



Innate bisexuality and its massive repression in humankind-a first survey of the social consequences of unnaturalness in humans

Florent Pirot

► To cite this version:

Florent Pirot. Innate bisexuality and its massive repression in humankind-a first survey of the social consequences of unnaturalness in humans. 2018. hal-01925081v3

HAL Id: hal-01925081

<https://hal.science/hal-01925081v3>

Preprint submitted on 16 Dec 2018 (v3), last revised 13 Mar 2019 (v4)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

Public Domain

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Innate bisexuality and its massive repression in humankind – a first survey of the social consequences of unnaturalness in humans

Florent Pirot

florent.pirot@orange.fr
@FlorentPirot on Twitter

Independent PhD student in economics

Bisexuality is natural in animals ; long-loving same-sex couples in animals are independent of the presence of competitors of the other sex. Humans are the only group in which heterosexuality has been erected as a norm and all other behaviours are repressed. The bisexuality of the baby is notorious since Freud but homophobia is a gatherer and all statist ideologies are built from it. The unity of repressed homosexuals is solely possible around ideologies that allow romanticism and that thus are non-Popperian. The coming together of theorists officially in conflict but sharing the rejection of the Popperian refutability can be taken as a supplementary testimonial of that preference : resurfacing of the repressed. All forms of statism, attacks against freedom and hatred of nature and life rely on the same springs of repressed homosexuality, self-hate and irrational links to individuals of the same sex built without care for refutability that manifest the unavoidable resurfacing of the loving human.

Made with PhD funding from the Région Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes in France

La Région 
Auvergne-Rhône-Alpes

Liberalism has to be scientific and gender theory and Austrian economics provide the two sole solid rocks to build a coherent house for humankind. Liberalism inspired itself long ago from Darwinian selection and nature provides us the best proof that humans are totally unlike *all* other animals. They have separated themselves from nature and this feeds back on their behaviour with a generalized tendency for self-destruction – and hatred of happiness, first manifested in homophobia, antisemitism, racism in general and taste for imperialism.

The Popperian criteria of refutability defines simply a scientific way of behaviour which implies making choices – what the economy also is about. Making choices is impossible for people repressing their real love preferences so they prefer ideologies full of contradictions, as themselves. While the free market conforms with scientific rationality by allowing choices, its rejectal allows ideologues to sustain their lifestyle and mindset. Animality is understood by everyone to be the source of natural love but most reject it for they do not accept that humans, as most animals, do not have a categorical taste for heterosexuality and that homosexuality is a fully natural behaviour. The free market is a simple reflection of the animality of humans which is also rejected, in direct continuation, for all natural behaviours become progressively hated by the repressed as they suffer more and more because of their straitjacket. Political economy has had a particular role in the organization of attacks against the free market and natural freedom and can be taken as a more general example.

In male giraffes, 9 sexual encounters over 10 are with other males (sodomy and prostatic orgasm). Homosexuality is natural in animals and bisexuality the rule more than the exception. Few animals are known to be solely heterosexual or solely homosexual according to Fleur Daugey and many animals are found in same-sex loving relations whereas mates of the other sex are nevertheless « competing » and could be alternative partners. The theory of Sigmund Freud and Wilhelm Fliess of the innate bisexuality of the baby can be seen directly in that lens.

Bruce Bagemihl (1999) really rejected the main point which is : love. All attempts to see, not love, but « evolutionary strategies » such as games of domination between animals of the same sex, or « exhuberance » but not a normal behaviour simply produced by *love*, are acts of invention of repressed homosexuals – the first definition of a repressed homosexual¹ being of course rejection of the idea of love, *at least somewhere*.

As concerns the observation of animals, the experimental set-ups are likely to produce only a limited picture of the reality of the sexual relations – rattlesnakes, for instance, can be found to have very long intercourse but animals that have learned to be afraid of humans certainly feel the observants and shorten their intercourse for that reason. It is a simple issue known in sociology and anthropology – observation itself destroys the validity of the data collected. There are many repressed homosexuals who reject this evident idea and pretend that experimentation is able to produce Popperian data – a proof of inhumanity.

