

Neither the ‘Far Right’ Nor the ‘Far Left’ Actually Exists

by Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.
U.S. Labor Party Presidential Candidate

May 9, 1976

[Published in *Executive Intelligence Review*, Volume 3, Number 20, May 18, 1976. View [PDF of original](#) at the LaRouche Library.]

PARIS, May 9 (IPS)—It is exemplary of the want of creative mental powers among the *New York Times*’ editorial staff that almost two centuries after the French Revolution, those editors are still attempting to explain all politics essentially in terms of the accident of the seating arrangements in the parliament of the First French Republic: “far right,” “right,” “center,” “left,” “far left,” and “extreme left.” Meanwhile, perhaps in credulous awe of the Times’ reputation, squirrely journalists all around the world are obsessively committed to fitting most of world politics into the same set of foolish, linear categories.

Such practices ought to be promptly outlawed, not only because they are contemptibly illiterate but, under present circumstances of global crisis, downright dangerous to humanity in general. The journalists who fail to appropriate remedial-educational programs to this effect might find new employment in some simple but useful handicraft, such as basket-weaving, which better suits their intellectual temperaments.

Reston, Reagan and Rockefeller

The *New York Times*’ James “Scotty” Reston cannot suggest that we slander him by reporting him an overt admirer of Vice President Nelson Rockefeller. We do not ask Scotty to answer the query “What is Rockefeller politically?”—since the strictly scientific answer to that query has been abundantly recorded on the walls of factory latrines. We challenge the querulous Scotty to develop a consistent journalistic characterization of Rockefeller’s politics according to the regrettable tired formulae to whose usages we have just raised our objections.

Nelson Rockefeller, the alleged liberal and “Bilderberger,” is of course a close second to “Atheistic Communism” as an object of opprobrium among strata which Mr. Reston would ordinarily term the “extreme right.” Mr. Reston would add that the ex-male model and former low-priced imitation of John Wayne, Ronald “Dutch” Reagan, is the current darling of much of this so-called “far right.” Yet, Mr. Reagan is currently the pawn of Nelson

Rockefeller, and the most consistent advocate of policies originating with the Rockefeller faction. What will Mr. Reston make of such ironies; will he describe Nelson Rockefeller, like Schachtian economist Milton Friedman, as a covert sponsor of the “extreme right,” or will he correct his characterization of Mr. Reagan’s supporters from “extreme right” to “extremely credulous”?

Of course, we are not imputing Mr. Reston’s adoration of Nelson Rockefeller and Reagan’s Schlesinger doctrine to the *New York Times* editorial staff as a whole. During recent weeks, to be precise on this matter, each weekend the pro-Harriman pens at the *New York Times* have ostensibly retreated to their Friday night cocktails and Sunday sobering-up, during which absences the *New York Times*’ pages have been somewhat dominated by Mr. Rockefeller’s Reaganisms. Then, approximately beginning the Tuesday edition of the same publication, the denunciations and ridicule of Mr. Rockefeller’s pet Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger, are resumed for a few days. In between, there is Mr. Sulzberger, who, to make a pun, is somewhat Balled-up, making the Rockefeller, Ball and Harriman support in the *Times*’ editorial staff a special kind of problem in the orbits of three bodies about one another. Even so, apart from this lability in *Times*’ foreign policy posturing, the defective usage of which we have complained is the common problem of all factions.

Metaphor and Paranoia

In strict terms of clinical psychoanalysis, the vogue in usage of the linear “far right” to “far left” formula for professed political analysis and characterization is *paranoid*. The formal, or, if you prefer strict terms, the epistemological proof of that statement is as follows.

On any agreed definition of a certain policy, it is possible and sometimes useful to employ the metaphors of First Republic parliamentary seating arrangements to describe the form of tactical commitment which various factions tend to impute to an otherwise agreed policy. The fact that the First Republic’s leaders started from the same special, French-republican philosophical world-outlook permitted a meaningful distinction among the respective conservative, Jacobin and left-Jacobin factions engaged in common support of the same essential political-philosophical world-outlook. That is, where a group of factions are united by a predominant commonality of philosophical outlook, but differ in degree and form of commitment to the proposed pace of realization of such policies, a linear distinction among such factions—conservative, moderate and radical—has some usefulness as a short-hand method of description.

