

Responding to Terrorism in the 21st Century

Robert Harman, M.D.

Annual Conference, October 21, 2001

The American College of Orgonomy

In 1998 Charles Konia, M.D., writing in the Journal of Orgonomy, discussed the widespread contactlessness in modern society and pointed out:

One of the most dangerous social consequences of the state of contactlessness is that people are often not aware of being in jeopardy...[in] the 1930s during Hitler's ascent to power...millions of European Jews did not recognize that their very lives were in danger until it was too late. Today, the same state of mass contactlessness in the face of a serious threat to world peace explains the lack of effective response to radical Islamic "fundamentalists." While they openly announce their intention of committing genocide and while they carry out acts of carnage globally the helpless world does little to address and eliminate the danger.[Footnote 1, 210]

Three years later, on September 11, 2001, the reality of that statement was brought painfully home to Americans by the murder of over 5,000 human beings. Especially horrific is the fact that, at the very moment when death struck, the victims were peacefully engaged in constructive work to make life better, safer and more satisfying for everyone.

Every animal, including the human, must be able to sense danger; that is part of what we mean by "contact," and why contactlessness is a dangerous state, for a society as much as for an individual. It was the social state of mass contactlessness that led to a general lack of awareness of a clear and present danger and kept us from preventing those acts of widespread destruction. If not successfully addressed, social contactlessness will make it impossible for us, as a nation, to discharge our vital responsibility to safeguard life by destroying global terrorism. Thus, in response to terrorism a central role of the science of orgonomy is to offer knowledge that can help those individuals who are working to bring themselves into better contact with what is going on in the world around us.

Who Are We?

An essential part of contact is to know ourselves, both as individuals and as members of our social unit, which is our nation, the United States of America.

Our country is unique in what it offers those who come here. Foreigners are often impressed by the fact that everything here is "big" and "open." This is not merely a matter of wealth or geographical size, but of a way of life that values room to

grow for each individual. Practically, this means the ability to live one's life in accord with one's individual nature.

The open quality of American life is the product not only of geographic advantages and historical background, but also of functional thinking. The original creation of our system of government and finance, primarily by Alexander Hamilton, was based on an understanding that the strength and wealth of a nation depend on the freedom to live one's own destiny to the fullest. In his efforts to establish an economy in which manufacturing and commerce would balance agriculture, Hamilton's thinking was as follows:

...minds of the strongest and most active powers for their proper objects fall below mediocrity and labor without effect, if confined to uncongenial pursuits. ...the results of human exertion may be immensely increased by diversifying its objects. When all the different kinds of industry [exist] in a community, each individual can find his proper element, and can call into activity the whole vigor of his nature...To cherish and stimulate the activity of the human mind, by multiplying the objects of enterprise, is [an important] expedient, by which the wealth of a nation may be promoted. ...Every new scene, which is opened to the busy nature of man to rouse and exert itself, is the addition of a new energy to the general stock of effort. The spirit of enterprise, useful and prolific as it is, must necessarily be contracted or expanded in proportion to the simplicity or variety of the occupations which are to be found in a Society. [Reference 2]

It was Hamilton's vision that America's "spirit of enterprise" be "expanded", and bioenergetic expansion is a hallmark of American life.

One present day example of the openness of American life is shown by a chart in the Oxford Atlas of the World [Reference 3] in which we see the percentage of young adults who are able to attend college in various countries. Note that in the U.S. it is 58% and in Great Britain it is 17%. This shows how much one's horizons are limited in the rest of the world compared to here. Even for the "elite" who do make it to college in Europe, the future is limited. Some years ago, I spoke with a group of freshmen at a French university. Each had chosen their major and their career. I asked them what they would do if they found out that their chosen field of study was unsuited to their talents. They were astonished at the question. It was, they said, of course impossible for anyone to change their college major, let alone their career choice. For them, life was already mapped out by the rigidity of the social system, so that choice or change were no longer a possibility. I have always had the feeling that, even in the most "enlightened" and "liberal" of European nations, people are far more constrained by the opinions of their families, their neighbors, their religion, and their political party, than they are in the United States.

