences in the New Left revered Manson as the latter-day Christ, which is indeed how he saw himself. *Tuesday's Child*, founded as an 'occult and underground' paper by Jerry Applebaum, Alex Apostolides, and other Leftist writers who went on to establish the *Los Angeles Free Press*, featured a crucified Manson on its cover during the Manson trial. Another issue carried a photograph of Manson, proclaiming him 'man of the year'.^[476]

Marion Delgado – Child Star of Leftist Sociopaths

Perhaps as bizarre as the adoption of Mason and his sycophants as revolutionary heroes was the championing by the Weathermen of a 5 year-old

Mexican-American child, Marion Delgado, who in 1947 put a slab of concrete on a railway track which derailed a train, injuring four people. To the Weathermen, this also was a revolutionary act, and they adopted the slogan ‘Marion Delgado – Live Like Him!’^[477] Jared Israel, co-leader of the Worker-Student Alliance, which opposed the Dohrn/Ayers coterie in the SDS, comments on this:

So, a) Weathermen advocated emulating a murderously disturbed child. And b) in specifically choosing a murderously disturbed Chicano child, and presenting him as the poster-child of their ‘revolutionary struggle’, in what they called ‘the belly of the beast’, they revealed the profound depth of racism that underlay their phony fight against ‘white skin privilege’.^[478]

It appears that the boy had merely sought to break a slab of concrete by placing it on the track.^[479] However, to the Weathermen it was as heroic a revolutionary action as the forking of Sharon Tate. An obscure prank of a child that happened twenty years previously appealed to the mentality of the Weathermen. The child’s picture that had been published in *Life* in 1947 was reprinted on the cover of *New Left Notes*, under the headline: ‘Bring the War Home!’^[480]

Bill Ayers in his autobiography writes of the launching of little Marion as a revolutionary icon by ‘Terry’ who held up a photo of Marion ‘hot off the AP wire’ who was holding ‘a piece of rock used to derail a freight train in Italy’.^[481] Ayers seems to be hallucinating here, as the picture had been taken in 1947 and could not be ‘hot off the AP wire’, nor was a rock used. The boy was from California, not Italy, and the train was carrying passengers, not freight. However, since Ayers is a professor ensconced in academia, one should not assume accuracy of research. Perhaps Ayers is trying here to mitigate the infantile reaction of the Weathermen at an event that injured five people, including the engineer, although Ayers states that there were ‘no injuries’, but that ‘damage to freight and rolling stock was extensive’.^[482] Hence, the scenario of the Delgado incident of 1947 has been entirely reinvented by Ayers, as it was by the SDS. That aside, Ayers recalls that Terry ‘whooped with glee... Terry read the caption aloud twice to shrieks of laughter’.^[483] Ayers recounts the extensive use of the boy as a Weathermen icon:

Marion Delgado became our revolutionary antihero and mascot, his face appearing on t-shirts, buttons, and in obscure corners of our leaflets and newspapers, identifiable only to the knowing. On phone call after phone

call we began to identify ourselves to one another as ‘Marion Delgado’...
Marion Delgado was everywhere, Live like him!^[484]

In the October 1969 Chicago riot organised by the Weathermen, Jeff Jones, one of the organisation’s founders, evoked the example of Marion Delgado before the crowd, and the mob of several hundred ran amok in the so-called ‘Days of Rage’, smashing shop windows and damaging cars.

Genocidal

Israel states of the homicidal anti-white mentality of the Weathermen:

Weathermen viewed white American working people as being the problem. The Weathermen hid their ideology of contempt behind rhetoric about what they, oblivious to the irony, called ‘white skin privilege’. I say ‘oblivious to the irony’ because the Weathermen and their allies disproportionately came from upper class backgrounds. In any case, whatever their backgrounds, their ideology was a trendy adaptation of the contempt for supposedly ‘crude’ working people they had absorbed during their upbringings. They were snobs with a license. Self-scrutiny? Please. Self-indulgence and self-glorification were their watchwords, as they demonstrated.^[485]

Israel in describing the nihilistic ideology of the Weathermen, writes of it as:

a mush of de Sade, Marcuse, Timothy Leary, Frantz Fanon^[486] (from whom they got deification of third world leaders and a tragically wrong-minded notion of the cleansing virtue of violence) and the PLO. (This at a time when the American Left, broadly defined, was not enamored of the PLO.) The Weathermen were into self-righteous, false-revolutionary posturing, extreme anti-Americanism, glorification of any demagogue who happened to be non-white, and grotesque self-indulgence. (They boasted that they all slept with each other all the time, but how they had enough brain cells left to remember doing so is a mystery since they routinely smoked anything that would burn and couldn’t escape.)^[487]

Predatory Sex

From what Bill Ayers writes it is clear that New Leftism provided as much a political rationalisation for rampant sexual release as it did for vandalism, theft and violence. Through unencumbered sexual encounters the Weathermen imagined that they were performing revolutionary acts against bourgeois

morality, or alternatively a manipulative method by which male narcissists could have multiple sexual partners and avoid attachments or responsibilities before feminism introduced a new Puritanism to the Left. Ayers enthuses:

We experimented feverishly because we were kids, and because our instincts were anarchistic, vigorous and unrestrained. One night after a fierce and bloody demonstration in Washington, a hundred of us created a moaning sexual pageant in a loft off Dupont Circle, flaunting and parading our outrageous exuberance. So that no one could miss the point, we ran a large cartoon strip in our newspaper sketched by a comrade. In one frame a zillion bodies cuddled together under a huge Viet Cong flag, resting up after the street battle...^[488]

On another memorable occasion Ayers bedded down with Terry and two women, and ended pairing off – predictably – in another revolutionary affirmation of breaking down bourgeois morality.^[489] This promiscuity was part of a political agenda to ‘smash monogamy’ according to Ayers.^[490] In other situations, such as the Jim Jones’ People’s Temple, or David Berg’s hippie-style Children of God, both New Left, quasi-religious cults, such practices were eventually exposed as sexual abuse for the gratification of their leaders rationalised behind the façade of dogma. Ayers indicates as much when he states that everything they did was given ‘a justification, a place in our political line’.^[491]

In 1969 Ayers attempted to extort money from the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, demanding \$20,000 to abstain from violence during a planned peace protest. After rejecting this demand, a member of the Moratorium group asked Ayers what he really wanted. ‘To kill all rich people’, Ayers replied. When it was pointed out that Ayers came from a wealthy family^[492], he answered with the New Left slogan: ‘Bring the war home. Kill your parents’.^[493] Columnist Steve Neal, in reviewing Ayers’ biography, comments: ‘It is troubling that Ayers doesn’t disclose how he and Dohrn used his wealthy family’s clout to fight their legal battles. After a decade on the run from Federal charges, they surrendered to the FBI’.^[494]

The last action of Weathermen was a 1981 Brinks hold-up with the Black Liberation Army. From 1970 until 1980, Dohrn and other Weathermen went into hiding, surrendering themselves, and being found guilty of only minor offences, due to ‘illegal surveillance’ having been used. Charges against Ayers were dropped. He was to comment in an interview with David Horowitz, ‘Guilty as

hell. Free as a bird. America is a great country'. Dohrn pled guilty to aggravated battery and bail-jumping, but received only a fine and probation. Two years after her surrender in 1980, she was jailed for seven months for refusing to give information to a grand jury about at-large members of the Weathermen.

21 - Mark Rudd

Rudd was one of the Chicago Seven defendants and a leader of the Weather Underground.

Like his Weatherman comrade Bill Ayers he states that sexual promiscuity was a revolutionary act. In order to ‘smash monogamy’ he states that ‘extreme sexual experiences’ were used. ‘Group sex, homosexuality, and casual sex hookups were all tried as we attempted to break out from the past into the revolutionary future’.^[495]

From Nerd to Revolutionary

Even Tom Hayden of the SDS, like Weather Underground leaders Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn, eager to show how ‘moderate’ they really were, stated that sexual promiscuity, which he found at university, was a stimulant to joining the New Left. Actually, the idea of combining sex with politics was not new. We have already observed the intellectualisation of promiscuity in the name of politics Marquis de Sade, hero of the Jacobins. The Austrian Communist psychologist Wilhelm Reich reformulated the synthesis in the 1920s.^[496] While the Bolsheviks in Russia had promised the peasantry land, the lure of the New Left was to promise promiscuity to adolescent males in the name of ‘liberation’ and ‘revolution’. Hayden recalls that ‘for male students like myself, the new climate simply meant that more women were openly “available”, but it told us nothing about the souls and needs of these women.’^[497]

The early movement of the sixties inherited and deepened the climate of male dominated permissiveness. I remember being startled at a student editor’s conference in New York in 1960 when one of my movement colleagues, a young radical from Queens College, leered and said, ‘the first thing you have to understand is that the movement revolves around the end of a prick’. The movement was a chauvinist’s paradise, the positions of power were dominated primarily by men, and the opportunities for unequal sexual liaisons were legion. Writers such as Simone de Beauvoir were interpreted to advocate these ‘free relationships’ and to condemn monogamy and marriage as being deadening.^[498]

The rise of feminism must have been severely traumatic to many adolescent

males who had joined the New Left to prove their manhood and get away from domineering mothers, only to be emasculated and ridiculed by militant feminists, while those such as Hayden were purged for their patriarchal attitudes.

Rudd confirms what Rothman and Lichter have analysed in their psychohistory of Jews in the New Left; that the phenomenon provided a means of proving one's masculinity in rebelling against the domineering mother of the Jewish family. Rothman and Lichter state in regard to their test scores of Jewish and non-Jewish 'radicals' and 'conservatives' that, 'In sum Jewish radicals were drawn from households in which the mother was perceived as a domineering figure, while the father was relegated to the background. Non-Jewish radicals, by contrast, viewed both parents as relatively intrusive'.^[499] Not surprisingly, with the sudden rise of feminism among the New Left, this caused another crisis for the insecure youths trying to prove their masculinity. They had to start the whole process of self-agonising again, this time with the added baggage of the guilt of being born male, and ipso facto as beneficiaries of centuries of patriarchy.

Rudd, still agonising several decades later, assessed the psychotherapeutic value of New Left aggression, writing:

I'm basically not a violent person. My whole life I've feared fights and contact sports. I always ran away from schoolyard fights.... In those pre-feminist days, it made sense to us that the colonized and humiliated would take back their manhood through violence.^[500]

Here we have the stereotypical 'nerdy' Jewish kid, bullied at school, fearful, and finally able to prove himself in adolescence as a 'man' by venting aggression in the ranks of New Left mobs run amok. With New Left ideology identifying with Third World communist theorists and tyrants such as Ho Chi Minh, Mao Zedong and Che Guevara who all ran regimes in which the likes of Mark Rudd, et al could not have lasted five minutes, the 'humiliated' could weave a heroic fantasy around themselves about being one with the 'colonised'. By identifying with violent doctrines and tyrannies the bullied weakling could vicariously display his manhood.

This security via the group will manifest as bravado in mob actions that the individual would normally feel too inadequate to undertake alone. The FBI observed at the time that Hayden 'had been one of the few demonstration leaders who had actually taken part in the street action... [and] appeared to be one of the few [in the New Left leadership] who does not mind, or fear, actual participation in disorder...'^[501]

This cowardice can continue to be observed readily in the mob actions of the Left today. Because the cowardice and amorality of the New Left recruit is reinforced by the sociopathic doctrines of the Left, there is no moral compunction about the cowardly use of violence. This mob cowardice has been the rule since the days of the French Revolution. Chivalrous conduct, combat with rules, and fair play are disregarded as ‘bourgeois morality’.

As for Mark Rudd, he recalls that he sought his masculinity by identifying with Che Guevara. Identification with another’s personality is a defence mechanism to compensate for one’s feelings of inadequacy. New Leftists such as Rudd could perceive themselves as combatants by identifying with revolutionary doctrines of violence and revolutionary characters such as Che. Decades later Rudd was to reflect on his fantasy of becoming an American Che:

In 1989, I attended a reading at an Albuquerque feminist bookstore by the writer Robin Morgan. Fifteen years before, back in 1974, Morgan had engineered Jane Alpert’s betrayal to the FBI of my ex-wife and myself. I jumped out of my chair when I got to Che. Morgan had nailed the problem and had nailed me personally, with my desire to be like Che. My career as a Guevarista suddenly made sense: a young man who seeks to prove himself through violence, in the image of the patriarchal hero. This is not what is meant by people liberating themselves, by the advance of freedom and democracy.^[502]

With the rise of feminism Rudd and the other New Left males during the 1970s had been presented with another cause of anguish: their gender. Many had joined the New Left, rioted, vandalised, bombed, and indulged in sexual promiscuity to prove their masculinity. They were suddenly confronted with the allegation that they were part of the patriarchal ‘Establishment’. It is little wonder that many finally entered a state of total confusion and withdrew from the New Left into the New Age, in an attempt to obliterate the egos that they had spent years trying to assert. Rudd had failed to ‘liberate himself’ by identifying with a ‘patriarchal hero’. Feminism demanded the emasculation of the likes of Rudd.

The Portnoy Syndrome

Rudd explained that being ‘raised culturally Jewish in a large Jewish community’ (even although his father had lived in the USA since he was 9) Rudd always saw himself as an ‘outsider’, and ‘always had a critical eye for

America',^[503] which is to say, a critical eye on the WASP culture and morals that were then still dominant.

Dr Stanley Rothman quotes an ex-Weatherman who confirms what Rudd states in regard not only to the Jewish perception of alienation but the sense of male inadequacy that motivated many to join the most violent of the New Left groups:

A lot of the Weathermen leadership was Jewish and had never been tough street kids, and I really believe that a tremendous amount of what they were doing was overcoming their own fears about their masculinity... Most of them... had been intellectually aggressive, but all of a sudden they were trying to be tough street kids... I think there was a lot of self-hate going on'.^[504]

Returning to Rudd, he elaborates elsewhere on what he and others perceived as the Jewish roots of their alienation as a motive in a revolt that was not only political, but also moral:

I invoke Roth^[505] to let you in on the insularity of the world I grew up in. My family carried the Jewish ghettos of Newark and Elizabeth with them to the suburbs. We may have lived in integrated neighborhoods, that is integrated with goyim^[506] (there were only a few blacks in the town) and we may have gone to integrated schools, (of course there were no blacks in my elementary school) but we were far from assimilated, if that means replacing a Jewish identity with an American one. At about the age of nine or ten I remember eating lunch at the house of a non-Jewish friend and reporting back that the hamburgers had onion and parsley in them. 'Oh, that's goyish hamburger,' my mother said. I lived a Philip Roth existence in which the distinction between Jews and gentiles was present in all things: having dogs and cats was goyish, for example, as was a church-sponsored hay-ride which I was invited to by the cute red-haired girl who sat in front of me in my seventh grade home-room. My parents didn't allow me to go, and, since repression breeds resistance, that was probably a signal event in my career of fascination with shiksas^[507] and things goyish, a career which paralleled that of young Alexander Portnoy in 'Portnoy's Complaint'.

Out of all the uncountable hours of discussion in SDS meetings, at the West End Bar over beer, and in our dorm rooms and apartments over

joints, I don't remember one single conversation in which we discussed the fact that so many of us were Jewish. This glaring lack alone might serve as a clue to what we were up to: by being radicals we thought we could escape our Jewishness. Left-wing radicalism was internationalist, not narrow nationalist; it favored the oppressed and the workers, not the privileged and elites, which our families were striving toward. Moreover, we were New Leftists, having rejected the sectarianism and cant of the Old Left, which, of course was dominated by Jews.

At the top of the Columbia heap sat President Grayson Kirk and Vice-President David Truman, two consummate liberal WASP's who privately claimed to oppose the war but maintained the institution's support of it.

In an infamous rabble-rousing speech I made in the course of one the confrontations on campus, I referred to President Grayson Kirk as 'that shithead'. Certainly I revelled in my role of head barbarian within the gates. But also I wanted to de-throne the President of Columbia University in the minds of my fellow students. It worked.

Marx and Freud brought critical eyes to European bourgeois society. Marx said, in effect, 'You think you've got yourself a fine little democracy here, well let me tell you about the class exploitation and misery that's underlying it'. Similarly, Freud exposed the seamy, sexuality-driven motives, the up-raised penises controlling the unconscious minds of civilized, well-mannered bourgeois society.

We Jews at Columbia—and I would guess at colleges throughout the country—brought the same outsider view to the campuses we had been allowed into.^[508]

Rudd and other Jews in the New Left, like secularised Jews in the Old Left, were conflicted by their Jewish origins. The New Left Jewish youths acutely felt their Jewishness vis-à-vis Gentile society; they felt excluded. They transferred the blame onto the 'System', although it is clear from what Rudd states, that his parents imposed the alienation. Here again is a projection against one's parents onto society. The New Left proclaimed itself to be a rebellion of youth against the State, which substituted for a rebellion against parents. Jewishness, like Blackness, provided added angst to direct against the System, while the white Gentile middle class youngsters wallowed in self-hate, with the additional factor of male gender issues introduced later by feminism. Again, also the New Left

provided an outlet for sexual promiscuity, pubescent frustration rationalised as political revolt. Due to the New Left doctrine of rationalising promiscuity as a political statement against ‘monogamy’ and ‘bourgeois marriage’, Rudd et al were able to have the ‘shiksas’ that had been made out of bounds by their conservative Jewish parents.

Philip Roth in his introspective evaluation of Jewish neurosis has his protagonist Alexander Portnoy stating:

Would psychoanalysis even exist without the Jews? Every goddamn hang up, we Jews have them worse than everyone else. You think I’m self-hating? Whew! Just wait to find out how many grievances I’ve really got. Judaism. All that pointless Rosh Hashannah nonsense. Why do Jews love that saga shit? My mother. Just give me a break from her constant ‘Why don’t you become a doctor, get married and give me grandchildren?’ My father. Castrated and servile.^[509]

Rudd states that he was brought into the still embryonic New Left in 1965 when he entered the centre of student revolt, Columbia University, where ‘I joined the sub-culture—pot, sex, opposing the war, fighting the university administration’. He again reiterates that, ‘The entire Weatherman strategy was a macho nightmare. It was designed to prove ourselves as young men (and women)’. Rudd left the Weathermen in 1970, realising that, ‘I didn’t have the courage and conviction to actually be the guerrilla revolutionary warrior I was posing as or to talk other people into it’.^[510]

Rudd, wanted on Federal charges of bombing and conspiracy, was a fugitive from 1970 to 1977. He surrendered to the FBI in 1977, and went through a period of depression. However, like other former Weathermen fugitives he was treated leniently, receiving only misdemeanour charges, a \$2,000 fine and two years probation.

22 - Aftermath: From New Left to New Age

The end of the Vietnam War also ended the New Left. Desegregation had come to the South by the use of Federal bayonets, and the USA had scuttled from Vietnam. The primary elements to intellectualise New Left angst had been eliminated by the Establishment. There was now nothing remaining other than an infantile sub-culture based on ‘sex, drugs, and rock ‘n roll’, which had been useful as a recruiting device, but useless to sustain a revolution.

For those who could not enter the mainstream like Tom Hayden, who became a California legislator, Jerry Rubin, who became a well-connected Wall Street yuppie, Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn and Mark Rudd, who became teachers, there was a void to fill. Abbie Hoffman did not succeed and committed suicide. Like Jerry Rubin’s initial reaction, many turned from the New Left to seek alternative psychotherapies and New Age transcendentalism. If the ego could not be satisfied then perhaps the answer was to have it obliterated.

The New Left as Group Therapy

The New Left had always been influenced by psychotherapists such as Abraham Maslow,^[511] and those from the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory.^[512] The favoured form of therapy at the time of the New Left was ‘group therapy’ and ‘self-criticism’, which were methods of mind control and conformity to the group, behind the mask of a movement that claimed to be representing the liberation of the individual.

Rothman and Lichter trace the psychotherapeutic purposes behind the New Left to the ‘self-actualisation’ theory of Maslow and other founders of what became the ‘human potential movement’, and ‘humanistic psychology’. Leftist social theorists such as Fromm argued that the family and other foundations of traditional social order are repressive and lead to the stifling of the ‘true’ individual. Therefore such institutions should be repudiated. Lavishly funded studies were produced to show that rebellion against social norms was healthy.^[513] Those who formed the New Left were regurgitating what they were being told by professors with an ideological agenda.

Indeed, Abbie Hoffman had studied humanistic psychology directly under Maslow. Maslow shaped Hoffman’s ideology. Maslow was ‘Abbie’s real hero’, and after leaving Brandeis University, Hoffman applied Maslovian psychology to politics and rebellion.^[514] It was at Maslow’s suggestion that Hoffman undertook a master’s degree in psychology^[515] at the University of California at

Berkley, which became one of the centres of New Left revolt. ^[516] The 1968 student agitation at Columbia University was praised by Dr Fromm as a psychotherapeutic ‘revolution of life’ amidst ‘a society of zombies’.^[517] Adolescents, marginal personality types, narcissists, neurotics, sociopaths, the complex ridden, and so on, played out their problems by scapegoating ‘society’, which was perceived as a white, middle class and later ‘male’ conspiracy to repress freedom, as defined for them by the Marxist refugees that had come to the USA during the 1930s and ended up dominating the social sciences. With Hoffman and Rubin’s Yippies, a significant element of psychodrama was introduced.