This same method of description fails and effects gibberish whenever the factional differences are qualitative, where fundamentally different outlooks are involved. In such cases, whether one is relatively moderate, militant or radical in advocacy of one’s views has very little

relevance respecting the contrast of that broad outlook with the variously moderate, militant and radical advocacies for an entirely different set of views.

The case of the Labor Committees is the most dramatic proof of that.

The Labor Committees are Marxian socialists, whose principal U.S. affiliation is the U.S. Labor Party, a body which overall does not embody a commitment to explicitly socialist views but is essentially simply a body dedicated to the political expression of the self-interests of working people and farmers. Thus, relative to doctrinaires, the professedly Marxist sects, like the De Leonist Socialist Labor Party or the Healyite Workers' Party, the Labor Committees are meaninglessly seen as extreme moderates, and thus subject to the childish epithet of "right-wing revisionists" from such quarters.

Tactically, the Labor Committees are sometimes allied with explicitly pro-capitalist currents and factions. In some instances, this tactical alliance is limited to specific urgent issues, and on others more durable issues of general national policies. Yet, in defiance of childish schematization, the Labor Committees not only denounce but are bitterly opposed to the type of so-called "historical compromise" governments which are the adopted policies of the Communist Party of Italy.

These tactical alliances with pro-capitalist and capitalist factions in the advanced-capitalist sector and with various kinds of bonapartist factions otherwise illuminate the more relevant working point to be made. What is the dividing-line, so to speak, which differentiates which capitalists the Labor Committees collaborate with tactically, and which capitalist and professedly, socialist factions the Labor Committees regard as the actual or potential enemies of humanity at this juncture?

Expressed in that way, the appropriate method of distinction becomes obvious. The division of the world into two principal factions, the one favoring Schachtian austerity and the other proposing global expanded reproduction as the common policy and cooperative relationship among pro-capitalist and pro-socialist forces, is the kernel of the issue and the only meaningful approach to distinctions.

For example, Rockefeller, Ronald Reagan, George Ball, the Maoists, the "Trotskyists" of the SWP and the dominant currents of the U.S. Communist Party momentarily all share the anti-development side of the factional division. Whereas, certain capitalist corporations, some major capitalist parties and fractions of such parties, leading forces of the developing sector, some Communist parties—such as that of Portugal—and the Labor Committees are all committed to a policy of expanded reproduction on a global scale.

In short, the simplistic categories of “right,” “center” and “left” as used by the *New York Times* and other journals of the same slovenly persuasions are worse than meaningless at this juncture.

The only meaningful approach to political categories at this—or any other point in history—is that which proceeds from study of the central dividing issues of general policy at each juncture. In such a responsible approach to political analysis, one initially assorts various factions according to their tendencies to align on one or another side of the central policy issue, and then analyzes each constituent faction sociologically and otherwise to the end of explaining how it arrives at a certain commitment and what the probable further evolution of that commitment might be.

The slovenly practice which attempts to reduce most currents to linear categories of the “far right” to “far left” form is much worse than the proverbial blunder of ignorantly confusing apples, oranges and washing machines as distinctions of mere degree. The attempt to impose a literary formula arbitrarily, without regard for reality, is literally a schizophrenic tendency, literally an expression of paranoia.

This use of the diagnosis of paranoia is not a simile or metaphor. The paranoid mind is characterized by a retreat into a caricature of childhood family life and household circles, is a mysterious, aversive domain, which the infantile mind attempts to encompass with more or less literal, propitiatory formulae. (Like the racist slander made popular in Rockefeller factional and other circles, to the effect that Italy has a crisis today essentially because (1) Italians are inherently lazy and incompetent, and (2) instead of exploiting the Italian boom frugally, every Italian worker, farmer and village donkey spent above his means in buying Maseratis, villas, and keeping movie actresses for mistresses. This is no exaggeration of the genre of the filthy, paranoid slanders one hears and reads from among leading social strata throughout Europe and in much of the leading press!) Similarly, the paranoid journalist and his editor “knows” that all politics outside the incestuous household of the journal’s editorial offices is neatly assorted into degrees of the “far right” to “far left” formulation.

Parentetical: Metaphor and Method

The problem of the paranoid journalist and editor is not that he or she is employing a metaphor in treating political phenomena. On the contrary, the mental processes associated with synthesis of metaphor and equivalent forms of ambiguities are the most immediate common expression of the same mental processes properly associated with creativity or even genius. The experience of solving an elaborately-divided jigsaw puzzle is a useful illustration of the working point.