The free development of the individual in America has enabled a new form of social cooperation to develop, one in which individuals function together as a group with each person able to feel passionately about his own part in the work that everyone is doing. A good example of this is shown in the movie Apollo 13 where, when the lives of three astronauts are threatened by an accident in space, the technicians, astronauts and engineers involved are all free to find innovative solutions to unexpected problems. The movie was very popular with American audiences, many of whom left the theatre with tears in their eyes, which shows how deeply rooted is the principle of cooperating in vital social tasks by putting heart and soul into getting the job done by following one's own inspiration. This type of cooperation is widespread throughout America, and usually arises regardless of the ethnic origin, religion or political beliefs, of the individuals involved.

To give another example, I once had the opportunity to spend a day as an observer in an operating room at a prominent hospital in Japan. My host was a Japanese surgeon who had developed a number of life saving procedures. I was eagerly expecting a demonstration of the well-known Japanese efficiency, but was disappointed. Although everyone worked hard and was highly disciplined, the overall atmosphere was dull and mechanical. It seemed to me that the operating room crew got things done more slowly than their American counterparts. I asked the surgeon about this and he said that surgery at the Japanese hospital took twice as long as in America. He became sad when he recalled the months he had spent working in the United States, and said that if he had an American operating room crew he could save twice as many lives. He wished he could move to America, but his parents would never allow it. I think the difference lies in the fact that in an American operating room, there is a tremendous excitement and enthusiasm, one can literally feel Hamilton's "spirit of enterprise" come to life in the activity of the doctors, nurses and assistants. Everyone feels that he or she "owns" their part of the work and is free to innovate to make their work faster and easier and more effective. This includes a personal feeling of initiative that makes people want to "hustle" and get the job done quickly and well. This comes close to what Reich called "work democracy."

I should make it clear that what I am presenting here is not a put-down of anyone else's nation. I am aware, for example, that Beethoven was not an American. Citizens of other nations have every right to feel proud of and loyal to their own countries, and are free to use America's example to their own benefit, in whatever constructive way best fits their own situation. What I am attempting is to objectively define America's place in the world, based on well established historical facts.

In addition to the opportunities it offers individuals, the American nation is functionally unique in that it occupies a crucial and irreplaceable position in the

history of civilization and in the destiny of mankind on this planet. I believe it was Lincoln who said that America was the "last, best hope of mankind." The functional history of the relationship between our nation and the rest of the world is something that is often lost sight of.

Briefly, after the War for American Independence, America was one of only a few democratic confederations in the world. Then, in 1787, with the framing of the United States Constitution we became the first democratic nation in the history of the world. When full formal democracy was instituted by the 1820s much of the world assumed that America was not stable enough to endure. By 1860 the Civil War was about to begin and it appeared to everyone, except Lincoln and a few others, that America could not endure. Lincoln's awareness of America's destiny helped sustain him during that critical time.

On February 21st, 1861 at the New Jersey State capitol in Trenton, on the way to his inauguration as President, he spoke of his anxiety for the Union and recalled the battles of Trenton and Princeton in 1776, saying:

there must have been something more than common that those men struggled for...something that held out a great promise to all the people of the world for all time to come. [Reference 4]

The next day, at Independence Hall in Philadelphia, he pondered what it was that the American colonists fought for, and what had held the United States together:

It was not the mere matter of separation of the colonies from the mother land; but something...giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights should be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance. [Reference 5]

The Civil War tested to the utmost the American vision that a simultaneously free, prosperous and stable nation could exist. America proved its ability to survive as the world's "last best hope," but only after 600,000 American soldiers gave their lives in the struggle.

