

# WAR; BYSTANDING AND HATE – WHY CATEGORY ERRORS ARE DANGEROUS

PETRUSKA CLARKSON, PHYSIS, London

**ABSTRACT** *This paper is a psycho-philosophical analysis of major facts and psychological theories about war, bystanding and hate identifying how logical category errors can lead to dangerous consequences for world peace, ethics and schoolist warfare, and in the bedrooms of millions of people – perhaps even your own – on the principle of inner-outer equivalence.*

**Key words:** war, bystanding, hate, sexuality, category errors

This is a staunchly political message . . . After all, the same sensibility that drives one to seek ever deeper layers of truth in the psychological sphere might as easily drive one to seek an understanding of social tragedies and attempt to remedy them. The same quest for growth that drives one to change one's psychological makeup might as easily drive one to struggle to change the social arrangements . . . As people get used to consulting therapists for help addressing more of their everyday problems . . . they become less practised in social or collective solutions to these problems. And once we assume the unhappiness emanates entirely from a flaw deep within, we tend to seek more and better therapy whenever we experience more unhappiness. (Kuper, 1988, 139–40)

## INTRODUCTION

As a Christian child (growing up in apartheid South Africa!) I was indoctrinated to love *everybody*. I was brainwashed into believing that having angry feelings myself was *evil*. As a child of the 1960s, I protested against war – all wars.

My brothers the world is dying and we will not let it die

O since we have no power to stop these madmen who will destroy the world let us stand here praising God and I say this knowing of the sneers and the cynical laughter . . . (Patchen, 1989, 348)

As an adult of the twenty-first century I still *believe* that love is better than hate, that peace is better than war, and that these are the best goals for everybody. However, I also now *think* that I am (only sometimes) willing to accept this tragic existential reality: being a human creature means there will, almost always, be wars. I *don't* like it and I hope that I am *wrong*.

I will not believe it –  
But it is true.  
It is true. (Patchen, 1989, 159)

## PSYCHOANALYTIC AND PSYCHOTHERAPEUTIC THEORIES ABOUT HATE

Hate hurts and destroys. So I've spent my life studying the psychoanalysts and psychotherapists who have studied hate (amongst other things) in order to understand pain more –

and to help where I could. This is what I found.

Freud only added the idea of ‘the death instinct’ to his theory in 1920. He and his family themselves became the victims of collective hate and had to flee Nazi Vienna. According to Laplanche’s and Pontalis’s summary of the final Freudian theory of the instincts: ‘The death instincts are, to begin with, directed inwards and tends towards self-destruction, but they are subsequently turned towards the outside world in the form of the aggressive or destructive instinct’ (Laplanche and Pontalis, 1988, 97).

Klein was *the* great theorist on hate and envy. She was herself involved in the Great Schoolist War – where her hating daughter was on the other side – of British psychoanalysis during the 1940s. She believed that hate (or envy – the desire to *destroy* the good) is inborn in every baby – part of the ‘death instinct’ – and that people differed ‘innately’ or *constitutionally* in how much of it they had.

The capacity to give and preserve life is felt as the greatest gift and therefore creativeness becomes the deepest cause for envy . . . Greater integration implies that hate in some measure becomes mitigated by love, that the capacity for love gains in strength, and that the split between hated and therefore terrifying objects, and loved ones, diminishes. (Klein, 1984, 202 and 278)

Jung thought that that our morality is also inborn – a function of the human soul – as old as humanity itself (Hauke, 2000). Without it, living with other people (as we have from the beginning) would have been impossible. Yet will war also always be with us?

We to others’ sons spell glory. (Patchen, 1989, 134)

Recall that ‘barbarians’ mean people who speak a language that the dominant

group don’t understand. I am paraphrasing Jung slightly:

War pitilessly reveals to human beings that we are still barbarians, and shows us at the same time what a pitiless scourge lies in store for us if we are ever again tempted to make our neighbours responsible for our own evil qualities. (Jung, 1966, 4)

Other theorists, such as Fairbairn (1952) think that *our need to love* is even more important than our need to be loved – or our need to hate. Many psychologists (and most mothers) do not think or observe babies being born into the world already feeling full of hate and envious destructiveness. They *see* them coming into the world seeking to love.

To be is to love. (Patchen, 1989, 189).

Bowlby and his colleagues based attachment theory on actual research findings that suggest that babies’ bonding with their first care takers sets the pattern for future relationships (Fonagy, 2001 for review). This is great for those who can afford therapy. It’s a very big world.

As far as I know, hate and war have not been well theorized by other psychotherapists. Perls (1969) rehabilitated ‘aggression’ somewhat as *also* having positive purposes. He pointed out that the root of the word ‘aggression’ means ‘to reach out’, so etymologically it is value neutral. For example, breathing in (taking in oxygen) is, in this sense, *aggressive*. Storr (1970) also noted the positive values of anger and aggression.

Tell God that we like  
The rain, and snow, and flowers,  
And trees, and all this gentle and clean  
That have growth on the earth.  
White winds.  
Golden fields.

To hell with power and hate and war.  
(Patchen, 1989, 316)

Berne (1972) recognized the existence of fascist-type evil in human nature, but he didn't really say what to do about it; Peck (1988a) thinks it's the devil's work. I thought that Berke's *The Tyranny of Malice* (1989) was the best.

So, psychological theorists – ‘*I have been sent to explain your sorrow*’ (Patchen, 1989, 149) – say that hate may be innate; or learned from others; or a reaction to being an individual or group victim of hate (De Zulueta, 1993). It's most probably a combination of all three (Westermarck, 1912). My fractal theory involves an equivalence at seven levels (Miller, 1956): *As within, so without*. (And vice versa.) As between the couple, so between the nations of the world (Clarkson, 1992). But we can't get away with it.

Historically, princes of peace like Christ, Lennon, Gandhi are frequently murdered (Clarkson, 2002a). ‘*You're damn right. That's the way it is. That's just the way it is*’ (Patchen, 1989, 268).

## SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE ABOUT HATE

At an individual emotional level, most creatures experience feelings (complex socially moderated electro-chemical muscular changes in the body) that appear to be of the ‘anger’ family (Dalglish, 1998). Anger occurs in most animals and human beings as a biological signal that *something must be changed* (Harré and Parrott, 1996).

