

Student Revolt with Special Reference to the New Left: Further Thoughts (Introduction)

Franklin Merrell-Wolff
August 23, 1970

I have prepared for this morning a second tape on the student revolt. It has occurred to me that certain additional words should be introduced preliminary to this tape, and I am now so doing.

My study of the student revolt has unearthed two extreme aspects, one of them highly noble and motivated by the highest feeling and general orientation. There is also a dark side just as deep and dark as the noble side is lofty. This is as one would expect, for it is a general principle that where the light is brightest, the shadows are darkest. One thing, however, is evident: that there is a considerable confusing as between these two lines of orientation and motivation, and that the young people are often greatly confused so that even lofty motivation has been captured by the dark side to serve a profoundly evil end. In the tape that I have prepared, I have spoken severely to bring out in as clear terms as possible the distinction between these two sides and to excise as far as possible the dark side, to bring it out into clear perspective, to see it for what it is, and to give it the condemnation that it richly deserves. And, as well, to give the high place and the high regard that properly belongs to the light side. A few words in addition to what I have said in the tape now seem important.

In the quotation made by Gerhart Niemeyer, which was introduced into the tape of last Sunday and which was taken from the writings of Norman Brown, the statement of Brown was explicit that he was oriented to anti-Christ and that the movement was Satanic, in the sense that he approved of such. Now, there are certain implications that follow from this, that which is anti-Christ, is also anti-Buddha, and is anti-Shankara, is anti-Aurobindo, and is anti-the philosophy which I have put forth and the moral code which I would espouse. There is therefore here more than something that merely concerns young people. It concerns our own effort here, and I shall try to make the reasons for this explicit.

For the first point, we may view this as a basic truth, that what *Mara* was to Buddha and Satan was to Christ, Karl Marx was to Hegel. Now, I know that Northrop in his *Meeting of the East and West* seems to think that there's no essential difference between the philosophy of Hegel and that of Karl Marx.¹ He could not be more wrong. When the triadic dialectic of Hegel was inverted into dialectic materialism, it was a case of that inversion which is expressed by the sentence: the *demon deus inversus est*.² In other words, the demon is the inversion of the god. The difference is so vast between Hegel and Karl Marx as to parallel the difference between heaven and hell. I know where

¹ F. S. C. Northrop, *The Meeting of East and West* (New York: Collier Books, 1966), 227.

² H. P. Blavatsky, *The Secret Doctrine* (Adyar: The Theosophy Co., 1888), 443. The text actually reads: "*Demon est deus inversus.*"

the triadic dialectic is to be found. I have seen it in operation. It was not a clever creation of Hegel's intellect. It was rather the result of a deep mystical insight. That logical principle is founded in the metaphysical heights. And lofty as it is on its own level, equally foul is it when inverted into the form of dialectic materialism. Karl Marx is therefore the enemy of that which Hegel stood for, and Hegel stood essentially in alignment with Buddha, Shankara, and Christ. And I also stand in alignment with his orientation, and fundamentally with the orientation of all the post-Kantian idealists. For every light there is a shadow, as great as the light may be. This shadow is now dominant in this world. Where in the light men are persuaded by reason, and example, and insight; in the darkness they are compelled by chicanery, by psychological cleverness, by murder, by torture, and by brainwashing. And these, you will note, are the methods of the dialectic materialist. They brand themselves as a force representing unmitigated evil.

Secondly, as the other great prophet of darkness in our day, I will name Sigmund Freud. The evil of this man is revealed in the chapter on him found in Dr. Carl G. Jung's book *Memories, Dreams, [and] Reflections*. It is there pointed out that Freud had lost his religious orientation, which was an orientation to Yahweh, and had emplaced animal sexuality on the throne that formerly belonged to a mystical entity, and that this was not simply a scientific development on his part, but a religious sort of dogma. And he also there acknowledged that his sexual doctrine would have an annihilating effect upon all culture. In other words, all religion, all of fine art, all of lofty philosophy, particularly of the metaphysical sort, would be but a perversion of sexuality. And also, though this point is neglected, it would mean that all of the developments of pure mathematics were also merely a perversion of sexuality, and at that point all of this point of view becomes manifestly absurd. Immanuel Kant, in his "Introduction" to the *Critique of Pure Reason*, recognizes very clearly that the problem of whether a pure metaphysics is possible is very closely connected to the problem of how can pure mathematics be possible; and he points out how the critique of David Hume would fall destructively upon pure mathematics as much as it did upon pure metaphysics. Now, this becomes ridiculous because the achievements of pure mathematics are so evident to us. Pure mathematics renders applied mathematics possible. Applied mathematics renders modern technology, modern navigation, and almost every part of our present life possible. More than anything else, the landing on the moon was dependent upon applied mathematics. To say that this is, then, just a perversion of sexuality becomes obviously very ridiculous. But the point I'm making here is that there is just as much reason for regarding pure mathematics as a perversion of sexuality as there is for regarding pure metaphysics, all religiosity, all fine culture as merely a perversion of sexuality. Because Sigmund Freud's influence tends to degrade and denigrate these high values, he is to be regarded as primarily a vicious and evil force in this world.

I would say, therefore, that in this world today the two outstanding apostles of evil are Karl Marx and Sigmund Freud. Both of them would strike forcibly at the thing which is represented in *Pathways Through to Space* and in *The Philosophy of Consciousness Without an Object*. I want this point to be understood very clearly, and that there is a big reason why I should take a definite stand against the movements that are influenced by men of this sort. And the New Left is so influenced, as well as the Old Left. My foundation, as is the foundation of the Buddha, of Shankara, and the Christ, is in the sky, is in space, in other words, the *Akasha*. It is not grounded on Earth. It is not grounded on

biology. These only seem to be a foundation because of a fundamental inversion of the truth that takes place in the manifestation of the Unmanifest. They are not the true foundations at all. They are actually epiphenomena. But the Left, in general, founds itself upon these externalities. And there is no hope of redemption for this humanity or any individual in it until this whole orientation is seen for what it is and is thrown overboard as having any value other than that which is heuristic and temporary. The New Left continues this dark and negative orientation. At its strongest manifestation, it is profane, obscene, and oriented to pornography, all of the dark and evil things that are in this human nature of ours, and it should be excised with sharp differentiation. This I have attempted to do in the tape that follows, and I have not scorned to use some of the kind of images or language which the representatives of the New Left would understand, since they are incapable of understanding polite and dignified language.