Origins of Group Therapy in the Left

The psychotherapeutic foundations of the New Left were laid well before, in 1925, when a Marxist psychologist, Dr Jacob L Moreno arrived in New York, disappointed with the way the Soviet Union was unfolding. He aimed to replace the ‘class warfare foundation of Marxism with a foundation of group dynamics’, which he called ‘many small revolutions in small groups’.^[518] Moreno was the ‘foremost pioneer of Group Psychotherapy’. His theory is called sociatry, and includes music therapy and psychodrama.^[519] The New Left was the political manipulation of adolescent angst via the use of ‘sociatry’. Group therapy became as much a part of the USA as it did as a means of social control in China and the USSR.

New Left cells doubled as group therapy units, forming as ‘small collectives, or communes’ for the ‘mutual support’ that was ‘missing in an impersonal mass movement’.^[520] However, given the range of personality types that were attracted to the New Left, it is not surprising that those looking for a ‘nurturing’, ‘caring’ environment would be traumatised by narcissists and sociopaths. In particular ‘self-criticism’, the basis of group therapy, was designed to subordinate the individual to the group. It is a primary brainwashing technique that had been used in Communist states, and on American POWs in North Korea, the aim being to deconstruct and reconstruct the individual, reinforced by peer pressure. Self-criticism is utilised by the Left to expose, ridicule and eliminate every undesirable trait – such as unconscious ‘racism’ – that might linger in the unconscious.

Tom Hayden - Purged

In these New Left cells women were permitted the dominance that was

denied to them on the street actions. 'Free relationships' were practised among men and women. In the group Hayden joined, the 'Red Family', the primary concern was the purging of 'male chauvinism in both personal relationships and movement work'. Workshops were segregated according to gender. The male encounter groups were 'morbid' examinations of 'male oppression', and the 'male power-plays, self-centred jealousies, and wounded egos'^[521] that abound in the New Left. The group was inspired by Mao Zedong and North Korea's Kim Il Sung.^[522] Hayden explains the use of the self-criticism technique in the New Left cells:

The discussions took the form of self-criticism, a group psychotherapy in which it was assumed that anything said in one's own defense – whether about washing dishes, exhibiting macho attitudes, or being attracted to a woman – was probably a self-serving defensive alibi. I found these meetings to be torture sessions.^[523]

It was these psychological pressures for conformity and repression of one's true character – under the guise of finding one's 'true' character – that saw Hayden depart from the fringes and into the political mainstream. The process had already estranged him from his girlfriend and her child. Hayden reflects: 'I was particularly ill suited for becoming a "new man".'^[524] He had entered the Berkley collective, the Red Family, with the intention of changing his ego-centric and domineering character, but was unable:

There was basic incompatibility. My aggressive qualities were seen as oppressive burdens by other members of the collective, who often felt themselves defined as appendages of Tom Hayden and manipulated. Perhaps most significantly, my relationship with Anne deteriorated. In a drive to establish her own forceful identity, after having been defined first as a wife and then as a girlfriend of two well-known radical men, it almost was inevitable that I would become an obstacle to her independence. I was threatened and could not stop acting possessively towards her. Since she was a central figure in the group, I had to leave.^[525]

His estrangement from the group and from his girlfriend and her son happened in a 'frightening way'. Hayden arrived back at Berkley and 'encountered a tense meeting of the other members', sitting in a circle. In Hayden's absence it had been decided that he was 'an oppressive male chauvinist', 'being into manipulating people'. He saw a look of 'glazed unanimity' on each of their faces. He acted defensively – itself a negative sign in

group therapy – but ‘there were no open minds, only a collective will’. He left feeling bitter that his close friends had suddenly become a ‘cult’. Hayden was a victim of a process that he states was ‘attempting to purge and purify itself of all that was wrong with the world: racism, sexism, male chauvinism, and now macho leadership’.^[526] Hayden had been a victim of a process that was supposed to ‘liberate’, politicised psychotherapy that was being played out thousands of times over in the communes of Maoist China, where the ‘guilty’ were not let off as lightly as Hayden.

The intention of this form of brainwashing was explained by one of its most enthusiastic advocates, Mao Zedong, one of the icons of the New Left:

We have the Marxist-Leninist weapon of criticism and self-criticism... conscientious practise of self-criticism is still another hallmark distinguishing our Party from all other political parties... To check up regularly on our work and in the process develop a democratic style of work, to fear neither criticism nor self-criticism, and to apply such good popular Chinese maxims as, ‘Say all you know and say it without reserve’. ... This is the only effective way to prevent all kinds of political dust and germs from contaminating the minds of our comrades and the body of our Party.^[527]

Soon after Hayden’s expulsion the collective ‘self-destructed, its members scattering everywhere. The appetites for splits and purges was uncontrollable’.^[528]

Such clashes of ego, recrimination, betrayal of friendships and bitterness seem strange for a movement built on a façade of ‘peace and love’, but a movement largely comprised of the chronologically immature conjoined with others with various types of mental disorder can only lead to conflict and even self-destruction. What was being played out in the dormitories, hovels and streets of the USA and Europe had been played out fifty years before on a far vaster and deadlier scale by the Bolsheviks whose ‘Red Terror’ was undertaken in the name of ‘peace’ and ‘democracy’, and 180 years previously by the Jacobin ‘Terror’ in France in the name of ‘liberty, equality, fraternity’. Had the New Left attained power like their predecessors in France and in Russia, their regime of ‘peace and love’ would have been just as murderous and repressive.

Self-Criticism – The Example of Jonestown

How such doctrines would have been played out had they assumed power was

demonstrated in Jonestown, the People's Temple commune in Guyana under the dictatorship of Jim Jones (a.k.a., 'Dad'), ending with the mass suicides of over 900 followers in 1978. Jones' following had sought to live precisely the ideals of the New Left. Jonestown was New Left ideology in practice. The actress Jane Fonda, still remembered as 'Hanoi Jane' for her support of North Vietnam, who married Tom Hayden in 1973,^[529] had enthused about the Jones communist cult: 'The church that I relate to most is called the People's Temple [which provides] a sense of what life should be about.'^[530]

The methods of control used by Jones were self-criticism and 'group therapy' on a mass scale. Members of the cult were obliged to write so-called 'Letters to Dad' to Jones, which an Associated Press report described as 'ledgers of self-criticism and evaluation, guilt, feelings of inadequacy and confessions of weakness'.^[531] *Time* reported that Jones exhorted his followers to write him letters 'analysing their attitudes toward elitism, anarchy, capitalism, socialism and their feelings about sex, authority and death'. The hundreds of letters found at Jonestown 'reveal minds bent upon self-abasement and sometimes self-destruction'.^[532] Writers often offered their services to 'Dad' to assassinate 'traitors', and undertake other terrorist actions, and expressed their willingness to die. One states:

Dad, I am a senior and I am willing to go and fight for this cause, and also do my husband in. My life has no purpose but live for socialism, and I am willing to give up my life so socialism will live on. Gertrude Nailor.^[533]

Self-criticism encouraged a sense of worthlessness, rather than self-affirmation:

Dad, I feel I don't work as hard as I should and I feel I am lazy compared to others here that I've seen work. I feel as a supervisor I ain't shit. I see alot of shit go on and I fail to write it or report it because I want to look good and I want people to like me. I value friendship too highly that's why I never make any complaints on the people I associate with. I feel that I am to family oriented. Thank you Dad, Shirley Baisy.^[534]

One 'teacher' of the commune's children was audacious enough to refer to the distractions of the constant blare of music and of Jones' voice for most of the day, but assured Jones of her commitment to him and her determination to become a good Communist:

Jim, I did not turn in my news article. There is so much noise around here

but I cannot concentrate. The morning starts out with the doubletalk on the radio (that seems to be taking a break now) there is always music or talking over the speakers all day long and by the end of the day my ears feel like an atomic bomb has been exploded in them.... I hope the children will grow up to be whole human beings and not manipulators of each other. I have a long ways to go building up my mind to become a communist. I do appreciate you. ... I'll listen more to the news. Thank you Dad. Dorothy Brewer.^[535]

Ms Brewer was expounding the doctrine she had heard from Jones. The doctrine is identical to that of the New Left. Ultimately it was the message of the 'therapeutic state' that had been advocated by Adorno and others of the Frankfurt School: that an entire regime based on psychotherapy is needed to cure everyone of their neuroses caused by the repressive 'Establishment'. Jones applied what the Frankfurt School social scientists, the humanistic psychologists and the New Left were demanding. This was – and remains – the angst of psychopaths who believe they have found the way to Utopia and that it is the normal world that needs curing.

A white supervisor confessed his 'guilt' because of his less than reverent attitude to a Black comrade:

Dad, I really screwed up today. I lost my temper with Lula Ruben, a senior, was swearing. Not at her in the sense of name calling, but nevertheless talking loudly and unkindly to her. Such conduct on the part of a white supervisor is not excusable. Several others heard it, and I am sure it went all through. [illegible] Went away saying this was just like the USA... I apologize to her at the time. I am bringing myself up for [illegible] because it will have to be made public to clear the air... whether or not anyone [illegible] brings it to your attention. ... Gene [Chaikin].^[536]

As in Maoist China, it seems that he would confess in public before the entire community, and become the subject of humiliation for failing to have purged himself of unconscious 'white racism'. The type of pervasive guilt complex at simply being born white was inculcated into the white members of the People's Temple, but it was a feature of New Left self-criticism, and remains a feature of the Left today. The fact of one's birth is a reason for guilt per se and any traces of unconscious white 'racism' must be purged. Ms Coomer reflects that she should carry more 'guilt' than she does due to her time under Jones'

tutelage.

To: Dad, From: Loretta Coomer, Being with you for as many years as I have been with you, I should have a lot more conscientiousness and guilt than I do have. Many times I have thought about the black people in our congregation who have been through so much, suffered so much injustice as a result of being black, and yet somehow managed to avoid the issue. Oh! Yes! I have felt guilty for being the same color of skin as their oppressors and have cried about it because I'm sure I have reminded some beautiful black person of someone they hated. I have lived without ever since I've known you. So much so that he used to irritate me (and still does) when I see some of our lighter skinned people continuously sitting together or more than 2 or 3 sitting together with a room full of black people. You have made me that observant.

I often feel bad because I have to scold or be forceful with black seniors a lot in the food serving line, but also realize they too have been conditioned and sometimes respond only to 'white' authority – and that makes me very angry. The black sisters serving can tell some people something and that person gets mad. Then I'll say the same thing and they are very nice and accept it and go on their way. This happens 2 or 3 times a day and it causes some hostility from the other servers.^[537]

The luminaries on the Liberal-Left of the Democratic Party had feted Jones for his 'progressive' outlook. The Mayor of San Francisco, George Moscone, appointed Jones to the City's Housing Commission. In 1976 Senator Walter Mondale, later elected as US Vice President, invited Jones to meet with him on his campaign plane, and wrote to Jones: 'Knowing of your congregation's deep involvement in the major social and constitutional issues of our country is a great inspiration to me'. Alaska Senator Mike Gravel, stated that Jones' 'People's Temple' was 'almost too good to be true'. Joseph Califano, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the Carter Administration, having also served in the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, wrote to Jones: 'Knowing your commitment and compassion, your interest in protecting individual liberty and freedom have made an outstanding contribution to furthering the cause of human dignity'. Former Vice President Hubert Humphrey said that Jones' work 'is testimony to the positive and truly Christian approach to dealing with the myriad problems confronting our society today'.^[538] The 'values', 'morality' and 'ideals' of Jim Jones do indeed exemplify today's liberal-democratic ideology,

and Jones acted in a manner historically consistent with the liberal-egalitarian doctrine: he was a sociopath whose ‘socialist utopia’ in the jungle of British Guyana ended with the deaths of over 900 followers two years after the luminaries of the Democratic Party had sung his praises.

Post-Vietnam Disorientation

With the USA’s scuttling of South Vietnam the primary reason for New Left militancy ended, indicating the shallowness of their foundations. Hayden states that ‘the New Left had served its major purposes and faded away, leaving only sectarian ashes’. ‘The sixties were... a “decade ready for the dustbin”’. The Black Panthers had disintegrated through rivalries, the Weathermen ‘had steadily lost their purpose and their bearings. The Yippies were a poster on the wall. The post-SDS Marxist factions continued to fragment into smaller and smaller cells’.

[\[539\]](#)

Some such as Hayden entered the mainstream, many making ‘successful transitions’, making up for lost time in their personal lives and careers but maintaining the Leftist doctrines. Some like Hayden were elected to public office, or joined the Carter Administration.[\[540\]](#) Others however felt rejected, martyred, and later came to ‘a discovery that we ourselves were not pure... We faltered, lost our way, became disorientated above all by death upon death. What began on a soaring spirit suddenly was over, perhaps to be finished permanently. We who claimed to be masters of our fortune discovered that we were not’.

[\[541\]](#)

New Age Cults and Therapies

While the emptiness that occurred after a decade long party of dope, rioting and promiscuity resulted in Abbie Hoffman's suicide, his Yippie comrade Jerry Rubin, and many others turned from the New Left to the New Age, although the doctrines have many similarities. Rubin found the psychotherapy that was being applied in the New Left as a method of thought control, in EST (Ego Self-Transcendence) a version of group therapy founded by Werner Erhard, now known as Erhard Seminars Training.^[542] Rubin stated that, 'Est will spread like wildfire throughout America. It addresses itself to basic human needs, and does work by giving people a greater sense of themselves. In many ways, it was the most powerful growth experience I had'. It is another form of the humanistic psychology that had been incorporated into the New Left.^[543] Group therapy or 'human relations seminars' and the like have long since become part of the mainstream, especially for corporation and government employees, throughout the Western world, and Erhard's system remains in the forefront of this form of induced group-think. Rubin got the same sense of ego dissolution from EST that he got from the New Left way to transcendence through LSD: 'On LSD I felt separate from myself, free of my ego, united with all energy. I felt everyone and everything as one. Sitting in that [EST] training room without any sense of time gave me a druglike feeling of timelessness and spacelessness'.^[544]

Rennie Davis, a 'Chicago Seven' defendant and founder-member of the SDS, was one of the first to find new meaning via the New Age. After a 1971 New Left march on Washington, Davis had a dope-induced vision and told fellow New Left luminary John Froines that he believed there would be an ecological holocaust after which only the 'freaks' would survive and assume power. On another occasion he told Hayden and Jane Fonda that 'the Vietcong were Jesus Christ'. He believed that the end of the Vietnam War would usher in a New Age.^[545]

In 1972 Davis attended the signing of the Paris peace agreement between the USA and North Vietnam and, convinced the war was over, 'was more disoriented than ever'.^[546] He went to India and came back a follower of the 15 year old Maharaj Ji, as had several other New Left veterans. Like Rubin's experiences with EST, Davis' 'initiation' by Maharaj Ji (a 'fat kid... wearing expensive clothes and driving expensive cars, surrounded by rich Americans at an Ashram'^[547]), 'blew out every socket in my head', Davis told Hayden.^[548] Davis said that he could only see 'light' for 'two whole weeks'. 'It scared the

shit out of me because I lost my identity in it'.^[549] Soon after, while washing his clothes at a stream, Davis hallucinated that a giant black bird had entered him and he 'felt helpless, prostrate'.^[550] Davis had found a new purpose in life, as part of Maharaj Ji's Divine Light Mission to convert his generation.

Hayden calls Davis 'one of the most stable and dependable' of the New Left leaders, and was deeply upset by Davis' new found cause. Yet, like Rubin's enthusiasm for EST, Davis was merely finding another avenue for the same psychological motives that attracted many to the New Left. A decade later Hayden found Davis, having left the guru, seeking investment capital for New Age research.^[551]

Al Haber, founder of the SDS, was twenty years later 'constructing a cherry-wood conference table for a global peace summit he envisioned being held at Megiddo, the site in Israel where the biblical Armageddon is prophesied to occur'. Hayden adds that Haber seemed to be 'blissfully without an anchor'.^[552]

Hayden however could understand the eventual disillusionment with the New Left experience that took many veterans into the New Age, writing:

The latter-day SDS and similar revolutionary collectives were closed enclaves with leadership worship, thought control, collective devouring of individual autonomy – totalist cells awaiting an apocalypse that never came. Such groups seemed to proliferate as refugee centers for those unable to live amid the moral and spiritual deficiencies of society. Though I initially encouraged and was fascinated by them, they were ultimately as alienating as the governing institutions I had abandoned years earlier.^[553]

The assessment is somewhat disingenuous. Hayden had done more than encourage and become 'fascinated' by the New Left, he had been a founder of it, and the author of its primary manifesto, the *Port Huron Statement*. It is open to question whether he would have departed so abruptly from the New Left had he not been purged for being a manipulative male chauvinist and had quickly found the option of entering the political mainstream with the help of his wife's fame and money. Nonetheless, his description of the New Left 'totalist cells' is instructive: these operated as closed mini-cults that enhanced the feelings of alienation and withdrawal among the members with an apocalyptic vision of the enemy outer world and impending doom. Jim Jones held his Communist cult together with the same techniques.

There are still those who are trying to recreate the frenetic days of the 1960s

and 1970s. The SDS has been revived on many US campuses as the 'New SDS, and as the Movement for a Democratic Society to cater for the aging veterans of the old New Left, which they now call the 'Next Left'.^[554] The Next Left is the reanimation of the New Left as a symptom of regressive personality.^[555]

There has also been what New Left veteran Jared Israel, a leader of the Worker-Student faction in the SDS, bitterly regards as the news media's rehabilitation of Weathermen terrorists, which he calls the media's 'Weathermen Redemption Project'. Bill Ayers and Bernadine Dohrn in particular have become media celebrities and respectable activists, without being challenged on their claims that they only intended to damage property rather than kill people. Jared Israel writes: 'Today, it is distressing to see on the internet young people looking up to Ayers and Dohrn as heroes of the student movement of the '60s. It means that the Weathermen's terribly harmful effects are being recycled',^[556] adding: 'The day Bill Ayers talks straight it will rain up, but never you mind: the media can perform miracles of public perception'.^[557]

23 - Feminism

Feminism arising during the late 1960s and early 1970s among the New Left provided both genders of the rank-and-file added reinforcement to their respective neuroses. For the females it provided an added dimension to their angst that made all other issues secondary. For the males it provided an added dimension of guilt by being born male in addition to being born middle class and white. For Jewish male adolescents, it meant again being subordinated to matriarchy, after they had joined the New Left to escape their mothers' domineering. Feminism opened up a new era of self-criticism in the New Left, as male radicals anguished over their genetic attachment to the capitalist patriarchy of white male privilege.

Not all those of the New Left and the Next Left such as those of the Occupy movement are psychotic or sociopathic, although clearly many of the leaders and militants are. The mass of camp followers can be observed to be common variety neurotics. Their screaming, shouting and yelling abuse at some authority figure, whether in the actual presence of the police, or the virtual, abstract presence of an 'Establishment' conceptual figure such as a political leader, or even more abstractly, at a form of Government or ideology, serves as self-therapy under sociopathic direction.

Many of those involved in the Left are hysterics, and loss of control out of proportion to any perceived injustice inflicted upon them, such as being arrested for disorderly conduct, obstruction or vandalism, will be met by an excessive reaction and emotional, exaggerated displays of martyrdom. Those arrested for law-breaking, whether it be obstructing traffic by blocking a road or throwing a Molotov cocktail, or training with weapons, will achieve martyr status among their admirers who are able to become vicarious 'revolutionaries' by campaigning against the perceived 'injustice' of arrest.

The rank-and-file activist redirects feelings of frustration and inadequacy onto political targets, just as a sociopath will direct his anger, frustration and feeling of inadequacy, more violently as a rapist, a serial killer or the alienated youngster might take a gun to high school, or a dismissed employee will shoot his former bosses and workmates.

Both the neurotic with issues of anger and frustration, and the psychotic with more violent impulses, can sublimate and rationalise their feelings and act upon

them via Left-wing politics, the extremity of the movement or doctrine depending on whether the adherent is a psychopath willing to kill for a cause, or merely a neurotic 'letting off steam' by chanting slogans and abuse.