The very fact that this country had done the impossible by establishing both freedom and stability, for the first time in history, became an inspiration to humankind everywhere on the globe. The dream of masses of people the world over was to come to America and become Americans. Millions underwent great hardships to immigrate here, literally kissed the ground when they arrived, and set aside their old languages, customs and ways of life, to be reborn as Americans.

Eventually, America became what is called a "superpower" despite being, of all the major industrial powers, the least interested in building an empire. By "superpower" is meant that our economic and military capacity is such as to overwhelm any potential opponent. To a large extent this is due to our tremendous ability to create wealth and our flexibility in adjusting to progress and change. Hamilton said that both independence and "opulence" [Reference 6] were America's natural destiny.

If the term "superpower" has any real meaning, the following story best defines it: It is said that when Admiral Yamamoto was instructed to prepare the sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, he begged his superiors to reconsider. [Reference 7] Yamamoto had been a foreign exchange student in the Midwest and he tried to describe to his colleagues on the Japanese Imperial High Command the energy of the Americans working in the prosperous fields and factories stretching over the vastness of the Mississippi Valley, which was just one part of America. If they could visualize this, as he had seen it with his own eyes, then they would never even consider an attack, because, even if the United States fleet were utterly destroyed at the beginning, the war would nonetheless inevitably end in a crushing defeat for Japan.

Most of us have seen an old movie called *It's a Wonderful Life* in which a man contemplating suicide is shown what would have become of his hometown if he had never been born. It well befits us to ponder the question: What if America had never been born? It is impossible to calculate our contribution to the human spirit worldwide over the last two hundred years and to imagine how the absence of that contribution would have affected the world. However, a little speculation tempered with common sense enables us to imagine what would have become of the world after 1940, if America had not been there. By 1945 the swastika, the hammer and sickle, or the banner of the rising sun would have flown over every nation in Europe and Asia. Sooner or later, the entire planet would have been under the domination of some variation of either communism or nazism, and George Orwell's vision of a world divided into a few massive totalitarian states at perpetual war with each other, would have become a reality decades before "1984." In the absence of any decent countervailing force, the demons unleashed by mechanistic science would have raged unopposed. By the end of the 20th century the corners of the earth would already have been devastated more than once by large scale nuclear war. Without America, the future of the world will be that of totalitarian empires destroying vast sections of the planet, or, even worse, the end of civilization itself followed by various groups of nuclear-equipped barbarians obliterating life everywhere.

It should be added that America, despite its strength has an important weakness, namely a tendency towards emotional overexpansion, which in general includes excessive optimism about the future, chasing after pleasure, and strong

disappointment reactions. Americans prefer to be unaware of threats from the external world. One manifestation of this is our lack of any civil defense preparations against nuclear attack, in contrast to Switzerland or Communist China. Another manifestation is a lack of interest in the languages and ways of living of foreigners. Citizens who perceive a threat from abroad would naturally have a shrewd interest in learning about other nations. American conservatives tend to lack interest in understanding other nations, and American liberals have only a naive interest in the superficialities (such as the formal political structure) of life in other countries. The overexpansive pursuit of pleasure is also one reason why many of our brightest minds, both liberal and conservative, who choose to work in business, computers, etc., would never consider a career in the military, FBI, CIA, or other fields whose function is to protect the country from external threats. This is a real loss to the nation.

Who Are They?

What I most want to emphasize is that the murderers who are attacking the United States and its people destroy life by creating

Confusion and Immobilization

All Americans need to be aware of this because we most likely will feel confused and immobilized at different times, and in various ways, in the coming months. It is important, both for our individual functioning and for our social environment, that confusion and immobilization be kept to a minimum.

Global mass murder as perpetrated on September 11, 2001 is a form of infectious social pathology. Pathology means disease or sickness. Just as medical disease requires a response based on medical science, social pathology also requires a response based on social science. We must first have an accurate diagnosis.