Look you have a life – *use* it! No one ever works alone! Hate and fear O blast them to hell for love everywhere and every old how you can! There is so much, so very, very much! (Patchen, 1989, 361)

As such, aggression serves obviously significant evolutionary purposes for (a) *survival* – and revenge – the need for justice (De Waal, 2001) and also for (b) *play* for example, play-fighting amongst puppies and multitudinous varieties of verified *non-procreative* ‘natural’ sexual contact (Judson, 2002).

O Love, it is so little we know of pleasure  
Pleasure that lasts as the snow. (Patchen, 1989, 185)

There is considerable research (for example, Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1961; Oliner and Oliner, 1988) which indicates that bystanding and collective hate are nurtured in the family environment. Children (and trainees) can be taught by instruction and example to hate – or avoid and ignore (this is aversive or ‘avoidant racism’: Rowe, Behrens and Leach, 1995) – other groups called by abusively used words: ‘blacks’, ‘whores’ (sex and fantasy workers joined the British General Workers Union on 4 March 2002), ‘Argies’, ‘sexually dysfunctional’, ‘screws’, ‘schizophrenics’, ‘queers’, ‘genitally immature’, ‘personality disordered’ or ‘spongers’. (My colleague Teresa Hope, for another kind of example, calls refugees ‘the conscience of the world’. Isaac 1964 is recommended reading about the methods of inculcating prejudice – what I call *collective transference and counter-transference distortions*: Clarkson, 1995.)

Those horriblenesses of words that never,  
never, never, never, O never have anything at  
all do with the lives of the people who say  
them, or to whom they are said . . . ‘Mercy.’  
‘Gentleness.’ ‘Peace.’ ‘Mercy . . . ! Gentleness  
. . . ! Peace . . . ! (Patchen, 1989, 450)

Numerically adult bystanders to any individual and collective abuse usually have the power to stop it (see Clarkson 1996a for sources, research evidence and argument) –

if individuals don't deny their own responsibility for being involved (see also Latané and Darley, 1970). Darwin (1981) for example, noted that many healthy animals sympathize with the distress or danger of others. So this human response is most likely a natural outgrowth of ancient social (moral?) tendencies.

What he called 'sympathy' and we call 'empathy' seems to be based on a natural physio-social reflex. Modern infant research also shows that by the age of 12 months healthy infants already spontaneously comfort others in distress (Killen and de Waal, 2000):

The rest is as it is – ghosts peering from mirrors.  
 Make of it what you will.  
 But surely man's concern  
 Should be with real things in a real world -  
 A world where every human being  
 Is responsible for every other human being!  
 (Patchen, 1989, 367)

Yet, the scale of child abuse worldwide is enormous. In the UK, 90% of *reported* rape cases don't go to trial. Just because something *is* so, doesn't mean it's good (or bad). The category error of the naturalistic fallacy is committed when ethical values are derived from natural facts – even when they're true. An 'ought' cannot logically be derived from an 'is'.

There is some independent evidence that children *with* certain kinds of genetic predispositions and *without* certain 'protective factors' are somewhat more *at risk* of dysfunctional behaviour in adult life. However, no reliable or valid direct causal link has yet been *proved* between childhood experiences and adult lives (Caspi et al., 2002).

Furthermore *numerous* exceptions have been demonstrated (a) in terms of anti-social behaviour (Caspi et al., 2002) and in terms of (b) the lives of eminent people

(Goertzel, 1965). It only takes one apple not to fall to disprove Newton's law of gravity. Until the day there are *no* exceptions, we are dealing with theories and hypotheses, not facts.

Yes childhood! Opinions might divide around it, like scoffing ancient water around a new-made boulder, still would it be necessary to remember the bit-of thisness, –thatness of it.  
 (Patchen, 1989, 436)

Childhood experience is evidentially not a *reliable* predictor. It's great for post-hoc theorizing – and keeping psychotherapists in business – 'frequently practised, but insufficiently evaluated . . .' (Roth and Fonagy, 1996, 375). Furthermore, there is excellent evidence of a strong genetic component for hateful violence in what zoologists call the 'King Rat phenomenon' (Wilson, 2001).

Men kill. Under the green ledge  
 I huddle with what life I can steal.  
 (Patchen, 1989, 183)

This is theoretically contributory in cases such as the child killers of Jamie Bulger, adults who rape and murder like Ian Brady of the 'Moors' who writes: 'the premeditated killing of one person by another, inside the law and with official permission, is not considered murder' (Brady, 2001, 33); or Bronson who 'just can't help himself' attacking prison wardens and art therapists – and who has spent more than 21 years in solitary confinement:

I've been on the edge of madness for as long as I can remember . . . They asked me my prison number and, as usual, I told them that I was a person, not a number. (Bronson, 2001, 287)

However, modern infant research proves, beyond all reasonable doubt, that healthy babies of a few weeks or months old feel



complex emotions such as pride, empathy, shame and rage (see Draghi-Lorenz, 2001, for review and original research evidence). These feelings are certainly not then already the result of complicated cognitive reasoning processes.

They appear to be ‘hard-wired’ into our genes. An overwhelming amount of academically verified research evidence proves that *the relationship is the single most important factor in all of psychotherapy* – and in all forms of healing (Clarkson, 1995, 1996b. See also Hubble et al., 1999, for a thorough sift through recent research evidence and many valuable recommendations.)

Many other scientific facts (data) show that vulnerable human beings (and animals) will rather stay within a relationship – even if it is cruel – than risk *not* having *any* relationship. Studies of infants and baby monkeys (who share more than 90% of their genetic material with us) proved this too. They would rather cling to a comforting wire mother covered in towelling, which gave them painful electric shocks, than approach a cold wire mother to whom they couldn’t ‘cuddle up’ (Harlow and Harlow, 1962).

So put the rest away, O put the rest away!  
I’ll tell you what it is I’m sure of –  
Neither of deathless souls nor fleeting clay,  
But that we are most alive when we love!  
(Patchen, 1989, 378)

The connection between love and hate remains. Many abused children continue to be loving and even self-destructively loyal to their hateful parents. Some victims of other people’s hate ‘fall in love’ with their torturers or kidnappers. This psychological phenomenon has been named ‘the Stockholm syndrome’ (see Robinson, 1999, for review and sources).