'The Politics of Anger'

In attempting to analyse a 'politics of anger' from a sociological perspective, Mary Holmes of the University of Aberdeen drew on 'second wave' feminist literature, particularly from New Zealand. Holmes quotes 'Pam' describing her increasing anger sublimated and reinforced via feminist ideology, from her initial inertia to her increasing resentment: I have become oversensitive to remarks/attitudes aimed at women which I had never noticed before as revealing prejudices against women.... The more I read about women's liberation, the more resentful and angry I become, and the less able I am to express myself on the subject, or even to understand my own feelings about what I want to do with my life.... I find myself arguing with others about women's liberation and almost despairing at the ingrained attitudes about women, in myself as well as others. [\[558\]](#)

As Holmes states, anger has not brought awareness to Pam, but 'confusion'. Holmes states that the ambivalent attitude among feminists towards anger is caused by the prevalence of 'middle class views'. [\[559\]](#) What might be observed here is that firstly 'Pam' is a woman of conflicted identity, seeking meaning in a doctrine. This internal conflict leads to frustration that causes anger. Rather than anger as a response to frustration being seen as a negative, feminism, or more broadly the Left, sees it as positive and in need of channelling and reinforcing. A more contemplative attitude in regard to attempting to resolve one's inner conflicts is regarded in typically Marxian manner as 'middle class' and in need of purging from one's character. One therefore subjects oneself to self-criticism to purge oneself of old attitudes.

During the time of this 'second wave feminism' (1970s-80s) in New Zealand radical Maori feminists began to make an impact on the Left. An attendee at a feminist congress observed the conflict between the anger of lesbians and the anger of the Polynesian feminists: I was reminded how oppression can twist people: the lesbians in this group were arrogant rather than proud, insecure and frightened rather than confident, hurtful and intolerant towards their sisters rather than woman-loving.... At the final session, Polynesian women protested against the racist nature of the convention. Their anger was uncompromising yet dignified, and right on target.... While my attention had been diverted by lesbian

vandalism I had neglected the genuine oppressed minority group of the convention.^[560]

There was a conflict of interest between two factions, one of which was based on race, which from that time started to become a preoccupation of the Left.^[561] The Polynesian feminists observed the white lesbian feminists, who were presumably the predominant faction of the convention, as arrogant, insecure, frightened, hurtful and intolerant.

However, there was also angst among feminists as to whether anger is an appropriate feminist response, or whether it is a symptom of patriarchal aggression.^[562] However, the objection to anger was often that it should be directed against the 'other' (i.e. men) and not among women.^[563] Holmes writes: Distinguishing politicized from personalized anger was difficult within social movements, especially a feminist movement that proclaimed the personal as political. However, interpretations of that slogan varied. Some felt that feminist politics should give personal fulfilment, because as well as challenging power structures, the vision must include personal changes in order to develop.^[564]

Hence one might conclude that feminism with other Leftist movements is personalised anger, politicised, and rationalised by doctrinal interpretations. Leftist feminism was personal therapy formed into a political movement, in common with other Leftist movements. Feelings of anger, inferiority, submission, *etc.* were projected not only onto men, but onto 'power structures', identified as 'patriarchal' or male-run. Leftism as therapy was described by some feminist theorists as focusing on 'issues that unite women by providing personal insights into their oppression', 'from which wider political implications can be drawn'.^[565] This brought further conflict within feminism and there was a split in the seminal New Zealand feminist magazine *Broadsheet*, between lesbian and heterosexual staff, 'and several lesbian members left the *Broadsheet* collective after disputes around differences in politics and allegiance between heterosexual and lesbian feminists.'^[566]

The lesbian feminists were charged with too closely connecting their personal lives (and in particular their sex lives) with their politics. The heterosexual members of the collective felt it almost impossible to criticize the lesbian members' politics without seeming to criticize their personal lives. To be angry about something and angry with someone became almost impossible to distinguish. It became a matter of respecting or disrespecting persons and/or groups.^[567]

The high level of narcissism among the Left makes frequent factions inevitable, and factions within feminism followed the same course. Further symptoms of prevalent narcissism are indicated: According to Anne McFarlane ‘angry separatist women’ attacked anyone who spoke, and there was an unwillingness to speak after seeing ‘the strong reduced to tears’.^[568] By 1980 there was a conference panel called ‘10 years of women’s liberation in New Zealand’. It involved, according to Pilar Alba, feminists who felt that their experience of women’s liberation was largely one of being personally attacked and ‘trashed’.^[569]

Holmes concludes that, ‘Politics can be better understood if emotions, and especially anger, are taken into account as not just motivating, but as having an ambivalent and moving role in politics’.^[570] From a psychohistorical perspective it is a symptom of the neuroses, psychoses and sociopathy being rationalised as political activism. The result of this ‘sociology of anger’ from the Left is often not only bitter factionalism among Leftists over the most pedantic minutiae of doctrine, but when empowered, this narcissism results in the wholesale slaughter or imprisoning of opponents.

24 - Intellectualising Paedophilia

The New Left gave De Sade, hero of Jacobin France, renewed revolutionary impetus. However, the rise of feminism within the New Left during the late 1960s limited the opportunities with women for both narcissistic sexual predators and nerdish inadequates. However, the ‘new morality’ that is intended to replace ‘bourgeois repression’ has extended to an intellectualised defence of paedophilia behind the guise of ‘children’s sexual rights’. This has caused disagreement within the Left, particularly among feminists. However, when ‘morality’ is attacked as a method of class oppression, and a nihilistic attitude towards morality that encourages the notion that ‘all is permitted’ in the name of ‘free expression’, it is the Left that has – whether deliberately or not – laid the basis for paedophilia as a political movement, as it has with sundry other ‘minorities’.

Tammy Bruce, a veteran feminist lesbian, former organiser for the National Organization of Women, and now a vociferous critic of the ‘deeply damaged individuals of the Left Elite’, in reviewing the academic literature that is being published rationalising paedophilia, states:

Here you see the continuing and intensive effort to change definitions and push ‘value-neutral language’, even to the point of eliminating the word ‘child’ from the discussion. ... Of course, it’s only the spread of moral relativism that makes these rank arguments intellectually possible. ... Remember, whenever one of these members of the Left Elite presses the value-neutral case, it provides a stepping stone helping to legitimize the next book or monograph or paper that challenges the ‘taboo’ on child sexual abuse while ‘arguing against the moral panic’ over child sexuality...^[571]

In defending feminist journalist Judith Levine’s treatise on the ‘sexual rights’ of minors,^[572] the Leftist website AlterNet^[573] reminded readers of the roots of the issue among the Left during the 1970s:

Why does the proposition that youth deserves sexual autonomy, pleasure, and privacy seem so radical? In the 1970s, the sexual revolution was in full swing and the idea that children and teens were sexual beings was accepted, at least among progressives.^[574]

Child sex, like other issues of morality, has been politicised by the simple expedient of making it a question of ‘rights’. Levine blames the repression of

child sexual rights on both the Christian Right and elements of feminism. It becomes a question of class, according to these elements of the Left:

Levine's conclusion that 'economic security is necessary for sexual safety' aims at the heart of the religious right's agenda of privatization, parental rights, and consolidation of the authority of the nuclear family over the interests of society and the needs of the younger generation. But such misplaced priorities are nothing new: In the late 19th century, as industrialization drove children into the factories, moralistic adults worried about saving them from sex.^[575]

Here the Leftist commentators associate the question of legalised paedophilia with opposition to 'religious right' agendas on economics and family. Children themselves become a 'class', Levine writing: 'Legally designating a class of people categorically unable to consent to sexual relations is not the best way to protect children, particularly when "children" include everyone from birth to eighteen'.^[576] It further becomes another means of subverting the authority of parents with the aim of destroying the family, a primary objective of Old and New Lefts.

Important sections of the Left saw the criticism of Levine as part of a Right-wing offensive against 'mainstream' opinion on wider issues. Debbie Nathan, who was a member of the committee that reviewed Levin's book for the University of Minnesota Press, states that:

The critics' real goal, though, is not to protect children. The right-wingers are pushing a fundamentalist attack on mainstream American institutions such as legal abortion; acceptance of gays as normal people, and sex education in public schools.^[577]

Such is the success of the Left that what was once regarded as extreme is now referred to as 'mainstream'. Hence, we are now all so acclimatised to the gradual implementation of Leftism that we regard the Left as having been defeated with the implosion of the Soviet bloc, because Leftist doctrines have been sold as 'democracy', 'progress, and 'equality'.

Allen Ginsberg

Among the ‘progressives’ from the 1970s and earlier who laid the foundation for the intellectualisation of paedophilia is Allen Ginsberg, one of the leading gurus of the New Left and founder of the allied Beatnik and Hippie subcultures.

Feminist theorist Camille Paglia has continued to defend Ginsberg’s pro-paedophilia, and writes of the enduring influence of Ginsberg on ‘pop culture’ and his advocacy of ‘man-boy love’ (sic):

Through his influence on Bob Dylan (who in turn influenced the Beatles), Ginsberg revolutionized rock lyrics and directly affected the thinking of several generations of young people around the world... As far as Ginsberg’s pro-NAMBLA stand goes, this is one of the things I most admire him for. I have repeatedly protested the lynch-mob hysteria that dogs the issue of man-boy love. ... Allen Ginsberg was the apostle of a truly visionary sexuality. ... Ginsberg’s celebration of boy-love was pure and sinless, demonstrating the limitations of Judeo-Christian paradigms of sexuality.^[578]

Ginsberg’s mother was a Communist who was diagnosed with ‘dementia praecox’ (schizophrenia) in 1932. She had to be committed to mental hospitals. His father was a Socialist. Allen and his brother Eugene went to Communist summer camps for children. Allen and his brother witnessed many horrifying episodes of their mother’s breakdowns, including a suicide attempt. Dr. K. Elan Jung writing of Ginsberg’s traumatic childhood, relates the bizarre behaviour of his mother, citing biographer, Bill Morgan:

She seldom wore a dress around the house and Allen became quite familiar with his mother’s anatomy. He was particularly upset when he saw her wearing only a bloody menstrual pad while doing chores. Later, while talking to psychiatrists, Allen mentioned seeing her wearing a ‘G-string (Kotex belt), fat, and with long breasts’, blood on her knees. It certainly appears that if Naomi didn’t make sexual advances to her son, she came pretty close to it...^[579]

Jung comments:

Because of this exposure, there can be no doubt the young Allen Ginsberg was deeply affected and clearly suffered from a very straightforward and direct form of sexual trauma. Perhaps it could be argued that his father, in

allowing Allen to be exposed to their mother's derangement in such a manner over a long period of time, was guilty of negligence (clearly, he was desperate). But this is certainly not sexual abuse as it is conventionally understood. However, the sexual trauma was much the same.^[580]

Ginsberg moved into a small apartment with his brother Eugene. They had to share a bed, Eugene uncomfortable with his brother's clinging intimacy. Jung continues:

Later Allen would develop crushes on other boys in his school, and at one point, echoing his mother's nudism, 'stood behind his porch rail and exposed himself to the passing traffic on Halendon Avenue. (No one noticed.) 'Perhaps my whole character is exhibitionistic,' Ginsberg observed as he looked back on that incident.^[581]

At Columbia University Ginsberg assimilated the ideas of the 'Beat generation' philosophers, such as Jack Kerouac and William Burroughs. To avoid prosecution for reckless driving Ginsberg committed himself to Columbia Presbyterian Psychiatric Institute, where he met another 'Beat' writer, Carl Solomon. At the prompting of his psychiatrist he became a full time poet. His early work *Howl*, became a statement of generational angst. Dr. Jung ascribes his career as a poet of the Beat and Hippie generations to Ginsberg's childhood trauma, which Jung nonetheless sees as giving the 'power' to become a 'creative genius'.^[582] His poetry lauds the aesthetics of 'man-boy love', for example:

Some think the love of boys is wicked in the world, forlorn
Character corrupting, worthy mankind's scorn
Or eyes that weep and breasts that ache for lovely youth
Have no mouth to speak for mankind's general truth...
Yet think back to the time our epic world was new
When Gilgamesh followed the shade of his friend Enkidu...^[583]

Ginsberg joined the veteran paedophile advocacy organisation, the North American Man-Boy love Association (NAMBLA) as a logical expression of his New Left commitment to 'freedom'. This was confirmed when there was some consternation in the Jewish community several years after Ginsberg's death:

The newspaper left a message at NAMBLA headquarters in New York requesting verification that Ginsberg was indeed a member of the radical

organization. Wednesday morning, a NAMBLA spokesperson returned the call and said, ‘Yes, Allen Ginsberg was indeed a member of NAMBLA and often spoke out in support of us.’

Ginsberg is quoted on one of NAMBLA’s Web pages as saying, ‘Attacks on NAMBLA stink of politics, witchhunting for profit, humorlessness, vanity, anger and ignorance . . . I’m a member of NAMBLA because I love boys too - everybody does, who has a little humanity.’^[584]

It is by no means certain that Ginsberg was a practising paedophile. What remains relevant nonetheless is that his advocacy of paedophilia was intellectualised by his Leftist conceptions of ‘freedom’. This ‘freedom’ was expressed particularly in the deliberately provocative language he used in his celebrated poetry, where he advocated promiscuous sex. He is credited with being a founder of both the Beatniks and the Hippies. According to Schumacher he is ‘accredited with coining the term ‘Flower Power’. Ginsberg became a figurehead of the global youth movement in the late 1960s’.^[585]

‘Danny the Red’ and the ‘Rights’ (?) of Children

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, a.k.a. ‘Danny-the-Red’, had a more hands-on approach to children. One of the iconic figures of the New Left during the 1960s, he is now a Green Party Member of the European Parliament, and co-president of the Federation of Green Parties in the European Parliament. Cohn-Bendit was one of those on the New Left who sought to extend ‘sexual liberation’ to children.

Daniel Cohn-Bendit, raised in Germany, returned to France in 1966, and while at university joined the anarchists. At the University of Nanterre he organised actions on typically adolescent issues such as ‘sexual freedom’, and occupied the girls’ dormitory as a protest. These antics laid the foundation for the wider radical student movement. Rumours that he was going to be expelled from the University led to the student occupation of the administration offices on 22 March 1968. The closure of the University pushed the student demonstrations into the streets of Paris, leading to a near-revolution in France. Confrontations between police and students led to a General Strike called on 13 May, and support from the French Communist Party.

While working at a Marxist bookshop in Germany Cohn-Bendit also run an ‘anti-authoritarian kindergarten’. A report in 2001 on Cohn-Bendit’s adventures with children in his care during the 1970s backgrounds the ideology of the New Left, and how this generated the environment in which such ‘experiments’ in

‘free expression’ could arise. *London Observer* reporter Kate Connolly questioned Cohn-Bendit on allusions he had made in an article in 1976 for the magazine *das da*, based on comments in his 1975 book *The Big Madness*. In the *das da* article Cohn-Bendit wrote:

My constant flirting with all the children soon took on erotic characteristics. I could really feel how from the age of five the small girls had already learnt to make passes at me. It's hardly believable. Most of the time I was fairly defenceless. ... It has happened to me several times that a few children opened the flies of my trousers and started to stroke me. I reacted differently each time according to the circumstances, but their desire confronted me with problems. I asked them: ‘Why don’t you play with each other, why have you chosen me and not other children?’ But when they insisted on it, I then stroked them. For that reason I was accused of perverted behaviour. [\[586\]](#)

Cohn-Bendit, as an exponent of ‘sexual freedom’, the very ‘issue’ that had sparked a revolt that almost brought down the French Government, was in a moral dilemma, and could hardly reject the sexual advances of five year olds according to his revolutionary conscience. Speaking to Connolly, Cohn-Bendit intellectualised the confession as merely ‘verbal provocation’:

It was meant to illustrate the difficulty of the educator in bringing up children: how does one accept that children have a sexuality, and also to recognise the resistance against which educators have to work. It was written in an autobiographical way and wasn’t scientific - it was a literary exaggeration. I admit that what I wrote is unacceptable nowadays. When I look at those sentences today, I say to myself, ‘Hey Danni, that’s impossible!’ It’s quite legitimate that personalities should be forced to confront their pasts. [\[587\]](#)

Connolly explains that when Cohn-Bendit was expelled from France to Germany he was involved in debates about child education, and the running of the *kinderladen* that had been established as an anti-authoritarian kindergarten run and funded by the Left. [\[588\]](#) He applied for a job as a carer at the *kinderladen* at Frankfurt University, working there for two years. He sought to create a relationship of dependency with the children, writing in *da das*: ‘I realised I had the need to be accepted by them at all costs. I wanted the children to like me and I did everything to make sure they became dependent on me’. He explained the doctrine of the *kinderladen* to *The Observer*: ‘Our idea was to let them realise

their personalities through expression of their needs. Paedophilia was not what got me going'.^[589] Nonetheless, it is the Leftist doctrine that created the rationalisation for an unhealthy relationship between carer and children; precisely the type of relationship paedophiles seek to cultivate.

Connolly pertinently remarks that the kinderladen movement opens up questions about the 'social and sexual mores' of the New Left era. She quotes Gerd Koenen, a radical from the era: 'This was a time of very far-reaching educational experimentation'.^[590] The aim was to eliminate the 'fixation' of children towards their parents and to create a children's 'solidarity battle group' to fight imperialism. Koenen states that portraits of Mao Zedong adorned the walls of the kinderladen. 'The children were taken out on to the streets to demonstrate, and in the more radical kinderladen sexual games became part of their play'. The movement considered that the new generation needed liberating from their parents, what the Baader-Meinhof Gang called the 'Auschwitz Generation'.^[591]

Koenen stated of the New Left in Germany that, 'They were attempting to make a total break with their parents. But in turn many subconsciously also made the break with their own children'. The Baader-Meinhof Gang were strong supporters of the kinderladen movement, believing that it was necessary to give up their children when pursuing urban warfare, Koenen stating, 'They saw it as part of the higher purpose of their terrorist activities. They could then say "I'm autonomous, my children are autonomous, we're all stronger because of the separation"'.^[592] Of particular significance Koenen states:

In a certain way the children were human guinea-pigs in this social experiment, and today there's a generation of children who suffered from being abandoned and unprotected.^[593]

The New Left promoted what the USSR had attempted in its earliest days of Bolshevism; the socialisation of children by separating them from parents and raising them in child care facilities.^[594] The Bolshevik policy was intended to destroy the family, and was reversed by Stalin.^[595] The New Left however fully embraced the original Bolshevik policy. Children were 'guinea pigs' and are so again with the 'Next Left' commitment to 'children's rights' in a new attempt to destroy the parent-child bond. Paedophilia is often rationalised by the perpetrator as being beneficial to children, and this is the line that is still intellectualised by the Left. It is not an anomaly among the Left; it is a consistent development of Leftist doctrine.

25 - 'Madness' as Social Revolt

The Baader-Meinhof Gang

The same time that the Weather Underground had 'brought the war home' to the USA, their counterparts in the Federal Republic of Germany were undertaking similar actions, with a similar ideology, under the red star and gun banner of the Red Army Faction (RAF), otherwise known as the Baader-Meinhof Gang. Of particular interest is that the second generation leadership cadre of the RAF were drawn from mental patients, while the first generation leadership included sociopaths.

Sociologist Dr. Gunther Wagenlehner concluded that the RAF urban terrorists were motivated more by 'psychopathological disturbances' than politics. Wagenlehner found that the Baader-Meinhof terrorists scapegoated the State for their personal problems. Terrorism was 'an individual form of liberation'. 'These students became terrorists because they suffered from acute fear and from aggression and the masochistic desire to be pursued'.^[596] Psychologist Konrad Kellen similarly concluded that most of the RAF terrorists 'suffer from a deep psychological trauma' that 'makes them see the world, including their own actions and the expected effects of those actions, in a grossly unrealistic light'.^[597]

The Baader-Meinhof terrorists were attempting to work out the same psychopathic maladjustments as their American counterparts. Like their counterparts in the USA and indeed around the Western world, they perceived the State or the 'Establishment' as representing the values and normalcy of their parents, and by destroying the State or killing representatives of it, they were killing their parents. It was redirected matricide and patricide intellectualised as a movement for freedom and equality.

The Red Army Faction was founded in 1970 after the breakout from jail of Andreas Baader who had been serving a three-year jail term, along with Gudrun Ensslin, for firebombing two department stores in Frankfurt in 1968. Andreas Baader was a petty criminal, a compulsive car thief and drug addict,^[598] with no political interests before his conversion to revolution under the guidance of Ensslin, although his conversion to the Left did not dissuade him from continuing to habitually refer to women as 'cunts'. Ensslin was the daughter of a pastor, and was referred to by prison doctor Helmut Henck as having a 'cool, seemingly schizoid'^[599] temperament'.^[600]

Ulrike Meinhof was a well-respected journalist from a middle class family. She began her political interests by joining the Socialist German Students Union at Múnster University. She was particularly active in the anti-nuclear campaigns. In 1958 she joined the banned German Communist Party. She wrote for the student Communist magazine *Konkret*, became its editor-in-chief in 1960, and married its publisher, Klaus Rainer Röhl, in 1961. She became well-known for a libel action that was brought against her by conservative politician Franz Joseph Strauss, whom she had compared with Hitler, in 1961. In 1962, after giving birth to twin girls, she had neurosurgery for a tumour, which turned out to be benign.

