Psychopathic Groups and Distorted Definitions

By Brent Jessop

Global Research, June 19, 2008

Knowledge Driven Revolution 19 June 2008

Theme: Science and Medicine

Trademark of the Psychopath

The use of an inner, or esoteric, language to intentionally deceive is a trademark characteristic of the psychopathic personality or a psychopathically dominated group. This is nicely summarized in Andrew M. Lobaczewski's *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes* (1998) [1]:

> "An ideology of a secondarily ponerogenic association [secondary stage of infiltration by psychopathic individuals] is formed by gradual adaptation of the primary ideology to functions and goals other than the original formative ones. A certain kind of layering or schizophrenia of ideology takes place during the ponerization process. The outer layer closest to the original content is used for the group's propaganda purposes, especially regarding the outside world, although it can in part also be used inside with regard to disbelieving lower-echelon members. **The second layer presents the elite with no problems of comprehension: it is more hermetic, generally composed by slipping a different meaning into the same names. Since identical names signify different contents depending on the layer in question, understanding this "doubletalk" requires simultaneous fluency in both languages.**

> Average people succumb to the first layer's suggestive insinuations for a long time before they learn to understand the second one as well. Anyone with certain psychological deviations, especially if he is wearing the mask of normality with which we are familiar [a psychopath], immediately perceives the second layer to be attractive and significant; after all, it was built by people like him. **Comprehending this doubletalk is therefore a vexatious task, provoking quite understandable psychological resistance; this very duality of language, however, is a pathognomonic [specific characteristics of a disease] symptom indicating that the human union in question is touched by the ponerogenic process to an advanced degree**." – 116

Let us take a look at a group that continually redefines words in an attempt to deceive, namely The Club of Rome.

The Club of Rome is a premiere think tank composed of approximately 100 members including leading scientists, philosophers, political advisors, former politicians and many other influential bureaucrats and technocrats. The organization and its members have been heavily involved in the environmental movement, including such individuals as Maurice Strong, Aurelio Peccei, Daisaku Ikeda and Mikhail Gorbachev to name but a few.

[From all quotes below, *italicised text* is original emphasis and **bolded text** is added by

myself.]

Self-Reliance versus Collective Self-Reliance

From *RIO: Reshaping the International Order: A Report to The Club of Rome* (1976) [2]:

> "Self-reliant development, with its reliance on local rather than imported institutions and technologies, is a means whereby a nation can reduce its vulnerability to decisions and events which fall outside its control: a self-reliant community will be more resilient in times of crisis. And since it is a style of development predicated upon a recognition of cultural diversity, it is an instrument against the excessive homogenization of cultures." – 66

The above quote may sound like a normal definition of a self-reliant country. But this is an odd statement coming from a group which is constantly pushing the idea of **inter**dependence. We need to look at their inner definition of self-reliance, that is collective self-reliance.

> "Self-reliance cannot mean 'self-seclusion', isolationism or autarky. No nation, given the nature of global interdependence, can exclude itself from the international system. The world has become too complex for that." – 68

> "Self-reliance applies at different levels: local, national and international [...] **[internationally], it becomes collective self-reliance**." – 68

Territorial Sovereignty versus Functional Sovereignty

From *RIO: Reshaping the International Order*:

> "Given the growing list of problems confronting mankind, every effort must be made to stimulate processes which point in directions which can be deemed desirable. This would certainly apply, for example, to the tendency towards the increasing centralization of decision-making involving issues beyond national frontiers should be viewed as a logical continuation of the process of change and a precondition for the effective assertion of national sovereignty." – 103

The "increasing centralization of [international] decision-making" being a "precondition for the effective assertion of national sovereignty" may seem contradictory. To rectify this misconception, we again need to look to the inner meaning of the word sovereignty. The Club of Rome redefines it from the commonly implied "territorial sovereignty" to what they call "functional sovereignty".