Research evidence has shown conclusively that most of us are compliant, that is,

we will torture and kill under sufficient relationship pressure – for example, if somebody in authority ‘orders’ us to do so (Gibson and Haritos-Faroutos, 1986; Haney, Banks and Zimbardo, 1973; Milgram, 1974). Reflect, for a moment, on the fact that these kinds of experiments are now considered to be unethical by their professional societies (Clarkson, 2000, 253–88).

It is not a question of choosing an enemy;  
But rather the nature of war. (Patchen, 1989,  
137)

Arch-scientists like physicists have demonstrated that everything and everybody exist in relationship to everything and everybody else (Isham, 1995 and personal communication 1997). Physically we are pro-social animals. We are entangled. *Human society is not so different from a bar magnet . . .*

You probably think you base decisions such as who to vote for, or whether to support a forthcoming war, on a rational weighing up of the facts. Well, maybe, but try this simple experiment, first performed four decades ago and reproduced many times since. Stand on a busy street corner and look up at the sky. The crowd will part around you, indifferent to whatever it is you may be looking at. Now enlist the help of a friend to stand beside you and also look skyward. Soon, others will stop and gaze up as well. A similar thing would happen if you and your friend boarded an empty elevator and faced the rear wall. As more passengers boarded many would face the back wall too (Schechter, 2002).

## WHAT ARE WE TALKING ABOUT?

He shook his fist at the sky and called  
God a bitter name (Patchen 1989, 174).

Hate is usually defined as: ‘extreme dislike, hatred, enmity, detesting’. At a *nominative* level its meanings and usages involve the

desire to destroy, or to have the object of the hatred destroyed. Hate is most commonly understood as a chronic negative, destructive and overpowering obsession of rejecting or disapproving of someone or something, and the wish to have them destroyed.

It's not: 'I hate standing in queues', or 'I hate spinach'. It's 'I *hate* . . .' (fill collective capitalized noun as applicable) to justify genocide. It's 'I *hate* the parent who sexually abused me and I want them dead!' to mark the loathing felt by the child whose natural love has been betrayed. It is words and curses used to express the most extreme intensity of anger.

In our Western culture, however, it is usually connotatively associated with violence. Violence is defined as destructive *acts* towards self, others or things – behaviours that usually have consensually observable and verifiable consequences.

### THE PHENOMENOLOGY OF HATE

We all observe that healthy children and animals certainly *feel* anger, violent dislike and wanting to destroy in hateful ways. However, when this is expressed in some healthy way, they often move on and make friends again.

Think for example how young children may 'hate' a new baby or many dogs reject a new puppy when it joins the family. It is statistically quite rare (although certainly not unknown) for this to end in the death of the youngest one (Judson, 2002). The 'hate' lasts until the environmental threat has been adjusted to or removed.

As of the earth and what I am on this earth – I  
fiercely wish to  
Protect the things I love.  
They fill my eyes with tears – the things I love.  
Suppose they are nothing – they are all I have.  
(Patchen, 1989, 355)

Hate at an individual scale is commonly experienced as part of the set of painful feelings after a relationship breaks up, for example – a reversion of love. It is often only the people we love, or we fear might hurt us in a particular way, which we hate. This kind of hate involves 'proximity' (or closeness). Statistically you are more likely to be raped or murdered by a relative or someone else you know, than by a stranger.

When one gets on with one's own life, then the bad feelings usually fade into a general indifference towards that person (or people). I personally think and feel that indifference is actually the opposite of love. '*All that is needed for evil to triumph is for good people to do nothing.*' And remember what the philosopher Arendt (1964) taught us about how 'banal' evil can appear.

On the other hand, Shakespeare's Richard III murdered Lady Anne's husband, her son *and* father-in law. Yet he actually succeeds in wooing her to marry him! *Richard III* is one of Shakespeare's most frequently performed plays, evidencing how popular and 'fascinating' the juxtaposition of sex and evil can be to the human imagination.

A glance at a daily newspaper – the headlines or the film reviews – will confirm this observation. (They wouldn't sell if human beings were not interested in sex and violence.) My own theory is that we are not just interested in sex and violence per se. We are even more interested and aroused by the experience of *physis* – the creative transformation of sex and violence into meaning – art, stories, myths, films, fairy tales, painting, temples, bridges, experiments, perfume, cartoons, jokes etc. etc. (Clarkson, 2002b).

When Dietrich Stauffer, professor of theoretical physics at Cologne University, came across Sznajd's finding, 'I liked it immediately, and was angry that I did not

invent this model myself years earlier.' Channelling his anger, Stauffer quickly took up Sznajd's model and began to play (quoted in Schechter, 2002, 44).

This is only one passing example towards the point that all important social changes in individual or cultural injustice (from leaving an abusing husband to the abolishment of slavery or cruelty to animals) have come about because somebody somewhere became angry enough to do something about it. For example, two lawyers in a pub started Amnesty International.

So, anger (whether we called it hate or protectiveness or whatever) is the *e-motive* power for change for good – or for evil. *But who decides what's good and what's evil?*

Well, it all depends whose side you're on (Hill, 1987).

'War is evil.' Agreed –  
Sure, that we all buy.  
But what about their 'peace'?  
A little less 'evil', eh –  
*When you can tell them apart!* (Patchen, 1989, 336)

### TAKING SIDES

If I am a caterpillar (or friends with caterpillars) the snake normatively has to be experienced and perceived as 'evil'. The snake is my enemy because he wants to eat me and my family. Therefore the snake – the serpent – is 'bad' from my perspective and the perspective of others who share my values.



Yet, of course, at the same time, the snake experiences a human and others who want to destroy him (and her and their friends and offspring) as 'evil'. From the snake's perspective, the plant is a friend – they can peacefully and usefully co-exist. From the plant's perspective the weevils or other 'bad' parasites are evil – they are trying to destroy the life of the plant.

From the perspective of the 'bad' parasites, the plant is experienced as 'good' – good for killing that is. My medicine for hate is a very long meditation on this image.