[\[601\]](#)

Brain Damage

Meinhof's neurosurgery caused brain damage. This neurophysiological damage combined with latent traits that had already been present in Meinhof's character set her on the path to notoriety as one of history's most infamous terrorists.

Meinhof had been popular and received fame as a journalist. She lived well, in a villa filled with antiques and mixed in 'high society'. This discrepancy between lifestyle and convictions created anxiety. Marcia Schenck, in her curriculum guide on the RAF states:

Ulrike Meinhof ended her turbulent life after 41 years by committing suicide in her prison cell - this was her last act of rebellion. Her personality remains a mystery until today. Unexpectedly, she transformed from a gifted, beautiful woman and a committed peace activist into the co-founder of Germany's top-terrorist organization, the RAF. Ulrike Meinhof was a mother, a wife, and a woman suffering from pathological aggression as well as never-ending self-doubt.^[602] The discrepancy between her real and her ideal lives was in Meinhof's own words, 'tearing her apart'. She required consistency and was unable to compartmentalise her two lives. Meinhof wrote in her diary of her anxiety:

My relationship with Klaus, my acceptance by the Establishment, my work with the students – three aspects of my life that seem irreconcilable are pulling and tearing at me. Our house, the parties, Kampen, all that is only partly enjoyable, but among other things it's the basis from which I can be a subversive element. TV appearances, contacts, the attention I get, they're all part of my career as a journalist and a Socialist...I even find it pleasant, but it doesn't satisfy my need for warmth, solidarity, belonging to a group. The part I play...corresponds only very partially to my real nature and needs, because it involves me in adopting the attitude of a puppet, forcing me to say things smilingly when to me, to all of us, they are deadly serious – so I say them with a grin, as if masked.^[603]

What is apparent is that Meinhof felt alienated, despite her society life, professional success and family life with a husband and children. According to her foster mother, she needed the reassurance of others because she lacked self-confidence, and required a stronger personality to support her. Meinhof sought out both a sense of identity, of belonging and of support in what amounted to –

like many closed, ‘totalist’ radical groups - a cult.

From 1968 her articles became increasingly radical with references to violence. In 1968 she divorced Röhl, the following year resigned from *Konkret*, and planned a failed occupation of the offices in protests against what she regarded as the magazine’s counter-revolutionary line. She now became increasingly isolated. She moved to Berlin in 1970 and became involved with the most extreme of the Left. After helping in the breakout of Andreas Baader from prison she went underground, and arranged for her children to be abducted from school, with the aim of sending them to a Palestinian orphanage while she underwent terrorist training in Jordan. However, Stefan Aust succeeded in finding the children in Sicily and returned them to their father.^[604] Marcia Schenck writes:

At times, Ulrike Meinhof showed remorse and signs of weakness because she missed her children, but group pressure, a mixture of threats and accusations proved to be successful, and Ulrike Meinhof surrendered to the fact that she could not be a terrorist and a mother. She abandoned her children for what she believed to be a political fight against the imperialistic state seeking justice in the world. The greater plan demands personal sacrifices. This decision is telling about Ulrike Meinhof’s personality. As much as she was the brain of the group and voice to the outside world, she was weak and submissive on a personal level to Baader and Ensslin. She was nervous and tended to engage in harsh self-criticism.^[605]

Here are all the traits of a cult that has a political façade. Meinhof was mentally vulnerable and insecure. She sought security in the group for which, like the adherents of cults in general, she was willing to sacrifice everything, including her family. While her public persona was as the ‘brains’ of the group, it was only her public reputation that was exploited by the cult’s real leaders, Baader and Ensslin. She had complexes that were reinforced and manipulated by the cult leaders, and again we find the use of self-criticism as a control mechanism to ensure subservience. The group dynamics at work were the same as that of Jim Jones’ Peoples’ Temple that ended in mass suicide in Guyana, and in the case of the RAF leaders, suicide in German jail cells.

Baader regarded Meinhof as ‘useless’ during their days at the Palestinian training camp in Jordan. She accepted these depredations without resistance. While such male emotional abuse is the mark of a narcissistic personality that is

common among abusive husbands who control their wives, the acquiescence of individuals to the criticism of the group or of the group leader is again typically cultic and designed to keep the individual subservient. The technique of self-criticism keeps the individual in an ongoing state of mental imbalance in the hope of approval. Schenck writes:

In contrast to what the name Baader-Meinhof Gang implies, Ulrike Meinhof's influence in the group was rather weak during this time because she was very insecure when it came to interpersonal relationships within the group even though she was assertive, strong, and convincing in her publications.^[606]

The radical posturing through the written word and the subservient, dependent character show again the discrepancy between the real and the ideal world's of Meinhof. Her extreme writings were an attempt to assert herself. Her involvement in violence was that attempt brought to a sociopathic conclusion.

However, while Baader had been a criminal before he found political terrorism, he was correct in regarding Meinhof as 'useless' in criminal activities: she broke off the steering wheel of a car she was attempting to steal, she left most of the money in the bank after a robbery, and she wrongly addressed packages containing stolen blank passports, official stamps and other items used in forging false identity documents.^[607]

After a campaign of bombings and robberies, Meinhof was arrested in a flat in June 1972. She recorded while in jail a sense that her 'head is exploding;' that the top of her skull was going to 'split and come off', and of the spinal cord being pressed into the brain.^[608] After assaulting a jailer, she wrote a self-criticism for this breach of RAF discipline:

I hit one of the cop-nuts here over the head with a lavatory brush. The same old crap: I was only thinking of myself – wanted to let off steam in a fight – self-criticism: I didn't think of the consequences, how the cops could use that against the RAF.^[609]

In 1974 Meinhof participated in all four hunger strikes of the RAF prisoners. However, Baader, Ensslin and her secretly took food according to their places in the RAF hierarchy, while other RAF prisoners died of hunger.^[610] Again, one notes the narcissism even of professed idealists such as Meinhof. Whether it is Mao Zedong, ruling China and living high on the hog while his people starve, or a few cult leaders placing themselves in a privileged position above their

followers, the sociopathy only differs as to the extent of the influence.

Meinhof was sentenced in November 1974 to eight years jail. While intending to write a history of RAF, she remained wracked by self-doubt, and even now believed that she had still not broken completely with the Establishment. In 1974 Meinhof was among five RAF leaders charged with five murders in a trial that lasted two years, during which time independent RAF cells continued to operate. Her relationship with Ensslin, with whom she was imprisoned, had after four years deteriorated to the point where they were 'brutal, cruel and underhand'.^[611] On 8 May 1976 Meinhof hung herself in her cell. The Left attempted to exploit her death by claiming it was State murder. Schenck comments that the suicide was more likely the result of the RAF leaders' own sociopathy directed against each other:

Instead of fighting united against a defined goal, the RAF leadership spent more time fighting against each other in a psychological warfare that was not only cruel and pointless but also self-destructive and counterproductive. It was partly a consequence of living under the strict prison conditions, but also an expression of the emergence of subliminal conflicts that had influenced the group latently since its foundation. They were foremost a result of the interactions of incompatible human beings that were overcoming difficult interpersonal relations. Peter Jürgen Boock who had to decode secret messages between the RAF prisoners remembered having read that the best that Ulrike Meinhof could have done with her miserable life was to kill herself. Internally nobody doubted her suicide and the extent of the disagreements within the group became clear. The sorrow seemed to be a mere mask to support the murder thesis.^[612]

When scientists studied Meinhof's brain they hypothesised that the surgery she had undergone in 1962 could have caused her personality change that led to her extremism. Neurologist Professor Professor Jürgen Pfeiffer, who undertook the autopsy, found deformations of Meinhof's brain. He considered that it was likely that brain damage had caused loss of reality. In 1997 psychiatrist Bernhard Bogerts was given Meinhof's brain for examination. Bogerts concluded that the clamping off of the tumour during the surgery had injured the right hemisphere that deals with emotional response.^[613] Bogert stated that, 'The operation led to pathological modifications of her brain possibly resulting in an increased aggression of Meinhof as well as behavioral changes that turned her from an

aspiring journalist to becoming the co-founder of the far-leftist RAF terrorist group'. "The slide into terror can be explained by the brain illness", he said'.^[614] Meinhof's husband, Röhl, also related that after Ulicke's operation she had become cool, distant and sexually unfeeling.^[615]

Pfeiffer wrote to Meinhof's daughter Renate Riemeck, who confirmed that after the surgery her mother had undergone a personality change that resulted in 'partial self-estrangement'. Dr. Pfeiffer wrote a report of his findings in 1976, stating that:

Arguably, it would have destroyed not only the legitimatization of the RAF but also the credibility of the entire movement of the extra-parliamentary left if it had become known that a pathologically sick woman was the voice of their movement, the author of many central pieces that laid out the RAF ideological framework, and one of the founding members of the Baader-Meinhof Gang.^[616]

Socialist Patients' Collective: Turning Illness into a Weapon

Recruiting for the Left among psychiatric patients seems particularly apt. Psychiatric patients sustained the Red Army Faction after the founding members were jailed. Psychiatric students and their patients in Germany formulated a new socialist doctrine of class struggle in which the new contending class interests became those of patients against doctors. Doctors were regarded as the true ruling class of capitalism, and the concept of 'health' was regarded as 'Nazi'.

Actually this was a development of the Marxian-Freudian, socialist-psychiatric doctrines of the Frankfurt School of Critical Theory. As we have seen, the likes of Theodor Adorno and Wilhelm Reich developed a theory of psychology based on social revolt, claiming that rebellion against normative values was healthy. They flipped normality on its head, whereby psychopathy was intellectualised as the new normality against a repressive system.

Dr. Wolfgang Huber, a psychiatrist at Heidelberg University's psychiatric clinic since 1964, founded the Socialist Patients' Collective, also known as the Patients' Front, from a therapy group that included both students and patients in 1970. We have previously seen how group-therapy became a significant element in the New Left in the USA. When the University administration attempted to remove Huber, his patients organised the Socialist Patients' Collective (SPK), protested and occupied the hospital administration offices until the University relented.^[617]

The slogan of the SPK is ‘turn illness into a weapon’. It is the conscious exposition of what much of the Left throughout history has been on an unconscious level. SPK upheld illness as a positive attribute in human development.

Huber’s Allies

The SPK’s heralding of mental illness as a desirable and revolutionary trait received the endorsement of New Left luminaries such as the philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre who wrote the preface to Dr. Huber’s *SPK – Turning Illness into a Weapon* in 1972. There was a New Left demonstration in New York in solidarity with the SPK on 5 July 1971. In 1972 Huber and his wife Ursel were jailed. In November 1975 both went on hunger-strikes, a major tactic recommended by Huber. 2000 participants at the Psychoanalytical Congress on ‘Sex and Politics’, at Milan called for the release of the Hubers.^[618]

Leftist philosophers and social scientists lined up to support Huber^[619]. Among them were:

- Jean-Paul Sartre, the celebrated French existentialist philosopher and guru of the New Left throughout the world.
- Simone De Beauvoir, Existentialist philosopher and Sartre’s mistress. She is noted particularly for her book *The Second Sex* (1949), a seminal text on Feminism.
- Jean-Jacques de Felice, French lawyer who defended revolutionaries.
- Robert Castel, French sociologist.
- Felix Guattari; a leading exponent of group therapy. Guattari edited the Trotskyite newspaper, *Communist Way* (1964-1965). In 1965 he founded the Federation of Groups for Institutional Study & Research. Guattari was involved with many Leftist causes, including the 1968 New Left riots that convulsed France. Writing of Lenin and psychiatry, he stated:

“I believe there is reason to still be Leninist, at least on the precise point that there is little point expecting spontaneity and creativity of the masses to establish analytic groups in a long-lasting way...”^[620]

Guattari’s aim, and that of Huber’s and many others, was therefore to establish a Communist society via psychiatry – under the guise of ‘anti-

psychiatry' and patients' power – by using the psychotherapy group as a new type of Communist revolutionary cell.

Guattari formulated a psychological doctrine for revolution in which the unconscious is regarded as that which has yet to be brought to consciousness as part of a new political and social order, in which even aspects of the most 'intimate' kind in one's 'private life' can become 'decisive cruxes of historical causality'.^[621]

- Jean-Claude Polack, French psychiatrist and editor of a Leftist psychiatric journal, *Chimeres*, founded by Guattari, by whom he was strongly influenced. Polack is the son of Jewish refugees from Poland, who were Communists from a young age. His father died when Polack was a child. He and his mother went to Latin America where he joined communist youth groups. Polack states in an interview that he was always attracted to 'treason', to supporting enemy states, and during the 1960s he and others of the French Left supported the Algerian revolt against French rule. His internationalist outlook, rejecting any sense of national loyalty, is perhaps accounted for by his wandering since childhood, and lack of native roots. At this time, while a student, he joined a Communist Party cell at a mental hospital.^[622]
- David Cooper, South African born psychiatrist and 'existential Marxist'. His theory on psychosis is similar to Huber's, Cooper stating that psychosis is the result of conflict between one's true identity and one's externally imposed social identity, which can only be resolved by revolution. Like Huber, he also opposed psychiatric treatments and instead favoured politicisation. In 1967 he helped organise the Congress on the Dialectics of Liberation, which drew New Left gurus such as hippie poet Allen Ginsberg, New Left guru Professor Herbert Marcuse, and Black Panther leader Stokely Carmichael. In 1974 Cooper underwent a physical and mental breakdown after finishing his book *The Death of the Family*. He was cared for by his brother and sister-in-law. The book is a Marxian polemic against the family, and perhaps Cooper's own breakdown after finishing it was a reaction to his own inner conflicts, since family members nursed him.^[623]
- Michel Foucault, celebrated French philosopher. Foucault had been

tutored by the French Communist theorist Althusser. Raised in a prosperous family, Foucault said very little of his childhood other than that he was a delinquent during his adolescence and that his father was a ‘bully’.^[624] He went to Paris in the 1950s and with composer Jean Barraqué indulged in heavy drug use and sadomasochism in efforts to enhance creativity.^[625] Foucault remained an enthusiastic practitioner of homosexual sadomasochism, indulging in the ‘gay scene’ on his trips to San Francisco, while teaching at Berkley. He died of AIDS complications in 1983.

- Franco Basaglia, Influential Italian psychiatrist, he successfully campaigned to close all of Italy’s asylums. As with Cooper, Huber, et al he regarded social institutions as the cause of mental illness, and like Huber, he stated that psychiatry was an Establishment control mechanism.^[626] The elimination of psychiatric institutions became a platform of the Italian Communist Party during the 1970s.^[627]
- Roger Gintis, French psychiatrist and opponent of psychiatric intuitions.
- Mony Elkaim, a family therapist in Brussels, and colleague of Guattari, he founded the Reseau International (International Network for Alternatives to Psychiatry), 74 of whose members petitioned on behalf of Huber when he was jailed.

The doctrine of ‘madness’ as a form of social revolt clearly has a significant place in the Left and has long been promoted by eminent psychiatrists and other social scientists.

Cooper wrote the introduction to Foucault’s *Madness and Civilisation*, in which he stated: ‘Madness has in our age become some sort of lost truth’. In *The Language of Madness*,^[628] Cooper stated, in terms similar to Huber, that ‘Madness is permanent revolution in the life of a person...a deconstitution of oneself with the implicit promise of return to a more fully realized world’. Cooper saw the attempts to define and treat ‘madness’, especially schizophrenia, as being ‘invented by the specialized psycho-police agents of final phase capitalist society’. Like Huber, he saw ‘madness’ as liberating, and in particular of freeing oneself from the family: ‘Madness (contrary to most interpretations of “schizophrenia”) is a movement out of familialism (including family-modelled institutions) towards autonomy. This is the real “danger” of madness and the reason for its violent repression’.^[629] Cooper regarded ‘all delusion as “political

statement” and all madmen [as] political dissident’.^[630]

Huber was, then, definitely not a lone eccentric among the Left; he was part of an influential current of thought among ‘existentialist Marxists’ who were prominent in the social sciences, such as Foucault and Cooper, and prior to these the Frankfurt School theorists such as Marcuse and Adorno who regarded traditional institutions such as family, as psychologically repressive. Many Leftist social scientists therefore saw in Huber someone of like-mind being persecuted by the State.

In the ‘Preface’ to the 1993 German edition of *SPK – Turning Illness into a Weapon*, Huber explained the convoluted ideology of SPK in an uncharacteristically succinct manner^[631]:

To be up to date nowadays means quite other things. The biggest industry is no longer that which produces weapons, computers, cars or interspace crafts. The biggest industry from nowadays is that which fakes to produce health, that’s to say a thing which never has existed and which never will really exist, except as a product of illusion nourishing nazism in all its past and coming variations (HEILwesen)^[632]. Capitalism takes its biggest gains from this top industry and the day is not far, on which half of the population in the Western world everyday will be either employed in the hospitals or will be exploited there as doctor-patients, the other half. Rotating system. For fun? Only for its respective planetary governors (for HEAVEN’s sake!) or star governors.^[633]

The strategy is to mobilise health patients as a new underclass in a battle against the true force behind capitalism: the health profession. Like the RAF fixation with the supposed Nazism of their parents, including those who had resisted Hitler, whom they called the ‘Auschwitz generation’,⁶³²^[634] the ill-revolutionaries see the very concept of ‘health’ and seeking a healthy population as intrinsically ‘Nazi’. Huber explained that Hitler had been the tool of a conspiracy of doctors, rather than the orthodox Communist doctrine that he had assumed power at the behest of monopoly-capitalists, writing:

Well, for many decades now, there has been a steady increase of facts and signs that Hitler did not come to power through crisis and psyche. It rather appears as if an international elite of medical doctors had found in him and his fellows their man whom they could use to enjoy undilutedly the medicynical monopoly to murder and the iatrocatic inebrity with power

for a short millenium.^[635]

The new 'proletariat' of the revolution are patients, and in place of the factories as the centres of capitalist exploitation there are the hospitals, and the new ruling class are the doctors. Hence, Marxist doctrine is now applicable to this new dialectic:

The reader of the following pages therefore is in no way asked to take the expression class-antagonism for nothing but a Marxist fossil... But for a long time since then, the class antagonism has returned from there, not to the factories, governed by the trade unions and by the bosses, but to the hospitals governed by the medical doctors, submitting and exploiting the patients, producing the illusionary commodity health altogether in those factories, regardless of all trade-unionism, regardless of all guerrilla activities.^[636]

'The class antagonism of nowadays and the only real problem to be solved', is that of patients versus doctors. In the SPK ideology territorial imperialism is replaced by 'medical imperialism', and the power of financial banks is replaced by the power of organ transplant banks. 'An imperialism dealing with the organs of children e.g. here and now just as far away with countries and peoples, as noted in the Marxian books'. Huber counsels, 'Make use of your own experiences about illnesses and put fantasy into action'.^[637] Illness offers the new revolutionary dynamic:

...That's because illness possesses the force required to cause a revolutionary change, force as torque [Krankheit that Kraft zum Drehmoment]; illness being the all-embracing force that is expanding over all limits, over matter, energy, space and time: illness being absolute acceleration, speed of light, on the inside as well as on the outside, physically abstract as well as concrete of the society as a whole.^[638]

The 'main focus' of the revolution would now be not the 'expropriation of property' from exploiters, but the 'expropriation of illness', 'apply illness', 'offend by illness', and turn it to 'political, economical and theoretical connections and contexts' on a 'worldwide scale'.^[639]

SPK's seminal document outlines eleven principles of the new revolutionary dichotomy:

Theses and Principles : 11 x ILLNESS

Illness is condition and result (*Voraussetzung und Resultat*) of the relations of production (*Produktionsverhältnisse*) in capitalism. Illness being the totality of conditions of capitalist relations of production is the productive power (force of production, *Produktivkraft*) par excellence for capitalism.

As the result of capitalist relations of production illness in its developed form as protest of life against capitalism is the revolutionary productive power par excellence for all human beings.