Repression of non-heterosexual behaviour by parents, together with the fostering of gender-differentiated identities (as shown by several authors such as Elena Belotti already in 1972), produces a highly repressed society in which the animal bisexuality is totally suppressed. The direct spillover of this repressed society is homophobia as a way to express social integration, for natural bonding is impossible and *Unterdrückung* becomes a norm, a social standard organized by ideologists and by States that all provide focal points (Schelling's) i.e. the form of institutions allowing for the repressed to think themselves of a natural persons and to reject the non-repressed as different. In these institutions, we find social culture (machism, homophobia), institutions of power in general that allow the selection and promotion of persons that foster the repression of the natural homosexuality of humans (all forms of political institutions for instance), religious cultures allowing the same, and prostitution which is a key denominator for repressed homosexuality (either for the users of prostitutes of the opposed sex as a way to pretend heterosexuality, or as a way to

1 In this paper « repressed homosexuality » is used as synonym for « repression of the homosexual relationships that bisexuality allows »

secretly use prostitutes of their own sex). All what revolves around taming animals, dominating them, taming nature, mastering the elements, is definitively part of *Unterdrückung* as well. The projects of humans attempting to think of themselves as, not part of nature, but outside of it, with specific forces and, most importantly, an independence from the conditions of the environment, are testimony of such *Unterdrückung*.

The hypothesis

The author postulates that about 99,2 % of the overall population of the entire world is repressing its own bisexuality. This postulate is based on

1. the observance of participation to elections and support of sports teams (a typical way of finding homoerotic bonding) as well as levels of interest for rational science (low levels suggesting repressed homosexuality) and on average feelings as concerns the respect of nature and, of course, the support of the free market (as lack of love of nature and rejectal of the free market suggest as well repressed homosexuality).
2. the lack of resonance of LGBT issues outside the Western world, and, even in the Western world, their « niche » nature, and, inside the LGBT world, the tendency to erase bisexuality.
3. this ratio matches the fine-structure constant, and I am assimilating repressed bisexuals to depleted uranium. Like depleted uranium, repressed bisexuals may turn into a weapon of mass destruction (when they call for socialism, which includes all forms of collective action, communautarianism, nationalism which always goes with some form of socialism, racism – Ludwig von Mises' definition), and the fine-structure constant is the ratio of U238 / U235 in nature.

The main hypothesis of the writer is that repressed homosexuality is highly dominant in mankind and directly linked to the curious taste of humans for killing others for pleasure (be it as a minimum animals, or polluting the environment for no reason, or of course oppressing other humans – so all attacks against freedom have to be taken into account). Ludwig von Mises is taken as the key author for economic freedom as he both theorized the spontaneous order, understood how political power is casually used to oppress women and how brothels are a place of slavery (see for instance *Human Action* for the first, and *Socialism* for the second and last). It is important to note that the theories of Mises on sex and power seem quite unpopular even among libertarian thinkers (in the limited observations of the author). Mises' criticism of prostitution and his comments on militarism feeding the prostitution serfdom can be related to the obvious fact that prostitutes are extremely needed for men (and women, for gigolos) looking to lie to themselves about their real sexuality.

The lie of heterosexuality needs to be permanently, and forcefully, told by the mind to the subconscious as a way to harness it and attempt to control all forms of attraction to persons of the same sex – going to prostitutes is only a small subpart of it – telling this lie takes much of the energy of the person, making it much less productive for other aims such as producing economic and social added value (wealth, happiness for the self and for others, etc). The life of the person is brought into a straitjacket of storytelling in which the only thing that matters is the image produced for the others – so the person cannot think on its own or give any clue that he/she is « outside the norms » because all norms are assimilated to heterosexuality and trespassing to homosexuality.

It is also obvious that sexual dimorphism is mostly a construct of feeding behaviours in which young girls are encouraged to eat less and boys more – constructing strong differences in sizes² and creating artificial needs for women to be protected by men of strength (and thus building again the need for heterosexuality).

Ludwig von Mises was the first author to explicitly underline the belonging of national-socialism to the wider breed of socialism and to dismantle attempts to propagandize ideas that the national-

² On this see Priscille Touraille (2005)

socialists are favourable to capitalism. In addition it should be obvious to everyone that repressed homosexuality is extremely wide even in tenants of neoliberalism and that all politicians *scenographizing their private life* one way or another (as well as in fact all persons that scenographize their private life, as couples, in the direction of others) are such.