We have to make choices . . . about who the good guys and the bad guys are . . . we also have to make choices about *how* to make choices. (Anderson, 1990, 8)

## HATE THERAPY

God! God! Do not let me go alone with no adequate word in my mouth. (Patchen, 1989, 163)

There are two major psychotherapeutic approaches to hate. One, largely from cognitive behaviour therapy, suggests that feelings are caused by thoughts. If you think hateful thoughts, you will feel hate. So, the therapy lies in learning how to change your thoughts. This is reported to work for shorter or longer periods of time (Padesky, 1995).

The other major approach suggests that feelings come first and are then followed by thoughts. This certainly makes evolutionary sense. I can *see* my dog getting angry because the bristles on her back rise while she bares her teeth, and *then* she decides whether to run away or attack. Therapeutic schools such as bioenergetics and psychoanalysis try to enable the expression and/or understanding of such natural feelings (Boadella, 1987).

As a psychotherapist person I am engaged in the therapy of hate and indifference at

individual and collective scales. As a philosopher person, I am currently persuaded that the scientific evidence about the primary importance of relationship is more valuable and important than schoolist allegiances to 'flag statements'. Check the UKCP Register (UKCP, 2000, xvi and vii) for relevant examples.

However, more seriously, 'flags' frequently signify 'wars'. Social psychology experiments have shown that 'the very act of categorization *by itself* is sufficient to elicit ingroup favouritism and discrimination against the outgroup' (Tajfel, 1970, 202, original emphasis).

But I know that one of my hands  
Is black, and one white. I know that  
One part of me is being strangled,  
While another part horribly laughs.  
Until it changes,  
I shall be forever killing; and be killed.  
(Patchen, 1989, 97)

Schoolism is an example of a logical category error – *a dangerous thought disease*. 'The voices didn't join in, *this* time, as she hadn't spoken, but to her great surprise, they all *thought* in chorus (I hope you understand what *thinking in chorus* means – for I must confess that I don't.)' (Carroll, 1987, original italics). Carroll was, of course, an Oxford logician.) See Clarkson (2000) for its ethical and moral consequences, many 'training' tools and some remedies. *A category error* is committed 'when statements are represented as if they belonged to one logical type or category (or range of types or categories), when they actually belong to another' (Ryle, 1974).

Slightly rumped and smelling grandly of the imported gloss of other men's thoughts.  
(Patchen, 1989, 447)

The Oxford philosopher, Gilbert Ryle (1974, 9) defined philosophy as 'the replacement of category-habits by category-disciplines'. He defines 'category' as

follows: ‘The logical type or category to which a concept belongs is the set of ways in which it is logically legitimate to operate with it’ (Ryle, 10).

### SCHOOLISM IN PSYCHOANALYSIS AND PSYCHOTHERAPY IS A LOGICAL CATEGORY ERROR

‘Schoolism’ is therefore defined as the result of behaving as if theories are facts (Clarkson, 2002a, 14). Heraclitus said, 2,500 years ago: ‘Most people do not think things in the way they encounter them, nor do they recognize what they experience, but believe their own opinions’ (Kahn, 1981, Fragment IV).

Logically our beliefs about ‘what is the good side to be on’ are our *opinions*. Our *theories* are our stories – our explanatory narratives for the currently assessed best *rational factual evidence* available throughout human knowledge. (Knowledge is a collection of current facts, which demonstrably work in practice to solve problems.) *Theories are not facts* to be *believed* in the same way as we believe apples will fall to the ground if we drop them. (On Earth that is.)

And where are we to go/ What are we to do,  
God,  
When the dream falls to the ground?  
For the dream is falling to the ground.  
*For the dream is falling with a dull dead  
sound.* (Patchen, 1989, 157)

Schoolist fanatics outlaw questioning and expel dissidents like the ‘Ebenezer’ churches of our own psychotherapy organizations. It’s murder and genocide at the symbolic (?) level. (For *some* examples, see Grosskurth 1986, 428 on Kleinians; Clarkson 2000, on Gestaltist examples – and the rest; and Clarkson, unpublished.)

How will psychotherapists think things in the way the encounter them and recognize

what they experience? By clarifying our thoughts. By practising category disciplines and avoiding category errors.

### THE CATEGORY ERROR OF REDUCTIONISM (‘ONE-LEVEL PRIORITITIS’)

Women suffering domestic violence are often unfairly blamed for ‘going back to’ the abusing husband. Psychotherapists may call it ‘moral masochism’ (Caplan, 1985). Friends may say that they ‘really want it’. Paedophiles also say the children ‘really want it.’ *Victim blaming*. This is not simply true. Human experience cannot logically be reduced to only one level. We are more complex creatures than that (Bauman, 1993).

Falling in love with your abuser may not be rational or logical, but it is *psychological*. One explanation for this is that the victim ‘identifies’ at an emotional level with the aggressor. Another explanation is that humans find the *intensity* of these kinds of relationship *sexy* (see Clarkson, in preparation. Preliminary findings, *for one indicative example*, show that the most financially successful prostitutes in the UK are dominatrixes. See also Bataille, 1986 and 1989.). The truth is, we don’t know.

And I think there is nothing in the world but  
the mystery. (Patchen, 1989, 323)

### THE CATEGORY ERROR OF LINGUISTIC REDUCTIONISM

The *names* we give to phenomena are not independent of their *consequences*. “‘What’s the use of their having names,” the Gnat said, “if they won’t answer to them?” “No use to *them*,” said Alice, “but it’s useful to the people that name them, I suppose. If not, why do things have names at all?”” (Carroll, 1987, 193, original italics).

Nominations, values, our experience and the actions that we omit or commit and the justifications (theories) we bring to it belong in separate logical categories (Foucault, 1980; Van Dijk, 1987).

We can also ‘hypothesize’ or ‘theorize’ endlessly about whether all acts of violence are committed out of hate, how much and in what ways or why. But, in fact, many people have committed terrible acts of violence ‘in the name of love’. Just think about forcible ‘conversions’ of so many of the world’s majority cultures. For example, historically many Christian soldiers believed: ‘It’s out of love that we’re going to kill you – to save your souls’ (Ben-Jochannan, 1998).