4. Illness is the only form in which 'life' in capitalism is possible.
5. Illness and capitalism are identical: in the same measure in which dead capital (*totes Kapital*) is accumulated, a process which runs parallel to the annihilation of human work, so-called capital-annihilation (*Kapitalvernichtung*), becoming a common matter, illness becomes more widespread and increasingly malign (*Verbreitung und Intensität von Krankheit nimmt zu*).
6. Relations of production in capitalism involve that living work (*lebendige Arbeit*) has to be turned into dead matter (*tote Materie*: commodities, capital). Illness expresses this process, which is in permanent progress and gaining ground.
7. Illness is the veiled unemployment and in the form of social security contributions being imposed (*Sozialabgaben*) illness is crisis-buffer (*Krisenpuffer*) par excellence in iatro-capitalism.
8. Illness in its undeveloped form is inhibition and impediment and therefore the inner prison of the lonely ones (*der Einzelnen*).
9. If we get illness released from administration, exploitation (*Verwertung*) and the custody (*Verwahrung*) through the institutions of health and if illness emerges in the form of collective resistance there is the situation, that the state has to intervene in order to substitute the inner prison of the patients by external, 'real' (*richtige*) prisons.
10. The health system can get along with illness only on condition that patients are totally outlawed.
11. Health is nothing but a biologicistic-nazistic figment of the mind (*Gesundheit ist ein biologistisch-nazistisches Hirngespinnst*), the function of this figment is to veil in the heads of the making-stupids and of the made-stupids (*Verdummer und Verdummten dieser Erde*) that illness is conditioned by society and also to veil the social function of illness.^[640]

Huber explained further:

Medical practice has revealed itself to us again and again as the root of class domination and, being sovereign and superior over and beyond state power and economy, as sovereign murder weapon against revolutionary fulfilment. [\[641\]](#)

Illness is a capitalist plot to suppress the proletariat:

Illness, under the conditions of fully developed capitalism, is the only appropriate word for alienation and capitalism, and that the identity of suicide and murder is its most visible manifestation. It has been bought from us that illness is the buffer of capitalist crises that, together with the so-called system of social welfare and public health, the latter being organized on its pretext, is hopelessly damping the so-called industrial proletariat, keeping it down and in step. [\[642\]](#)

Huber wrote that State prosecutions proved the SPK premise that ‘revolution is therapy and therapy is revolution, and must not be anything else’. [\[643\]](#) Huber offers a ‘summary’:

The medical complex as a whole (world of scarcity, medicine, military) is the main focus for the strategy of revolutionary offensive.

Illness as the anticipated end of the world of scarcity and surplus value, and the anticipated beginning of world communism, wherever the medical blood ban is broken.

Mediations: agonal dialectics, front patient, pathopractices infusion [fusionierende Pathopraktik]

Fusing pathopractices: all are sharing in the aim, nobody is impeding the other.

Every step which unleashes illness and liberates from the physician is a step in which illness is leaving behind the permanent trace of its disappearance. [\[644\]](#)

Huber recommends illness as the means (‘pathopractice’) by which a revolutionary consciousness must be activated, with the Patients’ Front as the vanguard of the revolution:

Apply. Apply ILLNESS to everything [ALL]. Apply everything [ALL] to illness. Illness as nothing but a thoroughly technical matter. To intercede

in favor of illness: everybody, every time and everywhere. And, what is no more nor less: turn upside down, shake up [umkremeln]. Laugh yourself ill at everything that is shrinking by health [gesund schrumpfen]. Stigmatize yourself in favor of illness. Shrink by illness [krank schrumpfen] the Patients' Front up to a Front's patient.^[645]

'Pathopractice' includes the hunger strike^[646], refusal to take medication,^[647] and even the SPK's self-dissolution, as 'strategic withdrawal',^[648] because no actions could be taken by the state, including doctors, in regard to the patients whether in terms of prosecution or of treatment for psychosis. 'Illness had given itself speech and efficiency'.^[649]

SPK to RAF

The original SPK was short-lived.^[650] However, many supported RAF terrorism.^[651] The most notable was Klaus Jünschke, both a psychiatric student and a patient at Heidelberg University, where he became a member of the SPK in 1970. After the dissolution of SPK he was among those who joined the RAF. Ensslin code-named him 'Late Harvest'.

On 22 December 1971 he participated with six other RAF members in a robbery of the Bavarian Mortgage and Exchange Bank in Kaiserslautern, taking 134,000 DM. Herbert Schoner, a policeman, was shot during the raid. Jünschke along with Irmgard Möller was arrested on 9 July 1972. However only Jünschke could be proven to have participated in the robbery. Whilst a witness at one of the many trials of the Baader-Meinhof Gang Jünschke, after being interrupted by the judge, jumped over a table, threw the judge to the ground, yelling 'For Ulrike [Meinhof], you bastard'. In 1977 he was sentenced to a life term. With the assistance of Antje Vollmer, Green Party Member of the Bundestag, Jünschke was pardoned in 1988, and now works as a journalist, while continuing Leftist activities with the Green Party.

26 - 'Next Left'

As previously mentioned, some elements of the Left are referring to the 'Next Left', although this does not seem to be anything more than a reanimation of the New Left by the surviving vestige of that generation. Indeed, they have even resurrected the names of the era and in 2006 re-established the Students for a Democratic Society, along with an adult counterpart, the Movement for a Democratic Society (MDS), catering for those who might have a regressive personality disorder and are still fixated on the excitement of their adolescence. The SDS/MDS emulate the original SDS journal *New Left Notes*, calling their periodical *Next Left Notes*.^[652] Contributors have included Weather Underground veterans Dorhn, Ayers and Rudd; Paul Buhle, who had been spokesman for the University of Illinois chapter of SDS in 1966, and editor of *Radical America*, which ran from 1967 to 1999, and original SDS founder Alan Haber.^[653] SDS Mark II also emerged from an Old Left organisation, the Industrial Workers of the World (IWW).^[654]

'Next Left'^[655] is also the term adopted by a ghost from the very Old Left, the Fabian Society in Britain,^[656] founded in the latter part of the 19th century. This is not unusual, as the original SDS from which the New Left emerged, had its roots in the American version of Fabianism, the League for Industrial Democracy and its youth affiliate, the Student League for Industrial Democracy formed in 1905.^[657] In Europe, the Federation for European Progressive Studies launched the 'Next Left Research Programme' in 2009.^[658]

While Vietnam and 'Black civil rights', and later 'anti-apartheid' maintained Leftist momentum, the debt crisis has fuelled the current Left, providing justification for 1960s-style riots and the targeting of shops across European capitals, without the slightest evidence that the 'Next Left' has any more realization of the functioning of the debt-finance system than its predecessors. However, a critical examination and solutions to the debt-crisis is not the aim of any such movement. The aim is rather, the mobilisation of the dregs of society, allied with the alienated, and neurotic and led by the psychotic and narcissistic, as has been the aim since the 18th Century Jacobins. Like the mobs of France, the capitals of the Western world are again experiencing the rise of what Lothrop Stoddard called the 'revolt of the underman',^[659] and what the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche recognised in anarchists as social revolt based on *ressentiment*.

Hence, the Left saw the rampages through the streets of Britain in 2011 by

an underclass of thugs who looted and torched shops and mugged ordinary citizens, as revolutionary acts. To the nihilistic elements of the Left common criminality has always been of political significance, as exemplified in Abbie Hoffman's manual for thieves, *Steal This Book*.

London Riots 2011

The nihilistic Left attempts to analyse the British riots in a political context. Such analysis in making 'society' the cause of all forms of sociopathy is allied to the theories of the Frankfurt School and later Leftist movement among psychiatrists that regard 'madness' as a revolutionary response to 'capitalism', and revolt as the ultimate psychotherapy. Hence, 'libertarian-communists' (i.e. anarchists) in England saw the widespread 2011 looting and vandalism as politically justified:

One of the many things that we hear repeated ad nauseam in the context of the present rioting in London is that the rioters are 'feral', 'yobs', 'thugs' or more generously 'disaffected youth'. All the talk from Cameron and his cohorts is of crime and punishment and 'the full force of the law' - as if these young people did not encounter the full force of the law on a daily basis. We are told variously that there is no political context, no political motive, no political enemy - it is 'criminality pure and simple'. This is because violence against the police (and therefore the state) is not considered in itself to be political. It is because the envy of, the desire for and the acquisition of luxury goods such as plasma TVs and jewellery is not considered political. The political class and the commentariat cannot conceive of themselves as enemies of the people who live in areas like Tottenham where Tory cuts are closing youth centres, which suffer massive unemployment even while the City is booming, and which are the objects of legislation designed to disadvantage them even further.

...There is nothing mindless about this violence. It is intelligent, technological and well-organised. Tactically, the rioters have outfoxed the much stronger police force and the intelligence services. It is destructive of community life certainly, brutally hard on small shopkeepers and people living on or near the high streets, but is it as destructive as permanent unemployment, hopelessness and the conviction that the state has abandoned you in favour of the Stock Exchange? That these young people have turned on the most immediate symbols of power and wealth

and that they want some of it for themselves makes these riots no worse than the destruction undertaken by Thatcher or beginning under Cameron. And they are quintessentially neoliberal because these young people have absorbed the dictum that greed is good, that you take what you can, that the powerful shall inherit the earth. ... [As I write London is quieter but the action has moved to Manchester (from which many of London's police reinforcements have been drawn!), Birmingham and Bristol, and a police station in Nottingham has been fire-bombed.]^[660]

What sparked the riots in Britain in 2011 was the shooting of a thug by police. The Left have a penchant for politicising and heralding common criminals as revolutionary heroes. The lionising by the Weather Underground of the murderous sociopaths of the Charles Mason 'Family', and even of the accidental derailment in 1947 of a train by little Latino boy, Marion Delgado, are some particularly bizarre examples of the Leftist conception of 'heroism'.

Mark Duggan

Hence, to the Trotskyites, anarchists, et al, Mark Duggan was a ‘family man’, who had been shot without reason by police while he was in a taxi supposedly en route to his fiancée.^[661] The fact that Duggan was a father of four was used to obscure his background as a *gangsta* and drug dealer. Duggan was armed with a loaded pistol, and was shot while police attempted to arrest him on suspicion of planning a revenge attack on the killer of his cousin. He had been given a pistol just 15 minutes prior to the shooting.^[662] *The Guardian*, hardly a voice of the ‘Right’, reported:

...But Duggan’s Facebook page, under his alias Starrish Mark, pictures him in a T-shirt bearing the words Star Gang, and reports suggest he may have had links to that group and allied north London gangs such as the Broadwater Farm Posse and Tottenham Mandem. *The Voice*, Britain’s leading black newspaper, has claimed that both Duggan and his best friend, 23-year-old rapper Kelvin Easton, known as Smegz, ‘had links to the Star Gang’, one of several criminal groups in north London whose turf wars have caused at least three deaths over the past few years. ... At the time of his death last Thursday he was under investigation by officers from Trident, the Metropolitan police unit responsible for gun crime within the black community. ... Other unconfirmed reports have alleged he was a known drugs dealer. Some of the messages posted by friends on his Facebook pages could suggest possible gang involvement, referring to Duggan variously as a ‘soldier’, a ‘true star boy’ and a ‘five star general’. One of the messages left among the bouquets outside Duggan’s family home yesterday referred to ‘Gang N17 Farm’, the name of one of the Star gang’s allies...^[663]

The fact that Duggan was ‘Black’ and shot by police is more than sufficient to elevate him to the ranks of political martyr in the Left’s pantheon.

As in the iconic riot of the 1960s in the Weathermen’s ‘Days of Rage’ in Chicago, the destruction of the livelihood of small shopkeepers is just collateral damage and can be scapegoated onto the ‘Establishment’. Hayden described the Weathermen riot in 1969 as ‘otherworldly, like a tribal cult gathering in anticipation of a powerful, life-altering, and traumatic ritual... fuelled by drugs’. The Weathermen ran amok through the Gold Coast, smashing car and shop windows, over ‘three days of steady rampages’.^[664] What Hayden is describing is

the atavistic frenzy that takes over a mob, and which takes on a life of its own, wherein the individual is depersonalised, and becomes part of a single surging organism, capable of cruelties that would not normally occur.^[665] It is the collective psyche of the mob that has been utilised by revolutionists from the Jacobin Revolutionaries to the Bolsheviks, to the New Left. It is why the Left continues to be so heartened by the riots of Tottenham, for example, as indicating the ever-present latency of the violent mob ready to burst forth at the slightest provocation.

This is what the philosopher Nietzsche referred to as *ressentiment* as the motive of Leftist doctrines, the sociopathic desire for revenge based on envy and intellectualised as ‘social justice’, or with the Jacobin slogan: ‘Liberty, Equality, Fraternity’. Once such forces are unleashed, however, they enact a tsunami of bloodshed that is blind fury, destroying and killing without thought to the consequences or the suffering of innocent multitudes. *Ressentiment* is not merely being resentful, but the creation of a doctrine or a movement motivated by feelings of inferiority. Dr. Nathaniel Weyl was referring to the same psychology when he coined the term ‘aristocide’, as previously discussed. Hence, the barbarities that are inflicted in the name of ‘equality’:

The slave revolt in morality begins when the resentment itself becomes creative and gives birth to values: the resentment of those beings who are prevented from a genuine reaction, that is, something active, and who compensate for that with a merely imaginary vengeance. While all noble morality grows out of a triumphant affirmation of one’s own self, slave morality from the start says ‘No’ to what is ‘outside’, ‘other’, to ‘a not itself’. And this ‘No’ is its creative act. This transformation of the glance which confers value—this necessary projection towards what is outer instead of back onto itself—that is inherent in resentment. In order to arise, slave morality always requires first an opposing world, a world outside itself. Psychologically speaking, it needs external stimuli in order to act at all—its action is basically reaction...^[666]

The Occupy Movement: Rape, Drugs, Theft & Disease

One of the most significant actions of the Left in recent years has been the ‘Occupy’ movement that spread throughout the world, from the Occupy Wall Street Movement, as a reaction to the global debt crisis. Again, as is characteristic of Left-wing analysis, the vague demands are for a ‘redistribution of wealth’, through taxation or confiscation, with little or no thought given to the

workings of the global banking system. However, the search for answers to problems is not the impulse of the Left, it is the unleashing of destructive impulses per se. Much of the 'Occupy movement' became a beacon for the homeless to live parasitically off the food and shelter provided by the neurotic idealists among their number, who also provided the prey for the narcissists and sociopaths who come to the fore of such movements. Hence, the weaker elements of the Occupy movement were subjected to the characteristic traits of Leftist revolt: rape, theft and disease. The Occupy Wall Street movement was described idealistically as,

A people-powered movement that began on September 17, 2011 in Liberty Square in Manhattan's Financial District, and has spread to over 100 cities in the United States and actions in over 1,500 cities globally. #OWS is fighting back against the corrosive power of major banks and multinational corporations over the democratic process, and the role of Wall Street in creating an economic collapse that has caused the greatest recession in generations. The movement is inspired by popular uprisings in Egypt and Tunisia, and aims to fight back against the richest 1% of people that are writing the rules of an unfair global economy that is foreclosing on our future.^[667]

The Occupy movement has provided new opportunities just as in the earliest days of the New Left, for the underman to rise to the top. It is a giant, global squat. As microcosms of the future socialist utopia, the Occupy squats provide interesting case studies. A report in *The New York Observer* backgrounded the atmosphere of sexual harassment at the Occupy protests, for which the organisers are ultimately responsible. On 18 October 2011:

A 19-year-old Cleveland woman claimed she was raped at the protests after 'camp leaders' directed her to share a tent with a man named Leland. The OWS message boards erupted: the young woman was called a liar, accused of secretly working with the government to make OWS look bad, or at the very least she was asking for it by getting into a tent with a strange man, and other misogynistic excuses. Perhaps the only surprising aspect of the reaction to the alleged assault was that it was Occupiers themselves that were turning against the victim, who they perceived as a threat to their community and tentative relationship with the local authorities.^[668]

Here the mob mentality came into play and the narcissistic character of the

Left in condemning an individual who had broken ranks with the group and brought the cause into disrepute by her complaint. She was subjected to what amounts to the group criticism that is a feature of the Left as a means of control. The feminist answer to male Leftist liberties was to create a ‘Safer Spaces Working Group’ at the Wall Street Occupation, with a ‘female-only sleeping space in a section of Zuccotti Park’. [\[669\]](#)

Rape and molestation were augmented by other socialist activities including muggings and theft, otherwise known as the ‘redistribution of wealth’. When sociopathy and criminality are heralded by Leftist ideologues as forms of protest one might say, ‘the chickens are coming home to roost’. One cannot drag up a mob of squatters – regardless of the rationalisations used about politics – without expecting the dregs to rise to the top when the underworld is stirred.

Some of the revolutionary activism from the Occupy movements includes the throwing of a Molotov cocktail and making hand grenades in Portland, Oregon, plus multiple assaults within a 24 hour period, drug busts for heroin and Meth, body lice outbreak, sexual assault, and on-going theft; 12 assaults in 24 hours, ATMs smeared with faeces in San Francisco; outbreak of Zuccotti lung disease, threats towards a sexual assault victim, and other sexual assaults at Wall Street; ringworm outbreak at Santa Cruz; TB outbreak at Atlanta, Georgia; multiple reports of sexual assaults at Baltimore; vandalising of a vendor’s cart with bodily fluids [\[670\]](#) at San Diego, use of a local bank as a toilet at Eureka, and so on.

Expressing concern that sexual assaults were not being reported, Sergeant Ed Mullins of New York noted that many of the protesters were youngsters, who were ‘in the lion’s den’. [\[671\]](#) Fox News stated:

The first reported incident occurred on Oct. 8, when a man was accused of sexually abusing a woman who was in a sleeping bag at Zuccotti Park. The victim did not report the incident until a few days later, when she saw the suspect, David Park, 27, at the protest site again. Park, a Connecticut resident, had been arrested for disorderly conduct at a previous march, and he had numerous warrants out for him in both New York and his home state before the protests began. Another incident was reported last week when a Brooklyn man, Tonye Iketubosin, 26, was arrested for allegedly sexually assaulting a woman in her tent at Zuccotti Park on Oct. 25. Iketubosin, a volunteer at the Occupy Wall Street ‘kitchen,’ was questioned about the alleged rape of a second woman on Oct. 29. Reports

of sexual abuse also surfaced in Dallas, where a 23-year-old man was accused of having sex with a 14-year-old runaway girl, and in Cleveland, where cops opened an investigation of a sexual assault that allegedly occurred on Oct. 15. ... The incidents of sex crimes, reports of petty theft, assaults and general outbursts of violence have sprung up not only around Wall Street, but in Occupy camps across the country. ... In Boston, homeless protesters were removed from Dewey Square after they were discovered to have knives and stashes of illegal drugs.^[672]

In characteristic manner, ordinary workers were the victims of Leftist outrage when they were told they would no longer receive free food:

At the site of the Occupy San Diego camp, street cart vendors were forced to close up shop Monday when protesters, angry that they stopped receiving free food, ransacked and vandalized the carts. The angry mob not only scrawled graffiti on the carts, they reportedly splattered them with blood and urine as well. In addition, the vendors received death threats, according to local radio station KNX 1070. ... Also in lower Manhattan, a business owner made claims that she has been terrorized and her well-being threatened by Occupiers after she prohibited them from using her store's restroom to bathe. Stacey Tzortzatos, owner of Panini and Co., located across from Zuccotti Park, got fed up two weeks ago when demonstrators broke a bathroom sink causing flooding in the shop and leaving her with a bill of \$3,000 in damages, according to the New York Post.^[673]

These are the types that become the commissars and hold supreme power in the wake of successful Leftist revolutions, with the power of life and death over millions. It happened in Jacobin France, in Russia, China, North Korea... It is happening on the streets across the capitals of the world.

Conclusion To consider the Left in purely political terms is limiting and does not offer explanations. The Left is a psychological aberration having the same motivations as the mass murderer, the rapist and the thief. Those who in other circumstances would become criminal sociopaths redirect their destructive impulses via politics. Over the course of several hundred years and across continents, the course of the Left has been the same. We are therefore witnessing something other than merely politics or protests against injustices. There are common and persistent characteristics. Specifically, Sociopathy and Narcissism appear as constants among Leftists. In general, the Left is intellectualised psychopathy.

As many early social scientists and a few others who still have the courage to contradict the now largely Leftist orientation of the social sciences, observed, Leftism has provided a rationalisation or intellectualisation for behaviour that would in other situations be regarded as delinquent at best, when not tending towards mass murder. Leftist leaders often have the same personality traits as sociopathic and narcissistic cult leaders of the Jim Jones variety – himself a Leftist – but when the likes of Trotsky, Mao and Lenin are elevated to the leadership of millions, the damage extends far beyond whatever can be inflicted by a cult leader like Charles Manson (significantly another icon of the Left).

Leftist ideology has been formulated by those who project their own personal, often family, angst upon entire nations and civilisations, in a conflict that seems akin to the oedipal, transferred from parental authority to governmental authority. The motive, however rationalised, is not to correct injustices, but to destroy. What is notable about the dominant ideologies whether of the Old, New or Next Left, is that they seek above all else to destroy traditional human bonds cultivated over the course of centuries, in swift tumults that take no account of human suffering, but are unleashed with the utmost fury in the name of an entirely abstract conception of ‘humanity’. Hence, one social analyst, Lothrop Stoddard, aptly defined this as the ‘revolt of the underman’, and

so it remains regardless of whatever 'new' and 'lofty' wrapping around which the Left might be recreated.

About the Author

Kerry Bolton has doctorates in theology and related areas, Ph.D. honoris causa, and certifications in psychology and social work studies. He is a Fellow of the Academy of Social and Political Research, Athens; and a Fellow of the Institute for Higher Studies on Geopolitics and Auxiliary Sciences (Lisbon). a ‘contributing writer’ for Foreign Policy Journal, and a regular contributor to New Dawn (Australia). He has been widely published on a variety of subjects in the scholarly and broader medias.