A simple theorem of repressed homosexuality, for men (all cases discussed below), is the transfer onto the State of the « virility » the repressed homosexual « feel frail » in him. The « spontaneous order » is seen as feminine in that it simply evokes the lack of sexual vigor of the man who is actually unattracted by women but who repeats seduction attempts ; he will demand forms of strength of the State and campaign actively for it, up to sometimes very successful (yet absolutely traumatizing for others) political careers, as it allows them to compensate their supposed lack of virility with the idealized virility of the State.

Non/popperian theories allow to justify simply the power of the State and to convince followers. Their seduciveness is in the apparent simplicity that allows a quick output of slogans and in the large number of persons that can be drawn to them thanks to the lack of rigor in definitions (concealed by scenography, public speaking tricks such as conferences with no questions allowed, shouting instead of speaking, mass set-up of robots on social networks, « clappers » in meetings etc³). Alternatively, extremely tortuous theories offer a casual way of slipping non/popperian theories in academic articles, as have for instance demonstrated skeptics Alan Sokal in 1996, Helen Pluckrose, James Lindsay and Peter Boghossian this year. The folds of an article whose outline is almost impossible to follow are an easy way to conceal a very weak and irrefutable argumentation, for historicists and other holists of social sciences. The point of these writers is sometimes first to convince *themselves* and the polylogism very frequently emerges accidentally – in the first pages of Marx’s Capital when subjective value is quickly implied, or in Sismondi’s works when it comes to slavery, social welfare, imperialism, or in Rousseau’s total change of stance regarding private property, sometimes sacred, sometimes desecrated...

The repression of homosexual love leads to non-Popperian theories where symmetry with the implicitly (unwillingly) loved one is favoured to intellectual decency. Refusal of Popper’s refutability criterion is always the activity of repressed homosexuals, everywhere as it allows bonding between same-sex persons around holistic projects that can be assimilated in the mind to a form of romantic love. These holistic projects cannot thrive without non-Popperian argumentation to support it.

In addition the persons repressing their homosexuality can be highly expected to demand forms of interventions on the spontaneous order. The connexion between the repression of natural attractions of humans and the repression of the free market is simple to understand.

Repressed homosexuality involves both bonding between persons of the same sex and refusal to have such relations acknowledged as love. This article attempts to show how the rejection of homosexuality is absolutely common in antiliberal scholars and makes the point that rejection of homosexuality is the focal reason for the prescription of intervention of the State in the economy of these scholars, beyond the traditional borders of the left and the right, allowing actually mating between these scholars. It is likely the history of the Soviet Union and national-socialist Germany, from the first meetings of Lenin and Hitler in Vienna before the First World War where they played chess and could certainly have had some form of relation⁴, to June 1941. Between 1933 and 1934 (the *Tag der Arbeit* 1934 coin with the image of an old man, possibly Lassalle, a sickle and

3 The use of clappers in meetings was already well known in the Roman Antiquity as affidates benefitting from the generosity of a rich patron were, among other things, frequently expected to come to his electoral meetings to clap...

4 Emma Lowenstramm’s drawing testifies <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/culturenews/6130672/Pictured-Hitler-playing-chess-with-Lenin.html>

hammer⁵, and an eagle with the national-socialist hooked cross, evidences it⁶) until the elimination of the SA, which started the Communist policy of cooperation with social-democrats, and again effectively since 1937 when the Soviet Union provided the Gestapo with groups of anticomunist refugees⁷, the cooperation was evident.

Antisemitism is a simple spill over of repressed homosexuality : when homophobia is not enough to bond with other repressed homosexuals, the targeting of Jews, presented with feminine traits (flaccid nose evoking a flaccid penis or even tinier nose evoking a clitoris, lips like a small vulva, gold jewelry, thin arms, a veil...), is an additional motor of bonding. Other communities, depending on the local traditions, can be used as well as enemies. The Soviet Union's homophobic policies are very rarely discussed and taught – it is a quite obscured part of modern history in spite of its significance. Homosexuality has been vastly demonized in the Soviet Union as well as in all socialist countries and homosexuals targeted by law and police. It is obvious how homophobia and the repression of homosexuality are tied. Repressed homosexuals spend their time acting against other persons in which they observe some traits « similar » to them, having the feeling they could be would-be homosexuals as well, as an attempt to impede their possible coming out – to feel less isolated. Violence is an integral part of that permanent process. The behaviour can be observed widely in the opposition between national-socialists and socialists ; their relationship is of mutual and secret love, and mutual and explicit hatred ; both communities attempt deliberately to obscure the history of their political ideology as it concerns the closeness of their ideology. The modern founding cradle is Machiavelli – a closeted man for whom « queer experiences » have been reported⁸ but who idealized virility by transferring it onto the State. Machiavelli is not of course the first repressed homosexual in the history of humanity but he is a very interesting case for he is depicted as the founder of « Republicanism », the first antiliberal school of thinking.