It was also the ‘rational’ justification given by those most rational (by the standards of *their* time) Dominicans Kramer and Sprenger that resulted in the burning alive of thousands (millions?) of white women with ‘faggots’ (homosexuals) at the base of the stake to light the fires. (See their *Malleus Maleficarum* – and the introduction to it by a *contemporary* theologian – for an encyclopaedia of textbook examples of the most *rational sounding*, yet fatal category errors: Kramer and Sprenger, 1971).

The heart sees  
What is repellent  
And what benevolent  
But judges all within itself. (Patchen, 1989, 214)

Psychoanalysts and therapists today commit this kind of category error when they call human beings (patients or trainees) by psychiatric terminology in an abusive or ridiculing way. I have observed the Chair of the UKCP ‘Ethics Committee’ do this in a public lecture – and I wrote a letter about it too. (Somebody, I don’t know who, said: ‘Man is a letter-writing animal.’)

As Herscovitch writes in Ellenbogen’s 1987 ethics section of *Oral sadism and the*

*Vegetarian Personality*: ‘Principle 11: It is unethical to diagnose someone as borderline just because they are having more fun than you’ (Herscovitch, 1987, 215).

There has been a tendency among both philosophers and psychologists to abstract an entity – call it ‘anger’ . . . and to try to study it. But what there is are angry people . . . There is a concrete world of contexts and activities. We reify and abstract from that concreteness at our peril. (Harré, 1986, 4)

You, the sought for; I, the seeker; this the search;  
And each is the mission of all. (Patchen, 1989, 73)

### **FALSE FACTS AND THEIR RELATION TO ‘THEORIES’, POLITICS AND CLINICAL PRACTICE**

No wonder Freud wrote that he didn’t know what women wanted. He insisted: ‘the elimination of clitoridal sexuality is a necessary precondition for the development of femininity’ (Freud, 1977/1901–1905, 339).

A ‘transference’ must be ‘effected’ by the clitoris, of ‘transmitting the excitement to the adjacent parts . . . [like] pine shavings can be kindled to set a log of harder wood on fire’ (Freud, 1977/1901–1905, 143). Freud believed his theories were true in a factual sense: ‘the truth of the theories of analysis’ (Freud, 1992, 215). I call it coitocentrism.

Some female analysands, for example, Marie Bonaparte, even had *surgery* (more than once) to have her clitoris ‘repositioned’ in vain attempts to ‘overcome’ her Freudian-defined vaginal ‘frigidity’. (Her clitoris refused to make the ‘transference’.)

The operation unsurprisingly failed. Freud’s personal physician (Max Schur) was in attendance at the ‘operation’. Marie had been ‘psychoanalysed’ by Freud and he was

personally supervising her analysis of three patients at the time, 13 April 1930 – 14 May 1930 (Freud, 1992, 66 and 70).

In her book on *Female Sexuality* Marie wrote that a woman's masochism, 'combining with her passivity in coitus, impels her to welcome and to value some measure of brutality on the man's part' (Bonaparte, 1973, 48). (Please read that quote again.) Marie Bonaparte became the leader of the psychoanalytic movement in France. (And her influence was then superseded by that of Lacan – who simply pronounced that the woman doesn't exist! Does anyone know where the clitoris is mentioned in the Lacanian corpus?)

I blow on the hour.  
Have sweetness.  
It is tomorrow somewhere.  
The wound will sleep. (Patchen, 1989, 253)

Marie Bonaparte died without ever having experienced 'a vaginal orgasm'. No surprise here either. Even Freudian apologists such as Appignanesi and Forrester are obliged to admit:

It is almost inconceivable that Freud was not aware of the orthodox views of contemporary anatomists and physiologists, who had, from well before the early nineteenth century, demonstrated that the clitoris was the specific site of female pleasure . . . [and that] in the medical writing of his time, had asserted that the vagina had virtually no erotic functions at all . . . virtually the entire vagina could be operated on without the need of an anaesthetic. (Appignanesi and Forrester, 1993, 425)

But Freud writes: 'This anaesthesia [of the vagina] may become permanent if the clitoridal zone *refuses* to abandon its excitability' (Freud 1977: 143, my emphasis). One other example where Freud actually *observes* correctly (anatomically and phenomenologically) that childhood

sexuality seems to be concentrated in the clitoral zone of both girls and boys:

What I have in mind is the male genital zone, the region of the clitoris, in which during childhood sexual sensitivity seems to be concentrated in girls as well as boys. (Bonaparte, 1973, 233)

Notice how Freud *mis-names* the clitoris as 'the male genital zone', the 'excitability' of which *is*, in fact 'partly or wholly extinguished . . .' (Bonaparte, 1973, 233) in females at puberty. (Oh yeah?)

He concludes – as if it were a fact (or as if it logically follows?): 'This accounts for the flood of shame by which girls are overwhelmed at that time' (Bonaparte, 1973, 233). Compare with Freud's diary 1929–1939, 106 and 107, and see Benvenuto, 1995, on *The Rites of Psychoanalysis* for colour illustrations. He writes that the vaginal anaesthesia lasts . . . until 'the new vaginal zone is awakened, whether spontaneously or by reflex action' (Bonaparte, 1973, 233).

Come again? How – except by some miracle – can a largely anaesthetized sac of tissue be 'awakened'?

The average clitoris is, according to scientific evidence, *actually* the size of the penis which is anatomically homologous to it. Furthermore, the clitoris is the only human organ exclusively devoted to pleasure. Compare, for example, Freud's writing on this topic with the German anatomist Kobelt's (1844) publications who called the clitoris: 'this sexual heart' (Kobelt, 1978, 47). See also O'Connell et al. (1998) for contemporary scientific – and health-related – facts.

For here indeed was the unassailable kingdom  
of the heart itself.  
Under his fingers her warm, human flesh was  
alive in the sun  
And across that living bridge they Godsped.  
(Patchen, 1989, 458)



A 2002 survey of *Cosmopolitan* women readers found that two-thirds of their respondents ‘faked’ orgasms (Elms, 2002). From a massive survey Hite found that around 70% of women could not orgasm from penile penetration alone (Hite, 1976/1987). One woman, ‘worried about not having orgasms during intercourse, discussed the problem [of filling in Shere’s questionnaire item about it] with her analyst. He assured her that she could say she had “climaxes” during intercourse, since she did reach a peak of feeling – even though she didn’t really “orgasm”’ (Hite, 1976/1987, 612).