Other Books by Kerry Bolton include:

Revolution from Above

(London: Arktos Media Ltd., 2011)

The Parihaka Cult

(London: Black House Publishing, 2012)

Artists of the Right

(San Francisco: Counter-Current Publishing, 2012) Stalin: The Enduring Legacy

(Black House Publishing 2012)

Oscar Wilde: The Soul of Man Under Socialism: Introduction (Black House Publishing, 2012) Hilaire Belloc: Europe and the Faith: Introduction

(Black House Publishing, 2013)

- [1] K. R. Bolton, *Revolution from Above* (London: Arktos Media Ltd., 2011), p. 101.
- [2] T. W. Adorno, et al *The Authoritarian Personality* (New York: Harper and Row, 1950).
- [3] K. R. Bolton, "'Sex Pol' Ideology: The Influence of the Freudian-Marxian Synthesis on Politics and Society', *Journal of Social, Political and Economic Studies*, Washington, Vol. 35, No. 3, Fall 2010, pp 329-338.
- [4] S. Rothman and S. R. Lichter, *Roots of Radicalism: Jews, Christians and the New Left* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), pp. 50-52.
- [5] *Ibid.*, p. 55.
- [6] T. W. Adorno, et al *op. cit.*, p. 939. Cf. Bolton, *op. cit.*, p. 'Sex Pol Ideology', p. 335.
- [7] Erich Fromm, *Escape From Freedom* (New York: Rinehart & Co., 1941), p. 36.
- [8] *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- [9] *Ibid.*, p. 286.
- [10] Myran Sharaf, *Fury on Earth – A Biography of Wilhelm Reich* (London: Andre Deutsch, 1983), p. 169; K. R. Bolton, 'Sex Pol Ideology', *op. cit.*, pp. 347-348.
- [11] K. R. Bolton, *Ibid.*, p. 339.
- [12] E. Fuller Torrey, *The Roots of Treason: Ezra Pound and the Secrets of St Elizabeth's* (London: Sidgwick and Jackson, 1984).
- [13] Major Arch E. Roberts, *Victory Denied* (Colorado: Committee to Restore the Constitution, 1972) pp. 161-185.
- [14] Thomas Szasz, 'The Shame of Medicine: The Case of General Edwin Walker', *The Freeman*, Vol. 59, no. 8, October 2009, <http://www.thefreemanonline.org/columns/the-therapeutic-state/the-shame-of-medicine-the-case-of-general-edwin-walker/>
- [15] *Ibid.*
- [16] *Ibid.*
- [17] 'Paranoia as Patriotism: Far Right Influences on the Militia movement', *The Nizkor Project*, <http://www.nizkor.org/hweb/orgs/american/adl/paranoia-as-patriotism/minutes.html>
- [18] *The Association for Psychohistory*, <http://www.psychohistory.com/>
- [19] Lloyd deMause, <http://www.psychohistory.com/htm/bio.html>
- [20] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd* (Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, 1977).
- [21] Frank Ellis, *Political Correctness and the Theoretical Struggle: From Lenin and Mao to Marcuse and Foucault* (Auckland: Maxim Institute, 2004).
- [22] Lothrop Stoddard (1922), *The Revolt Against Civilization: The Menace of the Under-Man* (Wermod & Wermod, 2012), <http://shop.wermodandwermod.com/the-revolt-against-civilization-the-menace-of-the-under-man.html>
- [23] Cesare Lombroso is widely regarded as the founder of criminology.
- [24] Max Nordau, *Degeneration* (New York: D Appleton & Co., 1895), p. 18.
- [25] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.
- [26] *Ibid.*, p. 22
- [27] *Ibid.*, pp. 32-33.
- [28] *Ibid.*, p. 555.
- [29] *Ibid.*, p. 560.

- [30] Dr. Satoshi Kanazawa is a Professor of Managerial Economics at the London School of Economics and Honorary Research Fellow, Department of Psychology, Birbeck College, University of London.
- [31] Satoshi Kanazawa and Kaja Perina, 'Why More Intelligent Individuals Like Classical Music, *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, Wiley, January 2011, p. 274.<http://personal.lse.ac.uk/Kanazawa/pdfs/JBDM2012.pdf> See also: Satoshi Kanazawa, 'Why Liberals and Atheists Are More Intelligent', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 2012, 73, pp. 33-57 <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/Kanazawa/pdfs/SPQ2010.pdf>
- [32] Alienist = Psychiatrist.
- [33] Lothrop Stoddard, op. cit., Chapter VI: 'Rebellion of the Under-Man', p. 177.
- [34] Ibid., p. 177 n.
- [35] R. Courtier-Forster, 'Bolshevism, Reign of Torture at Odessa', *London Times*, 3 December 1919, pp. 2, 3, 4.
- [36] S. Melgunoff, *La terreur rouge* (Paris, 1927), cited by Vicomte Leon de Poncins, *The Secret Powers Behind Revolution* (California: Christian Book Club of America, n.d.), p. 149.
- [37] Jeffrey Dahmer killed 17 young men during 1978-1991, refrigerated them and cannibalised their body parts.
- [38] 38 Edward Gein was a cannibal, necrophile, and grave robber, who used body parts to construct leggings, furniture coverings and so forth.
- [39] Gustave Le Bon, *The Crowd*, op.cit., p. 86.
- [40] Gustave Le Bon, *The World in Revolt* (New York, 1921) p. 179; cited by Stoddard, op. cit., Chapter VII: 'The War Against Chaos'.
- [41] Nesta H. Webster, *The French Revolution, 1919, 1969*. Wermod & Wermod, Britain, will be issuing a de luxe edition of *The French Revolution*, with an introduction by this author. The pages cited in this article are from the 1969 edition.
- [42] Nesta H. Webster, 'Monsters Behind the French Revolution: Carrier and a few other Terrorists', *Revolutionary Portraits V*, *The Patriot*, 15 June, 1922.
- [43] Yoichi Chida, et al, 'Does stress exacerbate liver diseases?', *Journal of Gastroenterology and Hepatology*, January 2006.
- [44] Nesta H. Webster, 'Monsters Behind the French Revolution', op. cit..
- [45] H. A. Taine (Translator: John Durand, 1880), *The Origins of Contemporary France, The French Revolution, Vol. 2, Chapter IV, 'The Departments, I – Provence in 1792. – Early Supremacy of the Jacobins in Marseilles'*; <http://www.gutenberg.org/dirs/2/3/5/2/23524/23524-h/files/2579/2579-h/2579-h.htm#note-2401>
- [46] 'Archives Nationales', F7, 7171, No. 7915. Report on the Situation in Marseilles, by Miollis, Commissioner of the Directory in the Department, year V. Nivôse 15.
- [47] 'Archives Nationales', F7, 3202. Letter of the Directory of the District of Aurillac, March 27, 1792, with official reports.
- [48] Ibid., p. 311.
- [49] Ibid., p. 312.
- [50] Ibid., pp. 412-413.
- [51] For an examination of some of these cultural eminences and their socio-political-economic ideas, see: K R Bolton, *Artists of the Right* (San Francisco: Counter-Currents Publishing, 2012).
- [52] Oscar Wilde, *The Soul of Man Under Socialism*, Introduction by K R Bolton (London: Black House

Publishing, 2012).

- [53] Nathaniel Weyl, 'Envy and Aristocide', *The Eugenics Bulletin*, Winter 1984, <http://www.eugenics.net/papers/eb6.html>
- [54] Ibid.
- [55] Ibid.
- [56] John Spargo (1876-1966) was a member of the Executive of the Social Democratic Federation founded by H. M. Hyndman (See below) and was a founder of the Labour Parliamentary Representation Committee, the forerunner of the British Labour Party. Arriving in New York in 1901, he became a leading member of the Socialist Labor Party, and the editor of *The Comrade*. He was a founding member of the Socialist Party of America and served on the Executive Committee. He was a major influence in the founding of the Rand School of Social Research, and of the American Fabian organisation, the Intercollegiate Socialist Society. By the mid-1920s he had rejected doctrinaire socialism for what he called 'socialized individualism'. Markku Ruotsila, *John Spargo and American Socialism* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), inter alia.
- [57] J. Spargo, *The Psychology of Bolshevism* (New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1919), Preface.
- [58] Ibid.
- [59] Ibid.
- [60] Ibid.
- [61] This might be defined as hysterical excitability towards situations.
- [62] Ibid., p. 22-23.
- [63] Ibid, p. 24.
- [64] In psychological terms: projection.
- [65] Spargo, op. cit., pp. 25-27.
- [66] Ibid., pp. 32-33.
- [67] An antiquated term in psychology, the symptoms of neurasthenia that are applicable to Spargo's account of Leftist personality disorders include inability to relax and irritability.
- [68] Spargo, op. cit., p. 44.
- [69] A. M. Lobaczewski, *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes* (Red Pill Press, 1985, 1998) p. 99.
- [70] Ibid., pp. 27-28.
- [71] Ibid., p. 31.
- [72] Normal and psychopathic.
- [73] A. M. Lobaczewski, op. cit., pp. 140-141.
- [74] Ibid., p. 139.
- [75] Ibid.
- [76] Ibid.
- [77] Ibid., p. 148.
- [78] Ibid., p. 164.
- [79] Ibid., p; 165.
- [80] 'Symbionese Liberation Army, <http://sla-revolution.blogspot.co.nz/2008/09/donald-defreeze-donald-david-defreeze.html>

- [81] Ibid.
- [82] Ibid.
- [83] Ibid.
- [84] Lobaczewski states that the word had already, hitherto unknown to him, been used by a Hungarian scientist.
- [85] Lobaczewski, op. cit., p. 193.
- [86] Ibid., p. 199.
- [87] Ibid., p. 200.
- [88] Ibid., p. 201.
- [89] Cited by Jay Sherry, 'Carl Gustav Jung: Avant-garde Conservative', Ph.D. thesis, Freie Universitat Berlin, 2008, p. 142.
- [90] Douglas Hyde, *I Believed* (London: William Heinemann, 1951), p. 162. Hyde converted to Catholicism in 1948, and became an avid promoter of Catholic social doctrine as an alternative to both socialism and free market capitalism.
- [91] Ibid.
- [92] Ibid., p. 154.
- [93] Ibid., p. 155.
- [94] Ibid., p. 159.
- [95] Ibid., p. 161-162.
- [96] Ibid., p. 164.
- [97] Ibid.
- [98] Ibid., pp. 165-167.
- [99] Ibid., p. 167.
- [100] Vanessa Redgrave, quoted by Tom Adler, Daily Mail (see Chapter below: 'Trotskyism in Britain - Healy's Sex Cult').
- [101] 101 J. J. Rousseau, *The Social Contract, or Principles of Political Right* (*Du Contrat Social*), 1762.
- [102] Among the more infamous celebrations of the ironically named 'Cult of Reason' was the enthroning of an actress dressed as the Goddess of Reason, on the altar of Notre Dame Cathedral.
- [103] The jail of the old regime that, despite being portrayed by pro-Jacobin propagandists as the most infamous symbol of Royal tyranny, held few prisoners.
- [104] J. J. Rousseau, *Émile: or, on Education* (*Émile ou de l'éducation*), 1762.
- [105] J. I. Israel, *Radical Enlightenment: Philosophy and the Making of Modernity* (Oxford University Press, 2002), p. 717.
- [106] J. J. Rousseau *The Confessions of Jean Jacques Rousseau*, Book IX, (started in 1770 and published in 1782) <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3913/3913-h/3913-h.htm>
- [107] Alexis de Tocqueville (1835), *Democracy in America*, Vol. I, Chapter III, Part I.
- [108] Edmund Burke, politician and philosopher, was a notable orator in the British Parliament and a formidable opponent of Jacobin doctrines and their spread to Britain. Although a member of the Whig Party, he was a traditionalist and seminal Conservative thinker.
- [109] Edmund Burke, *A Letter from Mr Burke to a Member of the National Assembly in Answer to Some Objections to his Book on French Affairs*, 1791;

<http://www.ourcivilisation.com/smartboard/shop/burkee/tonatass/index.htm>

[110] Ibid.

[111] Cf. V. N. Soyfer, 'Tragic history of the VII International Congress of Genetics', *Genetics*, 1 September, 2003 vol. 165 no. 1, pp. 1-9; <http://www.genetics.org/content/165/1/1.full>

[112] Ibid.

[113] For example, the Canadian psychologist J. Phillippe Rushton had his funding cancelled because of his research into the genetic inheritance of intelligence among races. He was assisted in later years by the Pioneer Fund, established in 1937 to finance research on genetics that universities, trusts, and foundations will not sponsor. <http://www.pioneerfund.org/>

[114] David Burchell, 'Kevin Rudd and the Philosophers' Stones', *The Australian*, 14 September 2009, <http://www.theaustralian.news.com.au/story/0,25197,26067804-7583,00.html>

[115] There are other assertions that the children were not his.

[116] J. J. Rousseau, *Confessions*, Book IX

[117] Diderot compiled the *Encyclopédie*, a seminal influence on revolutionary thinking to which Rousseau contributed.

[118] Baron Friedrich Melchior von Grimm, a philologist, author and music critic associated with Diderot and the Encyclopedistes.

[119] J. J. Rousseau, *Confessions*, Book IX.

[120] Diderot described Rousseau as: 'false, vain as Satan, ungrateful, cruel, hypocritical, and wicked ... He sucked ideas from me, used them himself, and then affected to despise me'. Leo Damrosch, *Jean-Jacques Rousseau: Restless Genius* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2005), p. 304.

[121] Cited by D. Edward and J. Eidinow, 'Enlightened Enemies', *The Guardian*, 29 April 2006.

For an account of the dispute between Hume and Rousseau see the letter published by Hume in 1766: A concise and genuine account of the dispute between Mr. Hume and Mr. Rousseau : with the letters that passed between them during their controversy. As also, the letters of the Hon. Mr. Walpole, and Mr. D'Alembert, relative to this extraordinary affair;

http://archive.org/stream/concisegenuineac00hume/concisegenuineac00hume_djvu.txt

[122] Ibid.

[123] D. Hume, quoted in Damrosch, *op. cit.*, p. 432.

[124] J. J. Rousseau, *Confessions*, *op. cit.* Book IX.

[125] Ibid.

[126] Ibid.

[127] S. W. Orson (1896) 'Introduction', *The Confessions of Jean Jacques Rousseau*, <http://www.gutenberg.org/files/3913/3913-h/3913-h.htm>

[128] J. J. Rousseau, *op. cit.*, Book I.

[129] Ibid.

[130] Ibid, *inter alia*.

[131] Ibid., Book I.

[132] Ibid.

[133] Ibid., Book VI.

[134] Ibid.

[135] Ibid.

- [136] Ibid.
- [137] J. J. Rousseau, op. cit., Book I.
- [138] Ibid., Book X.
- [139] J. J. Rousseau, *Meditations of a Solitary Walker* (London: Penguin Books, 1995), p. 1. Originally *Les Rêveries du promeneur solitaire*, covering the years 1776-1778.
- [140] Ibid., p. 2.
- [141] Ibid., p. 3.
- [142] Ibid., p. 11.
- [143] Ibid., p. 26.
- [144] L. F. Seltzer, 'Evolution of the Self', *Psychology Today*, 2 February 2011, <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/evolution-the-self/201102/self-sabotage-passive-aggression-toward-the-self-pt-5-the-logical-ill>
- [145] *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Third Edition, Revised* (American Psychiatric Association, 1987), *Sadistic Personality Disorder*, p. 37.
- [146] Marquis de Sade, *Aline et Alcour*, Vol. II, 1795.
- [147] K. R. Bolton, 'Sex Pol Ideology, op. cit.
- [148] Ibid., pp. 341-348.
- [149] De Sade, *The Philosophy of the Bedroom*, 1795.
- [150] De Sade, *The Philosophy of the Bedroom*, 1795, 'To Libertines', p. 3; http://supervert.com/elibrary/marquis_de_sade/
- [151] Adorno, et al, op. cit., p. 400.
- [152] De Sade, op. cit., p. 43.
- [153] Ibid., p. 52.
- [154] Ibid.
- [155] Ibid., p. 53..
- [156] Ibid., p. 94..
- [157] Ibid., p. 99.
- [158] Ibid., p. 120..
- [159] Ibid., p. 144.
- [160] Spargo, op. cit., p. 43.
- [161] Ernest Belefert Bax, *Jean-Paul Marat: The People's Friend* (London: Grant Richards, 1900), p.1.
- [162] Sarel Eimerl, *Revolution!:France 1789-1794* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1967), p.90.
- [163] William E Lingelbach, 'Review: *Jean Paul Marat a study of Radicalism,*' *The American Historical Review* 23, no. 1 (October 1927), p.90
- [164] Ibid., p. 359.
- [165] D. McCalden (1981) *Exiles from History: A Psychohistorical Study of Jewish Self-Hate* p. 6.
- [166] Lewis S. Feuer, 'Karl Marx and the Promethean Complex', *Encounter*, December 1968, cited by McCalden, *ibid.*, p. 6.
- [167] S. Rothman and S. R. Lichter, op. cit., pp. 286-287.
- [168] D. McCalden, op. cit., pp. 6-7.

- [169] The Von Westphalens were prominent aristocrats from Marx's native city of Trier, Germany.
- [170] The day that Jenny Marx gave birth to a daughter, Franziska.
- [171] 'But that's not all'.
- [172] 'So much the worse for him'.
- [173] 'In a very few words'.
- [174] Marx to Engels, 31 March 1851; Marx-Engels Collected Works, Vol. 38, p. 322.
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1851/letters/51_03_31.htm
- [175] Marx saw in the Jewish race nothing other than the spirit of money and the Jews as epitomising the bourgeois.
- [176] Karl Marx, On The Jewish Question, II, 1844,
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1844/jewish-question/>
- [177] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (1848), The Communist Manifesto (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1975), p. 68.
- [178] Jenny to Karl Marx, ca. 21 June 1844, Marx Engels Collected Works (MECW) Vol 1, pg 575-579;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/jenny/44_06_21.htm
- [179] Heinrich Marx to Karl, 2 March 1837, MECW, (International Publishers, 1975), Vol. 1, pp. 670-673.
- [180] Ibid.
- [181] Ibid.
- [182] Jenny to Karl, 24 August 1845, MECW, Vol. 38, p. 526;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/jenny/45_08_24.htm
- [183] Marx to Engels, 29 November 1848, MECW, Volume 38, p. 181;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/letters/48_11_29.htm
- [184] Marx to Engels, 29 November 1848, MECW, Volume 38, p. 181;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1848/letters/48_11_29.htm
- [185] Marx to Engels, MECW Volume 39, p. 526; 8 March 1855,
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1855/letters/55_03_08.htm
- [186] Marx to Engels, MECW Volume 41, p. 279; 7 May 1861
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1861/letters/61_05_07.htm
- [187] Marx an Engels, 6. November 1861, MECW, Vol. 30, p. 198.
- [188] Marx to Engels, 18 June 1862, MECW Volume 41, p. 380;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1862/letters/62_06_18.htm
- [189] Engels to Marx, MECW Volume 41, p. 403;
http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1862/letters/62_08_08.htm
- [190] D. McCalden, op, cit., p. 7.
- [191] Ibid., p. 10.
- [192] Cited by McCalden, *ibid.*, pp. 11-12.
- [193] Heinrich Marx to Karl, 8 November 1835, MECW, Vol. 1, p. 645;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1835-fl1.htm>
- [194] Heinrich Marx to Karl, 18-29 November 1835, mother's postscript, *ibid.*, pp. 645-648;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1835-fl2.htm>
- [195] Heinrich Marx to Karl, ca. early 1836, *ibid.*, pp. 649-652;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1836-fl1.htm>

- [196] Heinrich Marx to Karl, 19 March 1836, *ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp. 652-653;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1836-fl2.htm>
- [197] *Ibid.*
- [198] Heinrich to Karl, ca. May/June 1836, *ibid.*, pp. 653-655;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1836-fl3.htm>
- [199] Heinrich to Karl, 2 March 1837, *ibid.*, pp. 670-673;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1837-fl2.htm>
- [200] Heinrich to Karl, 12 August 1837, *ibid.*, pp. 674-677;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1837-fl3.htm>
- [201] *Ibid.*
- [202] *Ibid.*
- [203] Heinrich to Karl, 17 November 1837, *ibid.*, pp. 683-685;
<http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1837-fl6.htm>
- [204] Heinrich to Karl Marx, 9 December 1837, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1837-fl7.htm>
- [205] *Ibid.*
- [206] *Ibid.*
- [207] *Ibid.*
- [208] *Ibid.*
- [209] *Ibid.*
- [210] Cluss, an emigrant to the USA of German birth, made his fame as an architect in Washington. He had been an early leader of the Communist League.
- [211] Marx to Adolf Cluss, 20 July 1852: 'Komplettere Esel als diese Arbeiter gibt es wohl nicht Voilà unsere Straubinger; schlimm, daß mit solchen Leuten Weltgeschichte gemacht werden soll'.
- [212] Marx to Engels, 14 August 1879, MECW, *op. cit.*
- [213] See examples of Marx's poems below, written at this time.
- [214] Heinrich to Karl, 9 December 1837, MECW, *op. cit.*
- [215] Heinrich to Karl, 10 February 1838, *ibid.*, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/marx/letters/papa/1838-fl1.htm>
- [216] F. Wheen, *Karl Marx: A Life* (Norton & Norton, 1999), p. 169.
- [217] *Ibid.*
- [218] *Ibid.*
- [219] *Ibid.*, pp. 169-177
- [220] *Ibid.*
- [221] H M Hyndman, *Further Reminiscences*, Chapter VI: 'Eleanor Marx and Edward Aveling', <http://www.marxists.org/archive/hyndman/1912/further/ch06.html>
- [222] *Ibid.*
- [223] *Ibid.*
- [224] *Ibid.*
- [225] *Ibid.*
- [226] Paul Henderson, 'Edward Bibbens Aveling' in A. Thomas Lane (ed.), *Biographical Dictionary of*