One starts, in laying out the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle or in approaching various problems of understanding in ordinary life, with what often appears to be a hopeless confusion. One then searches for a pattern of some kind or another, such that one can begin to order one's exploratory steps in such a fashion that progress in solving the task is effected by something better than random hit-and-miss procedures. These notions of patterns and ordering-principles are abstractions roughly analogous to metaphors; they might be described as procedural recommendations for problem-solving of the form of "Think of ... as ..."

At a certain point in successful problem-solving efforts, initial exploratory hypotheses are replaced by a successful hypothesis. In the case of the jigsaw puzzle, the person has grasped an effective insight into the general nature of the picture to be completed, and has subsumed working hypotheses for ordering the remaining loose pieces such that solving the puzzle can now proceed in a step-by-step ordered way. This image corresponds to a metaphor.

Once such an abstraction has been advanced from mere hypothesis to a proven, practicable theory, the process of making such a theory, such a metaphor a governing principle for corresponding practice is properly termed reification—a confusion of phenomenal detail has now been solved by reduction to a theoretically-sound metaphor, so that the collection of pieces is now conceptualized in a unified way, a single image, which image has been objectified by virtue of association of the image with a corresponding effective practice.

However, reification of metaphor is not therefore always a good thing in itself. There are three general grades of reification to be considered.

In the case in which a reified conception is premised on a coherent body of practice, in the sense that we seek coherence for a universal body of scientific knowledge, we are encountering human creative activities in their more advanced and most necessary form.

In a second class of reification, we have blundering of the sort we associate, in economists' usage, with "fallacy of composition." This usually signifies that some essential features of the "ground," some essential classes of phenomena, etc., have been viciously ignored in attempting to develop a conceptual insight into a problem.

In the third class of cases, we encounter what we properly define as paranoid reification, as in the case of the homicidal who kills his wife because he "knows" that his wife is really his mother in disguise. Or, more generally, in which a childhood family prejudice, a local superstition, and so forth are slyly accepted as the "real truth" to be imposed upon the "outside world."

It is the latter degree of paranoia which we meet in the slovenly journalists and editors' usages of the "far right" to "far left" linearity of political metaphors.

“Pornographic” Journalism

The paranoid disorder of the cited editors and journalists is coherent with a wretched journalist's practice popularized by the “human interest” approach to contemporary U.S. TV journalism. “Mrs. Jones, how do the people on this block *feel* about ..?” “What do you *feel* that black people ..?” or “Who do you *feel* would be the best candidate?” In short, the inherent presumption of such sodomic or “touchy-feely” journalism is that human beings have no minds, that people are merely like cattle, who “feel” but are not capable of rigorous reasoning.

Strictly speaking, such so-called journalism is close to outright brainwashing. The journalist is not only asking the individual interviewed to suppress his reason in favor of a cathexized emotional response to phenomena, but is using the implied authority of the public news media to cumulatively render the opinion that individuals' neurotically cathexized responses, and not their minds, are what society considers of social importance concerning each individual. Precisely the same method is used in explicit brainwashing techniques, as in the Tavistock-Lewinite mode of “small group” “sensitivity training” methods of induced programmed “attitudinal change” through induced paranoia and ego-stripping methods.

In a rational society, the reasoning adult is distinguished from the paranoid infantile individual most notably by the fact that he suppresses prejudices in favor of the dictates of reason. The adult becomes an adult by repudiating those cathexized responses which he or she discovers to be irrational. The grievously-afflicted neurotic progresses toward improved powers of functioning by discovering why he is afflicted with irrational compulsions of feeling, and by strengthening rational cathexes at the expense of his irrational, neurotic's “my psychological needs.” A society in which politics is regulated by cathexized feeling-responses to phenomena is a society of cattle, not human beings, a farm on the way to becoming a jungle.