Hite’s research findings, ranging around seven to eight out of every 10 women in the population – who cannot orgasm from penile penetration alone – have been replicated numerous times since. Much other evidence supports this (see Clarkson, 2003a, 2003b and forthcoming).

Anon (2002) reports:

Experienced by up to 43% of the female adult population, female sexual dysfunction [FSD] is a condition with high latent, but low realized, potential. From the onset of symptoms to diagnosis of FSD, patients withdraw at multiple points from the treatment flow. [Are you still wondering why?] Fulfilling FSD’s *commercial potential* will hinge *critically* upon translating patient potential into a diagnosed and treated population. (my emphasis)

Think and feel about this renaming of statistically and anatomically normal female sexuality as ‘Female Sexual Dysfunction’, FSD for short, in the light of the following quote from Freud: ‘This anaesthesia may become permanent if the clitoral zone *refuses* to abandon its excitability’ (Freud, 1977, 143, my emphasis).

Apart from the ‘commercial potential’ of all this individual human suffering – might this have anything at all to do with what has been called ‘the gender war’?

Contemporary British Lacanians still write and teach that women not only don’t ‘run the risk of being castrated’, women *cannot* be castrated – as if these authors have never heard of either ‘real’ or ‘symbolic’ female genital mutilation. (For example, ‘. . . *only men have something that can be castrated* . . .’ (Benvenuto and Kennedy, 1986, 191). I leave the imaginary to your imagination.)

‘Theories’, presented as ‘facts’ – which are in themselves false – are still taught and practised today on many women patients in psychoanalysis and psychotherapy as if they were ‘true’! ‘This is why the problem of demarcation between science and pseudo-science is not a pseudo-problem of armchair philosophers. It has grave ethical and political implications.’ (For psychotherapists of ALL persuasions.) (Curd and Cover, 1998, 26.)

Commercial potential anyone?

Life needn’t be ugly.

All this ratty lying murderous swindle of theirs be damned!

There’s a beautiful sun *today!* When are we going to throw the

Bastards off our backs. Art has no place for lies. (Patchen, 1989, 362)

Lacan (himself) pointed out that in psychoanalytic theories the woman comes out of encounter with the phallus, and consequently with the law of the father, as castrated. But castrated of what? Not of the phallus, because she does not have one, but of her own sexuality (Benvenuto and Kennedy, 1986, 193).

In *Why Men Hate Women* Jukes writes: ‘The oppression of woman begins at birth, when she is assigned to her no-sex’ (Jukes, 1993, 321).

Racism, like misogyny, is a category error (Clarkson and Cleminson-Afi, in press). There are no facts that can logically justify the loyalties of the heart.

But then, hate is often *called* love. Richard III says, just before he has his own brother murdered: ‘Simple plain Clarence/ I do love thee so/ That I will shortly send thy soul to heaven.’ Nations are called ‘developing’ when we act on what we believe that’s best for them (see Ani, 1994 for an African-centred perspective).

These are all logical category errors – dangerous to human beings and other living things.

Why do those who are pursuing knowledge not encounter tragic knowledge, or otherwise confront the penalties of knowledge, and why do they declare themselves free of sentiment and patriotism and religious conviction, and who are they writing for anyway (Hariman, 1989, 211)?

Were I God! O were I God!  
 But a man – what can a man do in this world?  
 A man may weep  
 A man may curse against the darkness.  
 A man may stand with all his heart’s power  
 raised against  
 The enemies of light.  
 And it will change nothing?  
 Ah, but it could change the world! (Patchen,  
 1989, 345)

## A COMPLEX CONCLUSION

As result of the 1998 International Symposium on *Transdisciplinarity – Towards Integrative Process and Integrated Knowledge*, a *transdisciplinary approach* towards global problems was instituted at UNESCO, because such an approach ‘tends to reveal, more than others, the underlying complexity of reality’ (UNESCO, 1998, 8). Most approaches to the therapy of hate (or anger) are agreed that feelings and behaviour can be, and must be, separated at different levels. These levels, like the political and the psychological, co-exist *ontologically* and *epistemologically*.

We can experience the physical impulse or the emotional desire or the moral imperative

to kill – whatever our theories and whatever we want to name it – ‘fighting for freedom’ or ‘eliminating terrorists’. However, at a rational level, the consequences of our actions need to be considered as well. All these levels co-exist simultaneously.

On alternating levels the world pounds in  
 And there is not such another one anywhere.  
 (Patchen, 1989, 109)

But that would involve us taking the medicine. (See, for example, Clarkson, 2002a, 2002b, in press). What medicine? Wittgenstein prescribed *philosophy* as medicine (*physic*). He defines philosophy as ‘the discipline of thinking about thinking . . . The object of philosophy is the logical clarification of thoughts. Philosophy is not a theory, but an activity. The theory of knowledge is the *philosophy of psychology*’ (Wittgenstein, 1980, 77, my italics).

Speaking in the vernacular: We should get our *own* heads straight first. (Read Ehrenreich and English, 1978 – and consider what current *belief*-based psychotherapeutic practices will look like to future generations 150 years from now . . .)

Use the best, current twenty-first century *scientific facts* on which to base our work rather than disproven and/or false theories. Start practising thinking. Category discipline. Differentiate, at the very least between the logically appropriate different truth values for our feelings, our beliefs, our facts and our theories. Drop schoolism. Defuse it immediately as if it is bomb whose dangerous fuse has already been burning too long. It merely mirrors the problems of our world. *Really* listen to our clients (Clarkson and Winter, 2000). *Even* to other knowledge-able people outside our own narrow disciplines (Nicolopoulou, 2002).

Because I think and feel that we can be neither psychotherapeutically nor politically responsible if we don’t (Samuels, 2001).

Because: ‘It is in gradual cross-fertilization that the future of knowledge – and indeed of the world – resides’ (UNESCO, 1998, 2). I think and feel that practising *this* knowledge is response-able love.