- European Labor Leaders (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1995), p. 37.
- [227] H M Hyndman, op. cit.
- [228] Ibid., p. 292.
- [229] Ibid.
- [230] ‘The Marx-Engels Correspondence’, Der Briefwechsel zwischen Freidrich Engelsn und Karl Marx, ed. Augustus Bebel and Eduard Bernstein (Suttgart: Dietz, 1921); cited by N. H. Webster, World Revolution (Britons, 1971), p. 168. It should be noted that Bebel and Bernstein, the editors of the Marx-Engels correspondence, were Marxists.
- [231] Webster, Ibid., p. 169.
- [232] Ibid.
- [233] H. M. Hyndman, Justice, p.5, 2 July 1910.
- [234] K. Marx, ‘Invocation of One in Despair’, 1837.
- [235] K. Marx, ‘The Fiddler’, 1837.
- [236] K. Marx, ‘The Player’, 1841.
- [237] K. Marx, ‘Oulanem’, an obscure play first published in R. Payne, The Unknown Marx (New York: New York University Press, 1971), p. 63.
- [238] J. Guillaume, Bakunin on Anarchy (London: George Allen & Unwin Ltd, 1971), pp. 25-26
- [239] Ibid.
- [240] Ibid.
- [241] Robert Service, Trotsky: A Biography (London: Pan Books, 2010), pp. 78-79; citing Pëtr Garvi.
- [242] Ibid., p. 336.
- [243] Ibid., p. 46.
- [244] Leon Trotsky, The Revolution Betrayed, Chapter 7, ‘Family, Youth and Culture’, <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1936/revbet/ch07.htm>
- [245] Robert Service, op. cit., p. 386.
- [246] Ibid., pp. 386-387.
- [247] Carleton Beals, ‘The Fewer Outsiders the Better: The Master Comes to Judgement,’ Saturday Evening Post, 12 June 1937.
- [248] L Trotsky, ‘A Letter to the Politburo’, March 15, 1933, Writings of Leon Trotsky (1932-33) (New York: Pathfinder Press) pp.141-2
- [249] Paul R. Gregory, Lenin’s Brain and other Tales form the Soviet Secret Archives (Hoover Institution Press, publication no. 55, 2008), pp. 24-25.
- [250] Lenin’s body: <http://blogs.funeralwise.com/dying/2010/10/30/mummy-found-in-suburban-los-angeles-has-communist-roots/>
- [251] Lenin’s Tomb: http://severinghaus.org/gallery/places/russia/kremlin/P3284560_lenins_tomb_sm.jpg.html
- [252] Paul R. Gregory, op. cit., p. 25.
- [253] Ibid., p. 25.
- [254] Ibid., , p. 27.
- [255] Paul R. Gregory citing Stetskii, ibid., p. 29.
- [256] Ibid., p. 29.

- [257] Ibid., , p. 31.
- [258] Thomas J. Cullen et al, 'Anomalies of asymmetry of pyramidal cell density and structure in dorsolateral prefrontal cortex in schizophrenia', *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, No. 188, 2006, pp. 26-31.
- [259] F. Colciaghi, et al, 'Status epilepticus-induced pathologic plasticity in a rat model of focal cortical dysplasia', *Brain: The Journal of Neurology*, Vol. 134, Issue 10, 2011, pp. 2828-2843.
- [260] Diencephalon = Posterior division of the forebrain connecting the cerebral hemispheres with the mesencephalon, which is the region of the brain that includes the epithalamus, thalamus and hypothalamus.
- [261] A. M. Lobaczewski, op. cit., p. 112.
- [262] Ibid., pp., 112-113.
- [263] V. Lerner , Y. Finkelstein, E. Witztum, 'The Enigma of Lenin's (1870-1924) malady', *European Journal Neurology*, Vol. 11, 2004; pp. 371-6.
- [264] Ibid.
- [265] James D. White, *The Practice and Theory of Revolution* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2001), p. 20. White, Professor Emeritus, Reader in Russian and East European History, University of Glasgow, is an eminent authority on revolutionary Russia.
- [266] Orlando Figes, Professor of Russian History, Birbeck College in *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution 1891-1924* (Penguin Books, 1998), p. 152.
- [267] James D. White, op. cit., p. 21.
- [268] Alexander Ulyanov.
- [269] James D. White, op. cit., p. 28.
- [270] Ibid., p. 39.
- [271] Orlando Figes, op. cit., p. 152.
- [272] Peter Struve, 'My Contacts and Conflicts with Lenin', cited by Orlando Figes, *ibid.*, p. 389.
- [273] Orlando Figes, op. cit., p. 152.
- [274] Cited by Michael Ellman, 'The Role of Leadership Perceptions and of Intent in the Soviet Famine of 1931-1934', *Europe-Asia Studies*, September 2005, p. 823.
- [275] Michael Linden, Max Rotter, Kai Baumann, Barbara Lieberei, *Posttraumatic Embitterment Disorder: Definition, Evidence, Diagnosis, Treatment* (Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, 2007).
- [276] Department of Psychiatry, Tai Po Hospital, Hong Kong.
- [277] M. J. S. Wong, 'Review: Posttraumatic Embitterment Disorder: Definition, Evidence, Diagnosis, Treatment', *Hong Kong Journal of Psychiatry*, Hong Kong College of Psychiatrists, No. 17, 2007, p. 103.
- [278] Ibid.
- [279] Ibid.
- [280] Gregory Elliott, *Althusser: The Detour of Theory*, Historical Material Book Series, Vol. 13 (Leiden: Brill, 2006), p. 48. Althusser applied methods of French structuralism. Cf. Gregory Elliot, p. 163: Althusser met the structuralists 'more than half-way'.
- [281] Ibid., xvii.
- [282] William Lewis, 'Louis Althusser', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2009 Edition), Edward N. Zalta(ed.), <<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2009/entries/althusser/>>.

- [283] Douglas Johnson in Louis Althusser, *The Future Lasts Forever: A Memoir* (New York: The New Press, 1992), 'Interaction', p. vii.
- [284] *Ibid.*, p. v.
- [285] Gregory Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 190.
- [286] <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/althusse.htm>
- [287] For example, the Communists 'ran' Buchenwald concentration camp. When the Americans entered the camp they were astounded to see that 300 Communists ran the camp and were dressed like 'prosperous business men'. See: Donald B. Robinson, 'The Communist Atrocities at Buchenwald', *American Mercury*, October 1946, pp. 397-404; R. H. S. Crossman, 'Buchenwald', *Nation*, July 30, 1945, pp. 123-125.
- [288] Petri Liukkonen, 'Louis Althusser', *Kuusankosken kaupunginkirjasto*, 2008, <http://www.kirjasto.sci.fi/althusse.htm>
- [289] William Lewis, *op. cit.*
- [290] Petri Liukkonen, *op. cit.*
- [291] Douglas Johnson, *op. cit.*, 'Introduction', ix.
- [292] K. R. Bolton, "'Sex Pol' Ideology: The Influence of the Freudian-Marxian Synthesis on Politics & Society", *Journal of Social, Political & Economic Studies*, Vol. 35, no. 3, Fall 2010, pp. 329-355.
- [293] Like the Marxian social scientists of the Frankfurt School, Lacan saw psychoanalysis as a means of creating the therapeutic society where the whole of society would be transformed on the basis of psychiatric theory to ensure the mental health of the population. What was meant by 'mental health' was defined of course by these theorists. K. R. Bolton, *ibid.*
- [294] Douglas Johnson, *op. cit.*, viii.
- [295] Zhdanov, Soviet minister of culture.
- [296] Gregory Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 48.
- [297] She also became a patient of the same psychiatrist as Althusser, although it is suggested that she might have done so in order to better supervise her husband. See: Douglas Johnson, *op. cit.*, xiv.
- [298] Petri Liukkonen, *op. cit.*
- [299] William Lewis, *op. cit.*
- [300] Gregory Elliot, *op. cit.*, pp. 168-178, pp. 246-253.
- [301] William Lewis, *op. cit.*
- [302] Louis Althusser, *op. cit.*, p. 15.
- [303] Douglas Johnson, *op. cit.*, 'Introduction', v.
- [304] Louis Althusser, *op. cit.*, p. 18.
- [305] *Ibid.*, 'Introduction', vi.
- [306] Petri Liukkonen, *op. cit.*
- [307] Douglas Johnson, *op. cit.*, 'Introduction', vi.
- [308] Gregory Elliott, *op. cit.*, p. 17.
- [309] Louis Althusser, *The Future is Forever*, *op. cit.*, p. 23.
- [310] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- [311] *Ibid.*, p. 36.
- [312] *Ibid.*, p. 38.

[313] Ibid., p. 44.

[314] Ibid., p. 38.

[315] Ibid., p. 43.

[316] Ibid., p. 43.

[317] Ibid., p. 38.

[318] Ibid., p. 43.

[319] Ibid., p. 44.

[320] Ibid., p. 45.

[321] Jacques Lacan, *Ecrits: A Selection* (London 1997) p. 66.

[322] Louis as 'Lui', and the French word for 'yes', 'oui', is being referred to.

[323] Louis Althusser, *The Future is Forever*, op. cit., p. 39.

[324] Ibid., p. 54.

[325] Ibid., p. 51.

[326] Ibid., p. 54.

[327] Ibid., p. 52.

[328] Ibid., p. 57.

[329] Ibid., p. 57.

327 Nietzsche's mental breakdown marked the end of his work, whereas Louis Althusser was afflicted with mental health problems throughout his life, and his work was written during his periods of mania as a projection of his own troubled psyche. The comparison between Nietzsche and Althusser is therefore, I contend, not legitimate.

[330] Gregory Elliot, op. cit., p. 322.

[331] Ibid., p. 322.

[332] R. G. L. Waite, *The Psychopathic God: Adolf Hitler* (De Capo Press, 1993).

[333] James Cotton, 'Enoch Powell: Voice of the Nation', Traditional Britain Group, <http://www.traditionalbritain.org/content/enoch-powell-voice-nation-james-cotton>

[334] Robert Conquest, *The Human Cost of Soviet Communism*, Senate Judiciary Committee, Subcommittee Internal Security (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 25. Conquest estimates 20 to 30 million killed in the USSR. Chang and Halliday in their definitive biography on Mao estimate 'well over 70 million deaths'. Jung Chang and Jon Halliday, *Mao: the Unknown Story* (London: Jonathan Cape, 2005), p. 3.

[335] J. Chung and J. Halliday, *ibid.*, pp. 198-199.

[336] Ibid., p. 200.

[337] R Service, *Comrades: Communism: A World History* (London: Macmillan, 2007), pp. 373-374.

[338] J. Chung and J. Halliday, op. cit., p. 483. Mao's move to make China the centre stage for world revolution began in 1960 when he invited 700 Maoists from the Third World for May Day celebrations.

[339] Ibid., pp. 478-489.

[340] Australian House of Representatives Hansard Record of Condolence Speeches for Mao, 14 September, 1976.

[341] A few books have been published recently exposing the character of Mao and Maoism. One of the most outstanding is the biography of Mao by Chung and Halliday.

- [342] Chung and Halliday allude to Mao being responsible for ‘well over 70 million deaths in peacetime, more than any other twentieth century leader.’ (p. 3).
- [343] Chung and Halliday, op. cit., p. 4.
- [344] Ibid., p. 3.
- [345] Ibid., p. 5.
- [346] Ibid., p. 6.
- [347] Ibid., p. 6.
- [348] Ibid., p. 6.
- [349] Ibid., p. 6.
- [350] Ibid., p. 6.
- [351] Ibid., pp. 6-7
- [352] Chung and Halliday, op. cit., p. 7.
- [353] Ibid., p. 9.
- [354] Ibid., p. 9.
- [355] Ibid., p. 9, citing a letter by Mao written in August 1917.
- [356] Ibid., p. 9.
- [357] Ibid., p. 9.
- [358] Ibid., p. 9.
- [359] Ibid., p. 10.
- [360] Ibid., p. 11.
- [361] Ibid., p. 11.
- [362] Ibid., p. 12.
- [363] Ibid., p. 12.
- [364] Paulsen taught that man is motivated by instinctive, irrational will.
- [365] Chung and Halliday, op. cit., p. 13.
- [366] Ibid., p. 14.
- [367] While many died en route, Mao and a few of his coterie were carried on bamboo litters, or had horses and porters to carry their belongings. Mao designed his own litter, on which he could lay, with a tarpaulin to protect him from the sun. Mao reminisced decades later that he spent much of the time reading while being carried. When climbing mountains the litter-bearers could sometimes only move forward on their knees, ‘and the skin and flesh on their knees were rubbed raw before they got to the top’. Chung and Halliday, Ibid., p. 144.
- [368] Ibid., p. 342.
- [369] Ibid., p. 345.
- [370] Ibid., p. 343.
- [371] Ibid., p. 343.
- [372] Ibid., p. 344.
- [373] Ibid., p. 345.
- [374] Ibid., p. 409.
- [375] Ibid., p. 411.

- [376] Ibid., p. 345
- [377] Ibid., p. 346
- [378] Ibid., p. 346
- [379] Ibid., p. 408.
- [380] Ibid., p. 537.
- [381] Ibid., p. 537.
- [382] Ibid., p. 538.
- [383] Ibid., pp. 540-541.
- [384] Ibid., p. 541.
- [385] Ibid., p. 542.
- [386] Ibid., p. 542.
- [387] Ibid., p. 15.
- [388] Ibid., p. 651.
- [389] Ibid., p. 651.
- [390] Ibid., p. 653.
- [391] Ibid., p. 342.
- [392] Ibid., p. 337.
- [393] Ibid., p. 338.
- [394] Ibid., p. 544. Chung and Halliday state that the photographing and filming of torture became common during the Cultural Revolution.
- [395] Ibid., p. 544.
- [396] Ibid., pp. 456-457.
- [397] Ibid., p. 458.
- [398] Martin Duberman, *Left Out: The Politics of Exclusion/Essays/1964-1999* (New York: Basic Books, 1999).
- [399] Sean Matgamna, 'Gerry Healy and the Failure of the Old British Trotskyist Movement', *Workers' Liberty*, 18 March 2009, <http://www.workersliberty.org/story/2009/03/18/gerry-healy-and-failure-old-british-trotskyist-movement> Matgamna writes with authority on the Trotskyite movement. He had been in Healy's Socialist Labour League, from which he was expelled in 1963, and the Revolutionary Socialist League in 1965, but left that organisation with a faction of supporters. Joining and then being expelled from the International Socialists in 1971, his followers formed Workers' Fight, which united with the Workers' Power group, becoming the International Communist League. This joined with the Worker's Socialist League, but Matgamna split from this and formed the Socialist Organiser Alliance. He remains a leading theorist of the Alliance for Workers' Liberty.
- [400] Ibid.
- [401] Ibid.
- [402] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy*, Chapter 11, <http://www.whatnextjournal.co.uk/Pages/Healy/Chap11.html>
- [403] Ibid.
- [404] Tim Adler, 'Vanessa Redgrave and the Red Sex Slaves: how her bid to start Marxist revolution plunged her into bizarre scandal', *Daily Mail*, 9 May 2011, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/femail/article->

1384994/Vanessa-Redgrave-red-sex-slaves-How-bid-start-Marxist-revolution-plunged-bizarre-scandal.html?ito=feeds-newsxml

- [405] Ibid.
- [406] Ibid.
- [407] Ibid.
- [408] Ibid.
- [409] Workers Press, 7 March 1987, cited in *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy*, op. cit., Chapter 12.
- [410] Tom Adler, Daily Mail, op. cit
- [411] Ibid.
- [412] Ibid.
- [413] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy* op. cit.
- [414] Tim Adler, *The House of Redgrave* (Aurum, 2011), cited by the Daily Mail, op. cit.
- [415] News Line, 16 November 1985, cited in Healy, *ibid.*
- [416] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy* op. cit. Chapter 12.
- [417] Marxist Review, September 1986, *ibid.*
- [418] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy*, op. cit., Chapter 12.
- [419] Jim Jones, Suicide Tape Transcript, 1978, http://employees.oneonta.edu/downinll/mass_suicide.htm
- [420] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy*, op. cit.
- [421] Considering the twists and turns of the Trotskyites over the decades Healy's support for Gorbachev is not surprising, and Stalin himself would have thought it predictable. From the start of the Cold War, many Trotskyites moved over to a pro-American position, and the seminal ideologues of the 'neo-conservative' movement were ex-Trotskyites. Trotsky's widow, Natalya Sedova, when resigning from the American Socialist Workers Party and the Fourth International, expressed her support for the USA against the USSR. See: K. R. Bolton, *Stalin: The Enduring Legacy* (London: Black House Publishing, 2012), pp. 93-126.
- [422] *The Rise and Fall of Gerry Healy*, Chapter 12, op. cit.
- [423] K. R. Bolton, *Stalin: The Enduring Legacy*, op. cit., inter alia.
- [424] Tom Hayden, *Reunion: A Memoir* (London: Penguin Books, 1988), p. 425.
- [425] Tom Hayden, *The Port Huron Statement*, Students for a Democratic Society, 1962, <http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/huron.html>
- [426] It is notable that the Black Panther program is altogether more rational than the White Panthers, and the two programs have few similarities. 'What We Want – What We Believe, Black Panther Party Platform and Program', October 1966, <http://www.luminist.org/archives/bpp.htm>
- [427] White Panther Party Program, 1 November 1968, Luminist Archives, <http://www.luminist.org/archives/wpp.htm>
- [428] Immature Personality Disorder (IPD) is diagnosed when the individual has an infantile reaction to problems, when the psychological age is notably less than the chronological age. Those with IPD are poorly adapted to normal demands, and avoid reality through fantasy where their unsatisfied desires are fulfilled. Like children they are impatient and require instant gratification.
- [429] 'John Sinclair', Luminist Archives, http://www.luminist.org/archives/john_sinclair.htm
- [430] John Sinclair, 'Marijuana Revolution', <http://www.luminist.org/archives/marijuana.htm>
- [431] 'Abraham Maslow', <http://www.psychology.sbc.edu/Abraham%20Maslow.htm>

- [432] Dr. J. Martin lectured in Behavioural Sciences at Macquarie University, New South Wales.
- [433] Dr. John Ray trained as a psychologist and lectured in Sociology at the University of New South Wales.
- [434] S. A. Rudin, 'The Relationship Between Rational and Irrational Authoritarianism', *Journal of Psychology*, 1961, 52, pp. 179-183.
- [435] K. J. Martin and J Ray, 'AntiAuthoritarianism: A Indicators of Pathology', *Australian Journal of Psychology* 1972, pp. 24, 13-18; <http://jonjayray.110mb.com/rudin.html>
- [436] Ibid.
- [437] Ibid.
- [438] Ibid.
- [439] W. A. S. P. = White Anglo-Saxon Protestant, seen as epitomising American middle class respectability.
- [440] Jerrold M. Post, 'Notes on a Psychodynamic Theory of Terrorist Behavior', *Terrorism: An International Journal*, 7, No. 3, 1984, p. 243.
- [441] Ibid.
- [442] Ibid.
- [443] Harry Walker Hepner, *Psychology Applied to Life and Work* (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1979), p. 66.
- [444] Ibid., pp. 66-67.
- [445] Tom Hayden, *Reunion*, p. 444.
- [446] Revilo P. Oliver, *American Opinion*, January, 1962, pp. 29-36.
- [447] *Trud*, New Jersey, November 1968.
- [448] Youth International Party.
- [449] Jerry Rubin, *Growing (Up) at 37* (New York: Warner Books, 1976), pp. 140-142.
- [450] Chairman of the sociology department at Barnard College, and co-editor of *Common Quest: The Magazine of Black-Jewish Relations*.
- [451] Jonah Raskin, *For the Hell of It: The Life and Times of Abbie Hoffman* (Berkeley: University of California Press,).
- [452] Chairman of the communications studies department at Sonoma State University. Rieder states of Raskin: In the 60's, he was a socialist of the straight, academic sort, but the Dionysian spirit of the counterculture beckoned. Before long, he was a courier for the Weather Underground, minister of education for the Youth International Party and Hoffman's comrade in adventure. At times Mr. Raskin is a bit breathless about Abbie as 'the quintessential spirit of the 60's'. J. Rieder, 'Groucho Marxist', 2 February, 1997; http://www.sonoma.edu/users/r/Raskin/hoffman_review_rieder.htm
- [453] Judge Julius Hoffman presided at the trial of the 'Chicago Seven. See: Tom Hayden, *Reunion: A Memoir*, op. cit., pp. 340-341.
- [454] J Rieder, 'Groucho Marxist', op. cit.
- [455] Ibid.
- [456] Abbie Hoffman, *Steal This Book* (New York: Pirate Editions, Inc., 1971).
- [457] Ibid., 'Knife Fighting'.
- [458] Ibid., 'Shoplifting'.
- [459] Tom Hayden, *Reunion*, op. cit., p. 269.