All collectivities with some socialization aim rely on permanent rituals of sacrifice which have as prime purpose to organize acceptance that links of love do not matter and that the group primes. Ceremonies, baptisms, professions of faith etc. involve forms of hazing in which the individual is demanded a commitment and the most committed socialists always take pride in reminding to others the titles acquired following such a hazing. Most people tend to accept this (see above on the hypothesis). The importance of the title in the eyes of the others is linearly tied to the violence the granters of the prize can inflict to the hazed and their political power allows them to demand more – as regards what Pierre Bourdieu⁹ called the state nobility for which acceptance of so many

5 And the sickle and hammer emblem actually evokes the insertion of a penis in an anus (like the traditionalist Catholic heart of Jesus and cross)

6 Many samples are available on the Web

https://www.google.com/search?q=tag+der+arbeit+coin+1934&client=ubuntu&hs=hrq&channel=fs&source=lnms&tbo=isch&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjuM6UpsXeAhUB6RoKHY3VDeYQ_AUIDigB&biw=1301&bih=670

7 On this see the *Black Book of Communism*, S Courtois et al (1997)

8 « What we did as adolescents » : in this 1523 reply to Machiavelli about the intimacy of Machiavelli's son Ludovico with a man, Francesco Vettori leaves no doubt about Machiavelli's own homosexual experiences : « Since we are verging on old age, we might be severe and overly scrupulous, and we do not remember what we did as adolescents. So Lodovico has a boy with him, with whom he amuses himself, jests, takes walks, growls in his ear, goes to bed together. What then? Even in these things perhaps there is nothing bad. » - Michael Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*, 1997. Haig Patapan in *Machiavelli in Love*, 2006, note 78 of Chap 1, points that Ridolfi does not exclude some isolated homosexual experiences of Machiavelli in his young years, that Machiavelli's friends (as for instance Donato del Corno) were homosexuals, but deduces « from personal correspondence » that Machiavelli was heterosexual – using personal correspondence to deduce heterosexuality is extremely naive when the obvious strategy of lying everywhere is the most essential characteristic of repressed homosexuals, and especially logical in a man so keen to recommend lying in his writings – the conclusion of Patapan is ambiguous – suggests Machiavelli could have been tempted by homosexuality – and lacks the simple light of *repressed* homosexuality evident from Machiavelli's hostility to his own son having homosexual experiences and from his cult of virility in his writings)

9 Himself obviously a repressed homosexual ! Another obvious repressed homosexual whose theories can be used here is Jean-Paul Sartre : his « group in fusion » is the typical monosexual group in permanent activity of bonding i.e. the fallen love of the humans unable to love, for they are repressing themselves, and needing to form a

humiliations can be expected – a process which can be naturally suspected to select homoerotic bonds established, through more or less pathetic ways, up to prostitution for future political power. It is a permanent process of co-construction of a « nobility » that State institutions (even in all neoliberal countries) attempt to define as linearly tied to success in life. Private companies are as well, in neoliberal countries, permanently submitted to such a process of hazing and extraction of monies through extortion, secret demands for retrobribes in calls for tenders followed by « cocktails » or joint public appearances in which of course the corporate leaders have to appear quiet and joyous (even though they can expect the leaders of the State to be permanently calculating how much they can extract from each company through e.g. new threats of normative action, speculation on the falls in market shares of these companies they themselves cause with their economic interventionism by using call or put warrants, etc) and one can expect the surviving CEOs, in big corporations, to be as well mostly repressed homosexuals that have accepted this sado-masochistic game as part of normal life and try to have « better chains and softer handcuffs » instead of fighting back.

