Bureaucratism is *late-onset psychopathy*. Let me explain.

First of all, psychopathy is simply a complete lack of integrity. In some cases, this lack of integrity sets in very early in life. When this happens, the person in question never even develops the character-architecture of a normal person, and so far as he ever appears to have one, it is simply because he is faking it. These people are con-artists, grifters, drifters, cult-leaders, and altogether plastic and obviously phony people.

A vastly more common kind of psychopat is the bureaupath, this being someone who forfeits his integrity into order to fit into some bureaucratic institution or pseudo-legitimate area of professional endeavor, such as academia or the law. This sort of person parted with his integrity late in life, and therefore did develop the characterological properties of a normal person and still, even after psychopathizing, retains the formal properties of such a person. In this sort of person, psychopathizing is the same as bureaucratizing—becoming a bureaucratic husk of a person, somebody for whom the magic is gone and in whom the spark is gone. In any case, contrary to what people are likely to presume, such people are indeed bona fide psychopaths. The reason they seem not to be psychopaths is that, unlike the early onset psychopath—who becomes an obvious conman or some such— the bureaupath is a late onset psychopath, who psychopathized in an institutional context and in order to submit, in the most complete way possible, to institution-internal, purely political mandates.

But there is a third kind of psychopath, also a late-onset psychopath.

Academia, specifically the humanities, are replete with this sort of psychopath. Some background will help. A lot of people, instead of saying that they agree with Freud or that they disagree with him, wil make

statements long the lines of “he had a *model*”, or “the Freudian critique is compelling, but should be tempered by the Marxist critique”, or “Freud’s *narrative* was informed by such and such…” The most invidious such dodge is: “Freud is interesting, but it should be treated as *literature…*”

People who say these thigns don’t understand Freud. Which is not in and of itself a crime, let alone psychopathic, and which in most contexts is no consequence. What is psychopathic is the hypocritical, projective stalling that they are doing. They simply don’t understand Freud. One option under such circumstances is to say: I don’t understand Freud. No comment.’ Another option is to say: ‘I half-understand him, but I half-don’t understand him. And I do, or do not, agree with the half that I understand.’ What is *not* an option is to project one’s own failure to understand onto the object of one’s non- understanding. What is not an option is to slime up that object by saying that it is ‘literature’ or a ‘narrative’ or a ‘critique’, etc.

These terms are used by phonies: by people who don’t understand but want to seem authoritative. So they are scumming up the truth and the categories in terms of which the truth is to be grasped with spongiform pseudo-cognitive categories, like ‘narrative’, ‘critique’, and ‘literature.’ That is psychopathic. It is driven by narcissism, hate, and psychopathic, infinite disregard for the truth. There is a heavy element of sheer stupidity in there as well, since someone with half a brain wouldn’t diminish themselves by so alienating themselves from the truth. But stupidity is perfectly compatible with psychopathy, which is nothing other than a total lack of integrity.

A magnet for psychopaths of this particular variety is the whole concept of the ‘paradigm’, in the sense in which Kuhn uses that term in his absurdly over-valued book The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. There are certain topics and conceits that psychopaths of this variety swarm all over— time travel, quantum theory, relativism, post-modernism. The first two of these topics obviously have inherent legitimacy, but they are used illegitimately by the psychopath. The latter two have legitimacy as objects of analysis but not otherwise. In any case, these topics, and the conceits popularly associated with them, are magnets for the spongiform, truth- concealing humanities professor psychopath.

I must stress that when I describe such people as psychopaths, I am speaking literally. These people are systematically dismantling life- and thought-critical epistemic instruments, and they are putting nothing in their place, and they are even going so far as to spurn the idea of putting

something in their place. And that is heavy-duty psychopathy: no one is drawn to such positions because they believe them, since it is biologically impossible to believe such positions. Such people are perpetrating fraud, for reasons of convenience and ego and hate. When people hand-wave and hem and haw with jabber about *deconstructionism* and *narratives* and *critiques*, know that you are dealing with a feather-head twig who is wasting your time

—that you are dealing with someone who himself has no integrity and whose career is an attempt to undermine the very notion of integrity—and promptly be on your way.