- [460] WASP = 'White Anglo-Saxon Protestant', an epithet for the so-called 'ruling class', which has not rally been the 'ruling class' in America for decades.
- [461] Abbie Hoffman, *Steal This Book*, op. cit., 'On the Job'.
- [462] James S. Kunen, et al, *People*, May 1 1989, Vol. 31, No. 17, 'A Troubled Rebel Chooses a Silent Death', <http://www.people.com/people/archive/article/0,,20120175,00.html>)
- [463] Ibid.
- [464] Ibid.
- [465] Ibid.
- [466] Ibid.
- [467] Ibid.
- [468] Ibid.
- [469] Wayne King, 'Abbie Hoffman Committed Suicide Using Barbiturates, Autopsy Shows', *New York Times*, 19 April, 1989
- [470] Phil Ochs, the protest singer, was a founder of the Yippies, and was involved in the 1968 Chicago riot. In 1975 he took on another identity, calling himself John Butler Train, believing that he was targeted for murder. In 1976 he was diagnosed with Bi-Polar Disorder and hanged himself that year.
- [471] Tom Hayden, *Reunion: A Memoir*, op. cit., p. 379.
- [472] Ibid.
- [473] Vincent Bugliosi and Curt Gentry, *Helter Skelter: The True Story of the Manson Murders* (New York: W W Norton and Co., Inc., 1974), pp. 296-297.
- [474] Tom Hayden, *Reunion*, op. cit., p. 379.
- [475] Kirkpatrick Sale, *SDS* (New York, 1973) p. 628.
- [476] Abe Peck, *Uncovering the Sixties* (Pantheon Books, 1985), p. 227.
- [477] Jared Israel, 'The Weathermen Redeemed, Part I: Snobs with a Licence', 2 November 2008, <http://emperors-clothes.com/exhumed.htm>
- [478] Ibid.
- [479] 'Boy Wrecks Train: Express is upset and five people are injured by a childish prank', *Life*, 2 June 1947, p. 40; books.google.co.nz/books?id=UkgEAAAAMBAJ
- [480] 'Bring the War Home', *SDS New Left Notes*, <http://kasamaproject.org/2009/12/29/understanding-weather-underground-revolutionary-words-strategic-void/>
- [481] Bill Ayers, *Fugitive Days: Memoirs of an Antiwar Activist* (Massachusetts: Beacon Press, 2001), p. 149.
- [482] Ibid.
- [483] Ibid.
- [484] Ibid.
- [485] Jared Israel, op. cit.
- [486] Frantz Fanon was of French-Algerian decent, born in the French colony of Martinique, a Marxist who continues to be heralded as a founder of postmodernist and anti-colonial thought.
- [487] Jared Israel, op. cit.
- [488] Bill Ayers, op. cit., p. 147.
- [489] Ibid.

- [490] Ibid.
- [491] Ibid., p. 146.
- [492] Bill Ayers father was a chairman and CEO of Commonwealth Edison.
- [493] Steve Neal, 'Memoir is more fiction than reality', Chicago Sun Times, 2 September 2001, <http://richgibson.com/ayers.htm>
- [494] Ibid.
- [495] Robert Wiener, 'Notes from the Underground: "How could you do this to me?" asks Mark Rudd's Mom', New Jersey Jewish News. <http://www.markrudd.com/?about-mark-rudd/notes-from-the-underground.html>
- [496] K. R. Bolton, 'Sex Pol Ideology', op. cit., pp. 347-348.
- [497] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., 107.
- [498] Ibid., 108.
- [499] Stanley Rothman and S Robert Lichter, op. cit., p. 227.
- [500] Mark Rudd, 'Che and Me', 2008, <http://www.markrudd.com/?violence-and-non-violence/che-and-me.html>
- [501] FBI Memorandum, 20 September 1968, cited by Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., p. 312.
- [502] Mark Rudd, 'Che and Me', 2008, <http://www.markrudd.com/?violence-and-non-violence/che-and-me.html>
- [503] Ibid.
- [504] Stanley Rothman, 'Group-Fantasies and Jewish Radicalism: A Psychodynamic Interpretation', The Journal of Psychohistory, Fall 1978, pp. 211-240.
- [505] Philip Roth, author of Portnoy's Complaint (Random House, 1969) a semi-autobiographical novel about the neurosis of Jewish males, based on conflicted sexual morals.
- [506] Non-Jews.
- [507] Non-Jewish girls.
- [508] Mark Rudd, 'Why were there so many Jews in SDS ? or the Ordeal of Civility', Fast Capitalism 1.2. 2005, http://www.uta.edu/huma/agger/fastcapitalism/1_2/rudd.html
- [509] Philip Roth, op. cit.
- [510] Sina Rahman, 'Anti-imperialism and its discontents: An interview with Mark Rudd, founding member of the Weather Underground', Radical History Review, Spring, 2006, <http://www.markrudd.com/?anti-imperialism/anti-imperialism-and-its-discontents-an-interview-with-markrudd-founding-member-of-the-weather-unde.html>
- [511] Maslow's 'hierarchy of human needs' postulates that once the basic physiological drives of food, shelter and sex are met, the individual is free to pursue higher creative paths. The theory is legitimate enough, however, it has been re-interpreted by the Left, with the blessing of Maslow himself.
- [512]
- 510 Dr Gerald L. Atkinson, 'About the Frankfurt School', August 1999, <http://frankfurtschool.us/history.htm>
- [513] Stanley Rothman and S. Robert Lichter, op. cit., 72-73.
- [514] Marty Jezer, Abbie Hoffman: American Rebel (1993), p. 34.
- [515] Hoffman did not complete the degree.
- [516] Marty Jezer, op. cit., p. 35.

- [517] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., p. 282.
- [518] Ed Dieckmann Jr., The Secret of Jonestown: The Reason Why (Torrance, California: Noontide Press, 1981), p. 35.
- [519] 'Dr Jacob Levy Moreno', Moreno Institute East, <http://www.morenoinstituteeast.org/bios.htm>
- [520] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., p. 420.
- [521] Ibid., p. 421.
- [522] Ibid., p. 425.
- [523] Ibid., p. 421
- [524] Ibid., p. 424.
- [525] Ibid., p. 242.
- [526] Ibid.
- [527] Mao Zedong, Quotations from Chairman Mao Zedong (Peking: Foreign Language Press, 1966) pp.258-259.
- [528] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., p. 425.
- [529] Ibid., p. 453.
- [530] Richard Grenier, 'Jane Fonda and other Political Thinkers', Commentary, June 1979, <http://www.commentarymagazine.com/article/jane-fonda-other-political-thinkers/>
- [531] 'Jonestown Letters Reveal Guilt', Associated Press, 27 November 1978.
- [532] 'Anguishing Letters, to Dad', Time, 11 December 1978.
- [533] 'Letters to Dad', Part I, <http://jonestown.sdsu.edu/AboutJonestown/PrimarySources/letterstodad1.html>
- [534] 'Letters to Dad', Part II, 21 February 1978, <http://jonestown.sdsu.edu/AboutJonestown/PrimarySources/letterstodad2.html>
- [535] Ibid.
- [536] Ibid.
- [537] Ibid., 25 January 1978.
- [538] M Bates, 'CNN's "Escape form Jonestown" downplays Democratic connections', News Busters, 14 November 2008, <http://newsbusters.org/blogs/michael-m-bates/2008/11/14/cnns-escape-jonestown-downplays-democratic-connections>
- [539] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., p. 461.
- [540] Ibid., p. 472.
- [541] Ibid., p. 505.
- [542] Werner Erhard Seminars Training, <http://www.erhardseminarstraining.com/>
- [543] Crawdaddy Magazine of Rock, New York, No. 2, February 1976.
- [544] Jerry Rubin, New Age Journal, 'I'm Scared, You're Scared', 15 September 1975, No. 7, p. 34.
- [545] Tom Hayden, Reunion, p. 461.
- [546] Ibid.
- [547] Ibid.
- [548] Ibid., p. 462.
- [549] Ibid.
- [550] Ibid.

- [551] Ibid., p. 463.
- [552] Ibid.
- [553] Ibid., p. 465.
- [554] Next Left Notes, <http://antiauthoritarian.net/NLN/?m=200702>
- [555] Adult regression is an avoidance method for dealing with problems of the present and future, by mentally regressing to times that seemed happier.
- [556] Jared Israel, 'Weathermen Redeemed, Part I, Snobs with a Licence', 2 November 2008, <http://emperors-clothes.com/exhumed.htm>
- [557] Jared Israel, 'Mummies Arise', 2 December 2008, <http://emperors-clothes.com/forget.htm>
- [558] Pam, 'First Impressions of Joining a Women's Liberation Group – Change in Lifestyle – Outlook Etc.', *Woman*, 18: 2, 1972; cited by M Holmes, 'Feeling Beyond Rules: Politicizing the Sociology of Emotion and Anger in Feminist Politics', *European Journal of Social Theory* (London: Sage Publications, 2004), p. 215.
- [559] M. Holmes, *ibid.*, p. 216.
- [560] J. Seule, et al, 'After the Convention's Over: Reports on the United Women's Convention 1979, Broadsheet, Auckland, New Zealand, No. 70, 1979, pp. 22-26., cited by M. Holmes, *ibid.*, p. 217.
- [561] At the time New Zealand Socialist theorist Rod Jesson started running a series on 'Maori sovereignty' in his journal, *The Republican*.
- [562] M. Holmes, *op. cit.*, p. 218.
- [563] *Ibid.*
- [564] *Ibid.*, p. 219.
- [565] *Ibid.*, p. 219.
- [566] *Ibid.*, p. 220.
- [567] *Ibid.*
- [568] *Ibid.*, p 221.
- [569] *Ibid.*
- [570] *Ibid.*, p. 223.
- [571] Tammy Bruce, *The Death of Right and Wrong* (New York: Three Rivers Press, 2003), p. 205.
- [572] Judith Levine, *Harmful to Minors: The Perils of Protecting Children from Sex* (University of Minnesota Press, 2002).
- [573] 'About AlterNet', <http://www.alternet.org/about>
- [574] Liz Highleyman, 'What Judith Levine is Really Saying', *AlterNet*, 25 April 2002, http://www.alternet.org/story/12960/what_judith_levine_is_really_saying
- [575] *Ibid.*
- [576] *Ibid.*
- [577] Debbie Nathan, 'Judith Levine: Brave Author', *Justice Busters*, 18 April 2002, http://injusticebusters.org/index.htm/Levine_Judith.htm
- [578] Camille Paglia, 'The Purity of Allen Ginsberg's Boy-Love', *Salon*, 15 April 1997.
- [579] K. Eland Jung, *Sexual Trauma: A Revolutionary Approach to Treatment and Recovery from Sexual Abuse and PTSD: A Trauma, Not Insanity* (New York: Hudson Press, 2010),
- [580] *Ibid.*

- [581] Ibid.
- [582] Ibid.
- [583] Allen Ginsberg, 'Old Love Story' (Lospecchio Press, 1986).
- [584] Andrea Jacobs, 'Allen Ginsberg's advocacy of pedophilia debated in community', Intermountain Jewish News, 21 June 2002, <http://www.ijn.com/archive/2002%20arch/062102.htm>
- [585] Michael Schumacher, 'Allen Ginsberg: Renowned Poet – World Traveller', <http://www.allenginsberg.org/index.php?page=bio>
- [586] Kate Connolly, 'Sixties Hero Revealed as Kindergarten Sex Author', London Observer, 28 January 2001, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/jan/28/kateconnolly.theobserver>
- [587] Danny Cohn-Bendit to Connolly, *ibid*
- [588] Kate Connolly, *ibid*.
- [589] Ibid.
- [590] Ibid.
- [591] Refer to following chapter.
- [592] Kate Connolly, *op. cit*.
- [593] Ibid.
- [594] Leon Trotsky, *The Revolution Betrayed*, Chapter 7, 'Family, Youth and Culture', <http://www.marxists.org/archive/trotsky/1936/revbet/ch07.htm>
- [595] Ibid.
- [596] Gunther Wagenlehner, 'Motivation for Political Terrorism in West Germany', in Marius H. Livingston, ed., *International Terrorism in the Contemporary World* (Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, 1978), p. 201.
- [597] Konrad Kellen, 'Terrorists: What Are They Like? How Some Terrorists Describe Their World and Actions', in Brian M. Jenkins, ed., *Terrorism and Beyond: An International Conference on Terrorism and Low-Level Conflict* (Santa Monica, California: Rand, 1980), p. 43.
- [598] 'From Pastor's Daughter to Terrorist', Gudrun Ensslin at 70', 16 August 2012, http://open.salon.com/blog/lost_in_berlin/2010/08/16/from_pastors_daughter_to_terrorist_gudrun_enssl
- [599] Schizoid personality disorder is characterised by inability to form interpersonal relationships, emotional coldness and aloofness, indifference to both praise and criticism and the feelings of others.
- [600] 'From Pastor's Daughter...' *op. cit*.
- [601] Marcia Catherine Schenck, 'World Politics Resource', Mount Holyoke College, Massachusetts, 2006, <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/index.htm><http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~s>
- [602] *Ibid.*, 'The Turbulent Life of Ulrike Meinhof', <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/index.htm>
- [603] *Ibid.*, 'Career as a Journalist', <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/Konkret1.htm>
- [604] *Ibid.*, 'Ulrike Meinhof's Family', <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/Family.htm>
- [605] *Ibid.*
- [606] *Ibid.*, 'Ulrike Meinhof and the RAF', <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/UMRAF.htm>
- [607] *Ibid.*

- [608] Ibid.
- [609] Ibid.
- [610] Ibid.
- [611] Ibid.
- [612] Ibid.
- [613] Ibid., 'The Brain Question',
<http://www.mtholyoke.edu/~schen20m/classweb/ulrikemeinhof/Brain.htm>
- [614] 'Meinhof Brain study Yields Clues', BBC News, 12 November 2002,
<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/2455647.stm>
- [615] 'The Brain Question', op. cit.
- [616] Ibid.
- [617] Richard Huffmann, 'Socialist Patients' Collective', <http://www.baader-meinhof.com/whos-who/terrorists/proto-terrorists/socialist-patients-collective/>
Huffman, whose father was targeted by the Baader-Meinhof Gang, is a leading authority on the RAF.
- [618] SPK Timeline, <http://www.spkpfh.de/Timeline.htm>
- [619] Ibid., 13.12.75.
- [620] Cited by Gary Genosko, Felix Guattari: An Aberrant Introduction (New York: Continuum International Publishing, 2002), 14.
- [621] Ibid.
- [622] Polack interview, <http://www.la-parole-errante.org/fichiers/Expo68/chantierpolack.pdf>
- [623] D Cooper, *The Death of the Family* (Penguin Books, 1974).
- [624] James Miller, *The Passion of Michel Foucault* (New York City: Simon & Schuster, 1993), p. 39.
- [625] Ibid., pp. 89-91.
- [626] L. Sapouna, P. Herrmann (ed), *Knowledge in Mental Health: Reclaiming the Social* (New York: Nova Science Publishers, 2006), p. 70.
- [627] Ibid.
- [628] David Cooper, *The Language of Madness* (Penguin Books, 1978),
<http://laingsociety.org/colloquia/polofdiagnosis/languageofmadness1.htm>
- [629] Ibid.
- [630] Ibid.
- [631] Huber's syntax must represent among of the most convoluted in literary history, which is itself indicate of psychosis.
- [632] HEILwesen is mentioned to infer Nazism, as in 'Heil Hitler' and 'Seig Heil', heil, a greeting, being a word for 'health'.
- [633] W. Huber, *SPK – Aus Der Kraknheit Eine Waffe Machen* (Heidelberg: KRRIM, 1993), 'Introduction'. Also, *Iatrocracy on a Worldwide Scale* (Milan, 1976), p. 23.
- [634] Gudrun Ensslin of the Red Army Faction declared in justifying terrorism: 'They'll kill us all. You know what kind of pigs we're up against. This is the Auschwitz generation. You can't argue with people who made Auschwitz. They have weapons and we haven't. We must arm ourselves!' Cited by Harold Marcuse, *Legacies of Dachau: The Uses and Abuses of a Concentration Camp, 1933–2001* (Cambridge University Press, 2001), p. 314.
- [635] W. Huber, 'Iatrocracy on a Worldwide Scale', p. 17.

- [636] W. Huber, 1993, op. cit.
- [637] Ibid.
- [638] W Huber, Iatrocracy on a Worldwide Scale, op. cit., p. 40.
- [639] Ibid., p. 41.
- [640] ‘SPK – Turn Illness into a Weapon’, KRRIM – PF-Verlag fuer Krankheit,
http://www.spkpfh.de/11_times_illness.htm
- [641] W Huber, ‘Iatrocracy on a Worldwide Scale’, op. cit., p. 3.
- [642] Ibid., p. 6.
- [643] Ibid., p. 7.
- [644] Ibid., p. 22.
- [645] Ibid., p. 26.
- [646] Ibid., pp. 28-29.
- [647] Ibid., p. 36.
- [648] Ibid., p. 30.
- [649] Ibid., p. 31.
- [650] A successor to the original SPK was established as the Information Centre of the Red People’s University (IZRU). SPK was revived and continues to exist.
- [651] See: ‘Terror Begets Terror’, http://vogania.com/K_OSMOSIS_Korner/Disclaimer.htm
- [652] Next Left Notes, <http://nextleftnotes.org/NLN/>
- [653] ‘Students for a Democratic Society (Re)Form National Organization’, IWW, 19 January 2006,
<http://www.iww.org/en/node/1901>
- [654] Ibid.
- [655] ‘Next Left’, <http://www.nextleft.org/2012/05/nextleft-is-closing-down.html>
- [656] Fabian Society, <http://www.fabians.org.uk/>
- [657] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., pp. 29-30.
- [658] FEPS, <http://www.feps-europe.eu/en/publications-next-left>
- [659] Lothrop Stoddard, op. cit.
- [660] William Wall, ‘Totenham and beyond: neoliberal riots and the possibility of politics’, 10 August 2011, <http://libcom.org/news/tottenham-beyond-neoliberal-riots-possibility-politics-10082011>
- [661] Julie Hyland, ‘Fatal police shooting sparks riot in north London’, 8 August 2011, World Socialist Website: International committee of the Fourth International,
<http://www.wsws.org/articles/2011/aug2011/tott-a08.shtml>
- [662] E. Branagh, ‘Mark Duggan “given hand gun just 15 minutes before death”’, The Independent, 18 September 2012, <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/crime/mark-duggan-given-gun-just-15-minutes-before-death-8152877.html>
- [663] P. Barkham and J. Henley, ‘Mark Duggan: Profile of Tottenham Police Shooting Victim’, The Guardian, 8 August 2011, <http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2011/aug/08/mark-duggan-profile-tottenham-shooting>
- [664] Tom Hayden, Reunion, op. cit., 361-362.
- [665] Gustav Le Bon, The Crowd, op. cit., inter alia.
- [666] Friedrich Nietzsche (1887), On the Genealogy of Morals, First Essay : ‘Good and Evil, Good and

Bad', Section 10.

[667] <http://occupywallst.org/about/>

[668] Drew Grant, 'Objecting, or Objectified? At Occupy Wall Street women get attention, but not always for their message', New York Observer 28 October 2011, <http://observer.com/2011/10/objecting-or-objectified-at-occupywall-street-women-get-attention-but-not-always-for-their-message/>

[669] Ibid.

[670] <http://commoncts.blogspot.co.nz/2011/11/occupywall-street-document-record-of.html>

[671] Perry Chiamonte, 'Occupy protests plagued by reports of sex attacks, violent crime', Fox News, 9 November 2011, <http://www.foxnews.com/us/2011/11/09/rash-sex-attacks-and-violent-crime-breaks-out-at-occupy-protests/>

[672] Ibid.

[673] Ibid.