This common problem of both wittingly and only credulously vicious journalists is interlinked with the vicious decay of U.S. culture during the post-war period. The idiocy of popularized child-rearing innovations typified by suburbia, combined with the lack of national goals to provide the young new citizen with a sense of purpose for life, have discredited the rule of reason, of science, in favor of petty sensuous gratification. The petit-bourgeois youth have no morality, and our increasingly lumpenized strata have been shut out from hope of a meaningful role in the advancement of the society in which they live. This pervasive moral decay of our culture, the bestialist's emphasis upon so-called “value-free” education, and so forth, has impelled our nation's suburbanite and ex-suburbanite youth away from thinking, and are transforming them from rational human beings into jungle beasts ruled by their irrational, incoherent, neurotic impulses. Journalists, members of a so-

called profession which itself has been largely degraded into a mere instrument of psychological warfare against the population, have been among the leading forces in the advocacy of this general moral decay.

What does the typical journalist and editor—on performance—include among the far left?

Among the so-called “far left” he ranks the Weatherman cult, a formation organized with the aid of Ford Foundation funding, by an agency which is directly linked to the Central Intelligence Agency and National Security Council! He includes, naturally, the Maoist groups which were created, according to a formula, by the same political intelligence agencies which created the Weatherman bombers and the Lebanese Falange, under the leadership of protégés of the same CIA-associated political intelligence conduits. Not only are the facts of the CIA and related lineage in the accessible public domain—from published, official sources from which we assembled and gridded them—but the ideology of the Weatherman bombers and the principal Maoist organizations is identical with that of the European fascist movements of the 1920s. This is the typical journalists included illustration of his so-called “far left”!

The “far right” is somewhat more credible. The Ku Klux Klan was taken over by the FBI and other agencies of the same parentage during the 1960s, and FBI “stringers” have been directly involved in bombings attributed to the Ku Klux Klan. (FBI “stringers,” sometimes under the thin cover of “leftism,” have also attempted assassinations, and so forth.)

However, when the appellation “far right” is more broadly applied, as to the base of the 1968 Wallace movement, the idiocy of the designation becomes obvious to any competent historian or journalist. The Wallace movement of 1968 was a populist movement, embracing both pro-socialist and pro-fascist currents in a sociologically lawful way.

The categorization of the “left” generally is sheer nonsense. First, the leading Maoist organizations of North America and Western Europe were created by Atlanticist political intelligence agencies—a documented fact of official records in the public domain—and are deployed by those political intelligence agencies. The bulk of the so-called “Trotskyist” movement was taken over, from the top down, since the end of the Second World War. Most of the official Communist parties, the CPUSA included, of the advanced-capitalist sector are also under direct control of Atlanticist or other security agencies of their respective nations. Furthermore, as the CIA’s Lieutenant-General Yarborough stated publicly at a conference in Glassboro, New Jersey, 95 per cent of all terrorism afoot in the world today is run by the CIA, both purportedly “left” and purportedly “right” blind-terrorists alike.

Although some even significant portions of mass-based Communist, social-democratic and smaller “left” organizations are actually socialist in conviction or tendency, the overwhelming

bulk of what the popular press terms the “left” is not only under top-down control of Atlanticist political intelligence agencies, but the political and social policies of these organizations and groups are either simply expressions of CIA-linked “politics of tension” destabilization scenario capabilities, or, as in the general case of U.S. Maoists or the Angela Davis wing of the U.S. Communist Party, *are outrightly fascist policies in terms of the criteria used to define fascist movements during the 1920s and 1930s.*

It is necessary to emphasize one point. The problem of classification of these left so-called groups is not that they are under administrative control through planted police-spies, provocateurs and so forth; the problem is that the characteristic political policies of these groups are either CIA-type “politics of tension” blind-terroristic or are otherwise explicitly fascist policies. The editor or journalist who classes the U.S. Maoists, the Communist Party or the Socialist Workers’ Party as variously “left” or “far left” is obviously either an idiot, a liar or simply an ignorant and incompetent fool.

This is not a formal question, but an eminently practical question. There is a profound difference in the way one ought to react to any political tendency, according to whether it expresses an independent political tendency or is merely a countergang deployed by secret police and allied agencies. Police gangs, like other “plumbers” outfits, ought to be dissolved in the urgent interests of democracy; honest independent political tendencies must have their political rights protected, also in the interests of democracy.

Nothing but confusion—even potentially dangerous confusion—can emerge from continued efforts to superimpose the paranoid’s linear categories of “right” and “left” upon the principal and auxiliary political movements and issues of the current crisis period. The only admissible broad categorizations are those which assort groups and tendencies according to their definitions of the central policy issues and their relative policies toward much defined policy issues.

Anything else is gibberish, probably dangerous gibberish.