There is only one power that can save the world -  
And that is the power of our love for all men everywhere. (Patchen, 1989, 330)

## REFERENCES

- Anderson WT. Reality is Not what it Used to Be. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1990.
- Ani M. Yurugu – an African-centred Critique of European Cultural Thought and Behavior, Trenton NJ: Africa World, 1994.
- Anon. Strategic Perspectives: Female Sexual Dysfunction. Are physicians and patients ready for a female Viagra? August, 2002. Datamonitor. Reference Code DMHC 1797.
- Appignanesi L, Forrester J. Freud’s Women. London: Virago, 1993.
- Arendt H. Eichmann in Jerusalem: A Report on the Banality of Evil. New York: Viking Press, 1964.
- Bandura A, Ross D, Ross S. Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 1961; 63(3): 575–82.
- Bataille G. The Tears of Eros. Trans. P. Connor. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1989.
- Bataille G. Eroticism: Death and Sensuality. Trans. M Dalwood. San Francisco: City Lights Books, 1986.
- Bauman, Z. Postmodern Ethics. Oxford: Blackwell, 1993.
- Ben-Jochannan YAA. Africa – Mother of Western Civilization. Baltimore: Black Classic Press, 1998.
- Benvenuto B. Concerning the Rites of Psychoanalysis – or the Villa of the Mysteries. London: Polity Press, 1995.
- Benvenuto B, Kennedy R. The Works of Jacques Lacan: An Introduction. London: Free Association Books, 1986.
- Berke JH. The Tyranny of Malice: Exploring the Dark Side of Character and Culture. London: Simon & Schuster, 1989.
- Berne E. What Do You Say After You Say Hello? New York: Grove Press, 1972.
- Boadella D. Lifestreams: An Introduction to Biosynthesis. London: Routledge, 1987.
- Bonaparte M. Female Sexuality. New York: International Universities Press, 1973.
- Brady I. The Gates of Janus. Los Angeles CA: Feral House, 2001.
- Bronson C. Bronson. London. Blake, 2001.
- Caplan PJ. The Myth of Women’s Masochism, New York: EP Dutton, 1985.
- Caspi A, McClay J, Moffitt TE, Mill J, Martin J, Craig IW, Taylor A, Poulton R. Role of genotype in the cycle of violence in maltreated children. London: Medical Research Council Social, Genetic, and Developmental Psychiatry Research Centre, 2002.
- Clarkson P. Dilemmas of Difference: Differentiating Couples Therapy Issues for Intervention, Negotiation, Separation or Celebration. In Brothers BJ (ed.) Peace, War and Mental Health. New York: Haworth, 1992.
- Clarkson P. The Therapeutic Relationship. London: Whurr, 1995.
- Clarkson P. The Bystander. London: Whurr, 1996a.
- Clarkson P. Researching the therapeutic relationship. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly* 1996b; 9(2): 143–62.
- Clarkson P. Ethics – working with ethical and moral dilemmas in psychotherapy. London: Whurr, 2000.
- Clarkson P. On Psychotherapy. Vol. 2. London: Whurr, 2002a.
- Clarkson P. Physis – A Psychophilosophical Life Science Study of Autopoiesis in Psychoanalysis, Jungian Psychology and Other Psychotherapies. Unpublished PhD thesis. University of Kent, 2002b.
- Clarkson P. No sex please, we’re counsellors. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Journal* 2003a; 14(2): 7–11.
- Clarkson P. Everything you Ever Wanted to Know about Extraordinary Sex. Vol. 1. 2 edn. St Leonards-on-Sea: UPSO, 2003b.
- Clarkson P. Philosophy of science? Epistemological category errors in psychotherapeutic discourse. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, in press.
- Clarkson P. On Fanaticism and Working with Difference. Unpublished, but available from [petruska.c@dial.pipex.com](mailto:petruska.c@dial.pipex.com).
- Clarkson P. Twenty-first Century Sex – or Freud’s Project for a Scientific Psychology, Lillith’s Daughters and Jocasta’s Sons. Submitted for publication.
- Clarkson P. ‘This Sexual Heart’ – Sex Research and Practice in the Twenty-first Century. In preparation.
- Clarkson P, Cleminson-Afi A (eds). Race and racism in Psychotherapy and Counselling. London: Whurr, in press.