> "Acceptance of these elements calls for a reinterpretation of the concept of national sovereignty. Participation and social control suggest a functional rather than a territorial interpretation of sovereignty, or jurisdiction over determined uses rather than geographical space. Conceptually, **this interpretation will make possible the progressive internationalization and socialization of all world resources – material and non-material – based upon the 'common heritage of mankind' principle**. It also permits the secure accommodation of inclusive and exclusive uses of these resources, or, in other words, the interweaving of national and international jurisdiction within the same territorial space [...] Ultimately, we must air for decentralized

sovereignty with the network of strong international institutions which will make it possible." – 82

The Common Heritage of Mankind

It is not always necessary to redefine old words or slogans, sometimes it is more appropriate to create new misleading ones to describe old ideas. The "common heritage of mankind" (or "functional ownership") is a good example of this. If you are "left leaning" this concept will sound like fascism, if you are "right leaning" this concept will sound like communism. Regardless of the label you wish give it, the end result is centralized control over all resources.

From *RIO: Reshaping the International Order*:

> "Effective planning and management calls for the fundamental restructuring of the United Nations so as to give it broad economic powers and a more decisive mandate for international economic decision-making [...] It is also hoped that major changes in the United Nations structure will be made over the next decade so that it is not only able to play a more forceful role in world political affairs but it is also able to become more of a World Development Authority in managing the socio-economic affairs of the international community. [...] The most effective way of articulating the planning and management functions of this organization would be through a functional confederation of international organizations, based upon existing, restructured and, in some instances, new United Nations agencies – to be linked through an integrative machinery. This system and its machinery, if it is really to reflect interdependencies between nations and solidarity between peoples, should ultimately aim at the pooling and sharing of all resources, material and non-material, including means of production, with a view to ensuring effective planning and management of the world economy and of global resource use in a way which would meet the essential objectives of equity and efficiency." – 185

> "In the long term, and assuming progress towards the creation of an equitable international economic and social order leading to a pooling of material and non-material resources, mineral resources will need to be viewed as a common heritage of mankind." – 148

Global Governance not Global Government

From *The First Global Revolution: A Report by the Council of The Club of Rome* (1991) [3]:

> "Not only have we to find better means of governance at national and international levels, but we have also to determine the characteristics of a capacity to govern. Global 'governance,' in our vocabulary, does not imply a global 'government,' but rather the institutions of cooperation, co-ordination and common action between durable sovereign states." – 100

In Club of Rome terminology, don't forget, "durable sovereign states" means "durable functionally sovereign states". From the same book the term governance, as in global governance, is expanded on:

> "**We use the term governance to denote the command-mechanism of a social system** and its actions, which endeavors to provide security,

prosperity, wherence, order and continuity to the system. It necessarily embraces ideology of the system, which may (democratic) or may not (authoritarian) define means for effective consideration of the public will and accountability of those in authority. **It also includes the structure of government of the system, its policies and procedures**." – 160

Unity Through Diversity

The following quote is from a book containing a series of lectures organized at the behest of Maurice Strong (an Executive Member of the Club of Rome) while he was Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (1972). One of the lecturers was Aurelio Peccei, co-founder of The Club of Rome. The book was entitled *Who Speaks for Earth?: Seven Citizens of the World on Major Issues of the Global Environment* (1973) [4].

> "As the various nations and regions continue to differentiate – in economic activities and in life styles – they must elaborate new ways of relating to each other so as to become progressively integrated into organic wholes. Differentiation must always be followed by integration. To symbolize the need of achieving **unity through diversity**, the United Nations might eventually come to be known as the Integrated Nations.
>
> In practice, a global approach is needed when dealing with the problems of the spaceship earth which affect all of mankind. But local solutions, inevitably conditioned by local interests, are required for the problems peculiar to each human settlement.
>
> These two contrasting attitudes concerning the environment are not incompatible : in fact they complement each other. The national loyalty that we must develop toward the planet as a whole need not interfere with the emotional attachment to our prized diversity. As we enter the global phase of social evolution, it becomes obvious that each one of us has two countries – his own and the planet earth. We cannot feel at home on earth if we do not continue to love and cultivate our own garden. And conversely, we can hardly feel comfortable in our garden if we do not care for the planet earth as our collective home." – 42