Terrorism is a form of what Wilhelm Reich called "the emotional plague of mankind." The emotional plague is a twisted form of human functioning that is associated with certain highly energetic individuals, whom we call emotional plague characters, are so incapable of tolerating the feeling of energy within their own bodies that they must destroy life itself. The emotional plague is a form of social, not just individual, pathology because of the following mechanism: When the emotional plague character comes into contact with the natural life functions of living human beings, he experiences an intolerable stirring up of the energy in his own organism and feels that he must destroy the functioning of others, whose very existence torments him by exciting his own trapped life energy.

By natural life functions we mean such things as natural sexuality, love, kindness, generosity, productive work, hard earned success, peaceful cooperation, and all the other manifestations of human health and decency.

An essential characteristic of the emotional plague is that its stated reason for an act of destruction is never the true reason. The reason given often involves religion or politics, but the emotional plague must be viewed as a biophysical rather than a religious or a political phenomenon. By contrast, a legitimate political leader seeks power so that he may govern and is motivated by love of his country, which he believes will be served by his goals. Similarly, the legitimate religious leader seeks to bring human beings into better contact with their own emotions, in a deep way, as a part of the universe. Although it is usually true that the efforts of both politician and religious leader are distorted by armoring and limited by lack of knowledge of energetic functions, they are nonetheless motivated by a desire to serve life and the result of their work is sometimes a temporary improvement in the lot of humankind.

For example, Mohammed, the founder of the Moslem religion, may be considered a legitimate political and religious leader. He is known for instituting three political reforms:

- He prohibited the murderous blood feuds between Arab tribes.
- He put an end to the practice of infanticide.
- He granted women the right to inherit property. [Reference 8]

The purpose and effect of these reforms was to soften the harsh patriarchal social structures that had taken over much of the world, including the Arabian desert, after the nearly simultaneous decline of the Roman, Persian and Chinese Empires. From a religious standpoint, Mohammed replaced pagan superstitions with the more accurate and life-positive belief in a single, lawful creator of the universe. This creator was perceived as a life-affirmative force. For example, all but one of the 114 books of the Koran begins with the words, "In the name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate." Here also the effect was to mitigate a harsh and degenerate social structure. The Moslem civilization spread from Spain to India and marked the end of the Dark Ages. It was noted for encouraging great progress in science. It is notable that Islamic civilization treated the Jews with far more tolerance and decency than the Christian civilization of Europe.

The Al Qaeda terrorists, the late Ayatollah Khomeini of Iran, and the Taliban act to increase the harsh, anti-life, patriarchal functions, and oppose every reasonable form of progress. To describe them as "Islamic Fundamentalists" is to turn the meaning of language upside down, since their goals are diametrically

opposed to the fundamentals of Islam. By fundamentals, I mean those principles that are at the vital core of the religion, as opposed to mystical and sex-negative elements.

Thus the terrorists cannot be understood in terms of politics and religion. Nor can they be understood in terms of moralism. The liberal tends to perceive the terrorist from a superficial moralistic perspective, for example, attributing their actions to superficial factors such as "social injustice," "oppression," or "imperialism," which are viewed as moral failings on our part. On the other hand, the conservative tends to perceive the terrorist from a deep moralistic perspective, i.e., as simply "evil." It is true that the individual terrorists are, in fact, evil, and must be dealt with as such. We cannot understand the emotional plague scientifically unless we are able to accept that the existence of evil is a reality. However, the moralistic concept of "evil" as elaborated by the conservatives, overlooks the vicious repression in matters of sexuality and child-raising which murders life in the infant and child, and thus creates the emotional plague character in the first place. The concept of "evil" also cannot explain how the emotional plague can temporarily infect otherwise decent individuals, for example, great masses of Germans during the Nazi era. The emotional plague is best viewed as an infectious process which is chronic in a small number of very sick, high energy individuals who can spread an acute form of the infection to the average person. Today, masses of conservative Moslems in the Middle East and masses of liberals in the United States are at high risk of infection from the emotional plague, and many, though not yet the majority, are already infected. By the way, the use of the term "infection" does not refer to a bacteria or virus, and infection by the emotional plague cannot be cured with antibiotics. The infection is an emotional infection ¹, which is why it is called the emotional plague, as distinguished from a bacterial or viral plague.