- Clarkson P, Winter D. Users' Voices – A Research Report. Leiden: Integrative Psychotherapy Conference, 2000.
- Curd M, Cover, JA. Philosophy of Science – The Central Issues. New York: Norton & Co, 1998.
- Dalgleish T. Emotions In Eysenck, M (ed.) Psychology – An Integrated Approach. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, 1998.
- Darwin C (1981) *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Princeton NJ: Princeton University Press. (First published 1871.)
- De Waal F. *The Ape and the Sushi Master – Cultural Reflections by a Primatologist*. London: Allen Lane, The Penguin Press, 2001.
- De Zulueta F. *From Pain to Violence – The Traumatic Roots of Destructiveness*. London: Whurr, 1993.
- Draghi-Lorenz R. *Young Infants are capable of Non Basic Emotions*. Unpublished doctoral thesis. University of Portsmouth, 2001.
- Ehrenreich B, English D. *For Her Own Good – 150 years of Experts' Advice to Women*. New York: Anchor, 1978.
- Elms E. *The sex diaries*. Cosmopolitan, February, 2002.
- Fairbairn WRD. *Psychoanalytic Studies of the Personality*. London: Tavistock, 1952.
- Fonagy P. *Attachment Theory and Psychoanalysis*. New York: Other Press, 2001.
- Foucault M. *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon, 1980.
- Freud S. *On sexuality: three essays on the theory of sexuality and other works*. London: The Pelican Freud Library, 7, 1977.
- Freud S. *The Diary of Sigmund Freud 1929–1939 – A Record of the Final Decade*. London: Hogarth Press, 1992.
- Gibson J, Haritos-Faroutos M. *The education of a torturer*. *Psychology Today* 1986; 20, 50–8.
- Goertzel V. *Cradles of Eminence*. London: Constable, 1965.
- Grosskurth P. *Melanie Klein: Her World and her Work*. New York: Alfred A Knopf, 1986.
- Haney C, Banks C, Zimbardo P. *Interpersonal dynamics in a simulated prison*. *International Journal of Criminology and Penology* 1973; 1: 69–97.
- Hariman R. *The rhetoric of inquiry and the professional scholar*. In HW Simons (ed.) *Rhetoric in the Human Sciences*. London: Sage, 1989, 211–32.
- Harlow HF, Harlow MK. *Social deprivation in monkeys*. *Scientific American* 1962; 207, 136–46.
- Harré R, Parrott WG. *The Emotions – Social, Cultural and Biological Dimensions*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage, 1996.
- Harré, R (ed.). *The Social Construction of Emotions*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1986.
- Hauke C. *Jung and the Postmodern: The Interpretation of Realities*. London: Routledge, 2000.
- Herscovitch J. *Ethical principles of psychologists: an update*. In Ellenbogen G (ed.) *Oral Sadism and the Vegetarian Personality – Readings from the Journal of Polymorphous Perversity*. New York: Bruner/Mazel, 1987.
- Hill CA. *Affiliation motivation: people who need people but in different ways*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 1987; 52: 1008–18.
- Hite S. *The Hite Report: A Nationwide Study on Female Sexuality*. New York: Macmillan, 1987.
- Hubble MA, Duncan BL, Miller SD. *The Heart and Soul of Change. What Works in Therapy*. Washington DC: American Psychological Association, 1999.
- Isaac J. *The Teaching of Contempt – Christian Roots of Anti-Semitism*, New York: Holt, Rhinehart & Winston, 1964.
- Isham CJ. *Lectures on Quantum Theory – Mathematical and Structural Foundations*. London: Imperial College Press, 1995.
- Judson O. *Dr. Tatiana's Sex Advice to All Creation – The Definitive Guide to the Evolutionary Biology of Sex*. London: Chatto & Windus, 2002.
- Jukes A. *Why Men Hate Women*. London: Free Association Books, 1993.
- Jung C. *Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, in The Collected Works Vol. 5, (RFC Hull, trans.)*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966.
- Kahn CH. *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus: An Edition of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Killen M, de Waal FBM. *The evolution and development of morality*. In F Aureli, FBM de Waal (eds) *Natural Conflict Resolution*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press, 2000, 352–72.
- Klein M. *Envy, Gratitude and Other Works*, London: Hogarth Press, 1984.
- Kobelt GL (1978) *The female sex organs in humans and some mammals*. (First published in German, 1844) in Lowry TP (ed.) *The Classic Clitoris – Historic Contributions to Scientific Sexuality*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1978; 19–56.
- Kramer H, Sprenger J. *The Malleus Maleficarum of Heinrich Kramer and James Sprenger Trans. M Summers*. New York: Dover, 1971.
- Kuper A. *The Invention of Primitive Society: Transformations of an Illusion*, London: Routledge, 1988.

- Laplanche J, Pontalis JB. *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. London: Karnac, 1988.
- Latané B, Darley M. *The Unresponsive Bystander: Why Doesn't He Help?* New York: Appleton Century Crofts, 1970.
- Milgram S. *Obedience to Authority*. New York: Harper & Row, 1974.
- Miller GA. The magical number seven, plus or minus two – some limits on our capacity for processing information. *Psychological Review* 1956; 63: 81–97.
- Nicolopoulou K. *Towards a phenomenological approach to organisational learning and information systems: a study of human experience in three large scale organisations'* unpublished PhD thesis submitted to Information Technology Dept of the LSE, 2002.
- O'Connell HE, Hutson JM, Anderson CR, Plenter RJ. Anatomical relationship between urethra and clitoris. *Journal of Urology* 1998; 159(6): 1892–7.
- Oliner SP, Oliner PM. *The Altruistic Personality: Rescuers of Jews in Nazi Europe*. New York: Free Press/Macmillan, 1988.
- Padesky CA. *Clinician's Guide to Mind over Mood*. New York. Guilford, 1995.
- Patchen K. *Collected Poems*. New York: Norton, 1989.
- Peck MS. *People of the Lie*. London: Rider, 1988.
- Perls F. *Ego, Hunger and Aggression*. New York; Vintage Books, 1969.
- Robinson ME. *Do Not Punish Me for Surviving: The Language of Violence, Examination of the Battered Women Syndrome and The Stockholm Syndrome Phenomenon*. Unpublished MA dissertation, University of Kent, 1999.
- Roth A, Fonagy P. *What Works for Whom? A Critical Review of Psychotherapy Research*. New York: Guildford, 1996.
- Rowe W, Behrens JT, Leach MM (1995) Racial/ethnic identity and racial consciousness: Looking back and looking forward. In Ponterotto JG, Casas JM, Suzuki LA, Alexander CM (eds) *Handbook of Multicultural Counselling*. Thousand Onks CA: Sage, pp. 218–35.
- Ryle G. *Dilemmas: The Tarner Lectures*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1974.
- Samuels A. *Politics on the Couch – Citizenship and the Internal Life*. London: Profile Books, 2001.
- Schechter B. Push me, pull me. *New Scientist*, 24 August, 2002, 42–45.
- Storr A. *Human Aggression*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1970.
- Tajfel H. Experiments in intergroup discrimination. In Gross RD (ed.) *Key Studies in Psychology*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1994; 185–206.
- UKCP Register. London: Routledge, 2000.
- UNESCO International Symposium of Transdisciplinarity – *Towards Integrative Process and Integrated Knowledge*, Proceedings. New York: United Nations, 1998.
- Van Dijk TA. *Communicating Racism-Ethnic Prejudice in Thought and Talk*. London: Sage, 1987.
- Westermarck E. *The Origin and Development of Moral Ideas*. Vol. 1. London: Macmillan, 1912.
- Wilson C. Introduction, *The Moors Murders in Brady, I. The Gates of Janus*. Los Angeles CA: Feral House, 2001.
- Wittgenstein L (1980) *Remarks on the Philosophy of Psychology* Vol. 1. Trans. GEM Anscombe. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

*Correspondence: Petruska Clarkson, 58 Harley Street, London W1G 9QB. Email petruska.c@dial.pipex.com.*