"Unity through diversity" (or "act locally think globally" as a variation on the same slogan) is a very fluffy way of saying interdependence. The Club of Rome refers to interdependence as an organic society. From *Mankind at the Turning Point: The Second Report to The Club of Rome* (1974) [5]:

> "The concept of the "organic growth" of mankind, as we have proposed in this report, is intended as a contribution toward achieving that end. **Were mankind to embark on a path of organic growth, the world would emerge as a system of interdependent and harmonious parts**, each making its own unique contributions, be it in economics, resources, or culture.
>
> [...] Such an approach must start from and preserve the world's regional diversity. Paths of development, region-specific rather than based on narrow national interests, must be designed to lead to a sustainable balance between the interdependent world-regions and to global harmony – that is, to mankind's growth as an "organic entity" from its present barely embryonic state." – viii

According to Bertrand Russell, a well bred elitist himself, an organic society is nothing more

than totalitarianism. From *The Impact of Science on Society* (1952) [6]:

> "Totalitarianism has a theory as well as a practice. As a practice, it means that a certain group, having by one means or another seized the apparatus of power, especially armaments and police, proceed to exploit their advantageous position to the utmost, by regulating everything in the way that gives them the maximum of control over others. But as a theory it is something different: it is the doctrine that the State, or the nation, or the community is capable of a good different from that of individual and not consisting of anything that individuals think or feel. This doctrine was especially advocated by Hegal, who glorified the State, and thought that a community should be as organic as possible. In an organic community, he thought, excellence would reside in the whole. An individual is an organism, and we do not think that his separate parts have separate goods: if he has a pain in his great toe it is he that suffers, not specially the great toe. So, in an organic society, good and evil will belong to the whole rather than the parts. This is the theoretical form of totalitarianism." – 64

Conclusion

The use, or more appropriately, the abuse of words is a characteristic of a psychopath or psychopathic group. As you have just seen, The Club of Rome is a well versed organization in this type of deceit and should be properly classified as such. It is very important for anyone trying to understand how these types of organizations operate, to take the time to understand the inner, or esoteric language developed for the elite within the organization. Without this understanding, the outer layer of propaganda's suggestive insinuations will be dangerously misleading.

References

[1] Andrew M. Lobaczewski, *Political Ponerology: A Science on the Nature of Evil Adjusted for Political Purposes* (1998, 2006). ISBN-10: 1-897244-25-8.

[2] Jan Tinbergen, *RIO: Reshaping the International Order: A Report to the Club of Rome* (1976). ISBN 0-525-04340-3. For more information about this book please read this series of articles.

[3] Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider, *The First Global Revolution: A Report by the Council of The Club of Rome: A Strategy for Surviving the World* (1991). ISBN 0-671-71107-5.

[4] Barbara Ward, Rene Dubos, Thor Heyerdahl, Gunnar Myrdal, Carmen Miro, Lord Zuckerman and Aurelio Peccei, *Who Speaks for Earth?: Seven Citizens of the World on Major Issues of the Global Environment* (1973). ISBN 0-393-06392-5.

[5] Mihajlo Mesarovic and Eduard Pestel, *Mankind at the Turning Point: The Second Report to The Club of Rome* (1974). ISBN 0-525-03945-7. For more information about this book please read this series of articles

[6] Bertrand Russell, *The Impact of Science on Society* (1952). ISBN 0-415-10906-X . For more information about this book please read this series of articles

More articles by Brent Jessop can be found at his site Knowledge Driven

The original source of this article is [Knowledge Driven Revolution](#)
Copyright © [Brent Jessop](#), [Knowledge Driven Revolution](#), 2008

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: **Brent Jessop**