As far as the masses in the Moslem countries who look up to the terrorists, this is a result of human biological helplessness and craving for a "great leader" who can "do it all." It is important to the terrorists that they create the illusion that they can seriously damage "the great superpower" and it crucial for America's survival, and for peaceful and constructive life in the Moslem countries, that this illusion not be allowed to persist.

The Unholy Alliance of Red and Black

The mass sociological forms of the emotional plague comes in two varieties, the emotional plague on the right, such as the Nazis, which we call "black fascism" and the emotional plague on the left, such as the communists, which we call "red fascism." The colors red and black which are used in this terminology are those which have traditionally been used as symbols by left-wing and right-wing

revolutionaries, respectively. More recently we have used the term "pseudo-liberal" to refer to the emotional plague character on the left, such as the communist and others on the left who function virulently by posing as liberals. As Konia points out [Reference 9], the Islamic fanatic murderers and Islamic extremist religious leaders are typically black fascists. However, there is often a synergistic relationship between black and red fascism. Failure to recognize this synergy can lead to disastrous miscalculations. It is often said that Britain and France underestimated the threat posed by Hitler, which is true, but Britain and France's most disastrous miscalculation was in assuming that the Soviet Union would fight with them against the Nazis. In August 1939, the world had finally decided to confront Hitler over his desire to invade Poland. This was the last chance to stop Hitler and to avoid world war. At that crucial moment in history, Stalin treacherously allied himself with Hitler and Europe's hopes of successfully stopping Hitler at an early stage came tumbling down like a house of cards.

For two years, from August, 1939 until July, 1941, the communists of the world did everything they could to stop the democratic nations from fighting the Nazis, just as the extreme political left, the pseudo-liberals, today are vocal in attempting to stop us from fighting the terrorists. The Communist Party of the U.S.A. claimed that fighting Hitler was merely defending capitalism and actively campaigned against the U.S. giving any aid to Britain, although this cost the Communist Party much of their American membership. Communist activities in the U.S. included strikes at American weapons factories. In France, the Communist Party worked to persuade French soldiers, on their own soil, not to fight against the Nazi invaders. At the time, the British ambassador to Berlin noted that Stalin personally admired Hitler. [Reference 10] The red fascist is incapable of expressing his aggression in a gut level way and of communicating a high, sustained emotional charge, thus he admires the black fascist's ability to do these things.

Conversely, the black fascist expresses himself emotionally, sometimes in a nearly incoherent way. This can be seen in some of Osama Bin Ladin's speeches and in Hitler's diplomatic communiqués, which are emotionally charged, but don't hold together logically. Thus the black fascist benefits from the red fascist's ability to use logical arguments to persuade liberals into immobilizing any nation's effort to forcefully oppose the black fascist's aggression. Eventually the red fascist and the black fascist will turn on each other and one or the other will prevail, but they are temporarily united as one in their hatred of life. This is seen today in the synergistic action of the covert hatred of America on the part of the pseudo-liberal and the overt hatred of America on the part of the Islamic fanatic.

A similar combination of left-wing and right-wing emotional plague is very common in the Islamic world. Many years ago, the Shah of Iran referred to this phenomenon as "the unholy alliance of red and black." [Reference 11] Atheistic

leftists and right wing Islamic fanatics worked together in Iran to overthrow the government starting in the late 1940s. After thirty years they finally succeeded. The Shah had modernized Iran, given women full rights, and led the successful efforts of the Moslem nations to obtain full market price for their oil. Nonetheless, Iranian and American leftists successfully manipulated Islamic and Western public opinion by portraying the Shah as a dictator and a puppet of the United States who was holding back democracy in Iran, thus preventing the West from doing anything to stop the Ayatollah Khomeini's takeover and subsequent fascist regime. Similar efforts are underway in Saudi Arabia today.

I would like to emphasize again that the emotional plague succeeds only to the extent that it induces confusion and immobilization in its victims. This occurs as a matter of course in every emotional plague attack and takes many different forms, but there is one form that was particularly relevant on a mass scale in the 20th century and which will be even more important in the 21st.

Fatal Attraction: The Sadomasochistic Relationship Between Fanatics and American Liberals

It is important that the comments I am about to make not be misunderstood as a personal or moralistic attack on liberals. A large proportion, perhaps half, of the general population has a biophysically liberal character structure, and the great majority of these individuals are decent people. By liberal character structure, we mean one who primarily uses the intellect to defend himself against disturbing feelings. The liberal makes his own contribution to society, and was a prime force behind such positive events as the Enlightenment, the separation of church and state, and the eradication of slavery. I believe that when confronted in a respectful and objective way, most liberals are capable of being concerned about the fact that their liberal structure makes them susceptible to certain forms of infection by the emotional plague. Because this process is contagious (and dangerous), it is important to deal with it frankly. The type of emotional infection that will be described is not perpetrated by the true liberal but by the pseudo-liberal. However, the true liberal is vulnerable to temporary bouts of the infection.

If the reader regards himself as a liberal but finds that the following comments do not apply, then he probably is not as liberal as he thinks. If these comments do apply, then I hope the reader will find them useful. It should also be said that biophysical conservatives, particularly those with a degree of masochism and those who work in strongly liberal environments such as academia and the mental health professions, can also be susceptible to the types of reactions and thinking that will be described.

Konia describes a functional attraction between the masochism of the liberal and the sadism of the Islamic fanatic. It is worthwhile to describe in more detail what

is meant by masochism. Contrary to popular belief, masochism does not mean the enjoyment of pain, but rather a specific way of functioning that generally results in a person becoming stuck in a state of chronic suffering. This can be illustrated with a clinical example of masochism in the realm of individual emotional functioning.

Imagine a woman married to an abusive, sadistic man. If she stays with him and cannot defend herself it is often because of a masochistic attitude on her part. This attitude arises either because of previously existing masochism in her character structure which perhaps put her in the marriage in the first place, or because she has lapsed into a masochistic pattern as a result of the relationship. What we mean by masochism can be illustrated by the following scenario: Suppose her husband hates it when his beer is not cold. He comes home, asks for a beer; she serves it to him and he explodes when it is not cold enough. He beats her severely and storms out of the house. Rather than pack her bags and leave, she resolves that from now on she will be very careful and make sure his beer is always cold. She remembers that she bought the beer that morning, but didn't put it in the refrigerator until 20 minutes before he came home and berates herself because, "He's made it clear how important it is to him that his beer be cold. I knew that, but I screwed-up anyway." This type of self criticism is masochistic. It involves a misperception of the world based on the inability to muster the aggression necessary to defend herself, to live alone, or to find a decent, non-sadistic husband. One could not change her opinion of the situation by pointing out the fact that many non-sadistic husbands in her community also like their beer cold, but in the same situation half of them would do no more than complain a little and then forget about it, and the other half would back down when their wives informed them that from now on they "can put their own damn beer in the refrigerator." Anyone attempting to help the abused wife to leave the situation would first have to deal with her helplessness, which would cause her to initially reject any solution as impossible. "I can't call the police, that would only embarrass me and inflame him." Then move out and get your own apartment. "I can't earn enough money for an apartment and he might stalk me." Then go to a women's shelter. "It would be too upsetting for the kids to change schools in the middle of the year," etc. etc. Even a well documented example of a previous wife who left the same man, stood up to his threats and made him leave her alone may not change the masochistic attitude. Finally, even if all considerations could be dealt with there would still be a belief that any expression of aggressive self-defense will be clumsy, stupid, awkward, and doomed to failure.

In summary, prominent features of masochism include

- blaming oneself for a sadistic attack,
- attempting to appease the attacker, i.e., believing that if one is nice enough, the attacker will stop attacking

- coming up with reasons why any proposed solution will lead to an unmanageable consequence, and
- a belief that any attempt to aggressively defend oneself will be clumsy, stupid, awkward and doomed to failure.
-

All of these features result from an incapacity to express aggression. In the masochistic character this incapacity comes from an inability to expand and blocks all aggressive expression except complaining and spite. The liberal does not suffer from a general state of masochism, but is prone to react masochistically in certain situations, particularly one where authority must be exerted. The liberal tendency to retreat from the body into the head makes the masochistic reaction especially strong when the situation requires the exertion of physical force, because the impulse to use physical force comes from deep within the body.

Thus, when his nation is attacked, the normally decent, true liberal is at risk for having the following masochistic reaction, particularly under the influence of vocal pseudo-liberals who occupy opinion-making positions (academia, the clergy, the media, etc.):

- He will criticize and may even blame his own nation.
- He will develop a guilt-ridden or anxious desire to "solve" the problem by being nicer to those who might hate or dislike his country.
- He will elaborate various disaster scenarios which he fears will occur if force is used aggressively. Usually the imagined disaster is a variation of "it will only make them hate us even more" or a feared dramatic escalation of violence which we will not have the will or the strength (so the liberal believes) to handle.
- He fears that his nation and its leaders (especially if they are not liberals) are stupid and clumsy, and he may insist on replacing a directly aggressive defense with half-hearted responses which actually would be clumsy and ineffective.

This type of masochistic reaction only increases the sadism of the terrorist, leading to new attacks which further increase the masochistic response, and so on in a vicious cycle. The September 11th attacks were the culmination of a decade of such a cycle of sadomasochistic interaction.

Our previous failure to fight back has also antagonized many Moslems who are not terrorists themselves. Our lack of a response was incomprehensible and inappropriate, therefore it aroused suspicion in the Islamic world, creating more

antagonism than if we had responded forcefully. The failure to fight back is also a failure to engage with those who threaten or hate us and, as such, it is much like turning one's back on one's opponent during a heated argument, which is the surest way to inflame hatred to a fever pitch. Note that the reality is exactly the opposite of the masochistic belief that it is dangerous to fight back. The reality is that it is dangerous, indeed fatal, not to fight back. Nor is there any reason to assume that fighting back will make the world hate us. In its history, America has had only two foreign opponents with whom it warred with absolute fury and to the bitter end, finally occupying their countries with millions of our armed troops, and even inflicting the death penalty on some of their leaders. Those two countries are Germany and Japan, and their citizens and governments show no evidence of hating us for what we did.

Faith for the Future

There are a million considerations, doubts and fears that can immobilize, confuse, and kill us, but there is not a single good reason why we cannot destroy global terrorism, eliminate the states that sponsor it, and help the Moslem world markedly increase its stability. In the 19th century, piracy, sponsored by several North African states, terrorized the Mediterranean, but within a few years, aggressive action, led partly by the United States, eliminated it.[Footnote 12] In the 20th century, the Nazi terror was similarly destroyed. In the 21st century, global terrorism, and the accompanying threat of nuclear proliferation can be eliminated as well. We must be confident of this. We do not know what it will take to accomplish this goal which is so necessary to our very survival, but experience shows we can feel confident that: Whatever happens, new functions and capacities will be created inside ourselves that will enable us to do what needs to be done.

What does the future hold? We cannot know because what we call "the future" is simply the infinitely variable and unpredictable transformations that result from the processes of creation and development. This must be kept in mind because we will be confronted, at every turn, with unexpected successes and failures.

The American Civil War provides an excellent example. The social problem of two antithetical ways of life in North and South were insoluble by peaceful means, but war seemed unthinkable. The Union military was small, weak and poorly led against a Confederate adversary that was fierce, determined, and under the command of the best military minds. There was no general willingness in the North for a prolonged war, only a brief, temporary, unrealistic enthusiasm for a short campaign. Defeat followed defeat for the Union on the battlefield, each incompetent general was replaced by another incompetent general, while on the political and diplomatic front each problem was bigger than the last. Many times

Lincoln had no plan to address a crisis, because there simply was no realistic way to solve it, all he could do was to persist with the war effort and wait for something to open up, and it always did: The most unexpected men emerged as brilliant generals. New ways of living developed, new ways of financing and fighting the war, a new perception of the nature of our country on the part of the average citizen. Even the tremendous human cost of the war brought about a new willingness to deal with the problem of slavery. Each of these positive developments was just as unexpected and as unpredictable as the setbacks. At the time the many unexpected circumstances that led to the Union victory were regarded as acts of God in support of a righteous cause. But we can also understand it scientifically, as part of the nature of the unpredictable processes of development and creation.

In nature, every living organism faces unforeseen threats to its life on an ongoing basis: predators, cold, hunger, etc. Yet most animal species survive for millions of years. They don't stop to question and worry if they will be able to find a way to survive. Rather, their energies go into finding and evolving ways to overcome the obstacles and threats they encounter. They have not yet learned to lose contact with the awareness, or at least the sense, that they can be confident that nature has provided them with the means of survival. We, too, must not lose contact with this faith in nature and in ourselves as a part of nature. To express this as an article of faith:

Nature provides every viable, bioenergetic system, be it an individual organism or a nation, with the means to survive and to develop to its fullest capacity.

We do not and cannot know what will happen. If we did know in advance, we would certainly feel inadequate to the task. But, to repeat, we have every reason to feel absolutely confident that whatever happens, new functions and capacities will be created inside ourselves that will enable us to do what needs to be done. This is true for each of us as human beings, for America, for the science of orgonomy, and for life itself on this beautiful planet of ours.

Footnotes

1. To understand what is meant by an "emotional infection," consider the well-known phenomenon of "mass hysteria."

References

1. Konia, C. Neither Left nor Right, Part II, Section 3, Journal of Orgonomy 32(2): 192-229, 1998

2. Hamilton, A. Report on Manufactures, The Papers of Alexander Hamilton, Volume 10, New York: Columbia University Press. pp. 255-6
3. Oxford Atlas of the World, London: Oxford University Press, 2000, p.46.
4. Lincoln, A. "Speech to the New Jersey State Senate at Trenton, New Jersey" in Collected Writings, Volume 3, pp. 235-236
5. Lincoln, A. "Speech in Independence Hall, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania" in The Collected Works of Abraham Lincoln, Volume 3, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1953, pp. 240-241
6. Hamilton, A., A Report on Manufactures, The Papers of Alexander Hamilton, Volume 10, New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
7. Keegan, J. A History of Warfare, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1993.
8. "Mohammed," Encyclopedia Britannica, Volume 15, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946, p. 648
9. Konia, C. "The Breakthrough of the Emotional Plague in the Form of Black Fascism" presented at the Annual Conference, American College of Orgonomy, October 21, 2001.
10. Henderson, N. Failure of a Mission: Berlin 1935-1939, New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1940, p.251.
11. Pahlavi, M. "The Unholy Alliance of Red and Black," Answer to History, New York: Stein and Day, 1980, pp. 145-174
12. Adams, H. History of the United States during the Administrations of Thomas Jefferson, New York: The Library of America (Penguin Books), 1986, pp. 165 et seq. and 591 et seq. (Originally published as four volumes, in 1889 and 1890, by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York)