The illiberal economic thinkers that will discussed below can simply be taken as representatives of a spirit of statism in which they hoped to leave their names. They will thus tend to « contribute » by constructing new tropes of seclusion and reasons for political intervention in the economy and society, allowing for others more opportunities for homoerotic groupism. All tropes are constructed so as to provide more reasons for humans to distinguish themselves « from animality » and involve negating said animality of human behaviour that economic freedom is the most simple way to identify. The State is an « institution » and per se any institution can be seen as having a « magical » power to discriminate i.e. *construct* the barrier between what is « human » and what is « animal ». Weber's « enchanted world » is not at all behind us – the State provides a simple recourse to all repressed homosexuals looking for proof of their heterosexuality (militarism, social success through manipulation of others to achieve promotion in the administration, political militancy in which homophobia can be implicitly or explicitly promoted, etc) and thus all repressed homosexuals will tend to become entrepreneurs in Statist ideology themselves and push the boundaries of State intervention to demand encroachment into private life, wallets, bodies... for they see in this intervention a way to reinforce their own straitjacket and / or avoiding competing behaviours from others that would remind to them as well their own inner, silenced, passions.

An analysis of economic ideologues

Marx and Engels are a simple example : the repressed homosexuality must be absolutely obvious to everyone, it is a simple example of a sustained homoerotic relationship in which feelings of love are never expressed but mutually felt, while actual homophobia is one of the main binders ; the June 1869 letter in which Engels expressed to Marx his « fear of rampant pederastia » in Germany is a simple example¹⁰. Antisemitism is also apparent in Marx with the usual cliché of the Jewish lover of

community to remind them of what they could enjoy if they were letting their mind free – Sartre's mind was so straitjacketed that one of his eyes permanently attempted to « escape » uncontrollably...

10 The paederasts [homosexual paedophiles] are beginning to count themselves, and discover that they are a power in the state. Only organisation was lacking, but according to this source it apparently already exists in secret. And since they have such important men in all the old parties and even in the new ones, from Rosing to Schweitzer, they cannot fail to triumph. *Guerre aux cons, paix aux trous-de-cul* [war on the cunts, peace to the arse-holes] will now be the slogan. It is a bit of luck that we, personally, are too old to have to fear that, when this party wins, we shall have to pay physical tribute to the victors. But the younger generation! Incidentally it is only in Germany that a fellow like this can possibly come forward, convert this smut into a theory, and offer the invitation: *introite* [enter], etc. Unfortunately, he has not yet got up the courage to acknowledge publicly that he is ‘that way’, and must still operate *coram publico*‘ from the front’, if not ‘going in from the front’ as he once said by mistake. But just wait

money (in his 1844 opus *On the Jewish Question*). The author of this paper surveyed several writings of several other authors to demonstrate similar relationships. It is argued in this article that repressed homosexuality is the main driver of economic thought as it is the driver of statism always and everywhere. Building walls around their private homosexuality (that is organizing your lie to your inner self, telling to yourself in permanence the lie that you are heterosexual while spending most of your time socializing with persons of the same sex and avoiding persons of the other sex except in planned settings) is much easier if they can harness political power to enforce laws or other rules or simply having a security guarantee but harnessing that power and / or money income source involves depriving others of resources and inevitably fuels a permanent feedback process in which instability and political disorder threaten them – forcing them to set up more schemes of extortion and violence to hide themselves. It simply expresses their fears of not being tolerated if the homosexual love was openly acknowledged.

Socialism and nationalism are both constructs from non-Popperian researchers wanting to conceal the animality of humans and, first, of their own mind. Rejectal of the free market and campaigning for the organisation of society and / or the national community all rely on the same springs. All need polylogism and non-Popperian prolegomena to conceal lack of rigor in definitions and attempt at political propaganda, and serve a single purpose which is power onto others to engage in « less animal-than-thou » activities of rivalry : humiliating others, perhaps torturing them, etc. to force appearance into the eyes of others of animal instincts of fear. The fantasma of domination is accompanied by secondary fantasmas of being dominated by the enemy – the mind of the repressed homosexual suffers and some subparts will always force the rest to accept some form of homosexual love, i.e. homoerotic bonding, at all costs. No human can truly survive without some at least very distant form of love.

St Simon and the St Simonians are a primitive example of groupism together with ideologization of the rejectal of the animality of mankind. Industrialism as a whole is an ideology that is a simple theorization of humans as builders and St Simon used the paraboles of animals *against* other animals to underline his point : bees against hornets. Fénelon has been denounced by St Simon as having an « effeminated » gallantry (Régent-Susini). The St Simonians had customs that involved dressing together, each one putting another in a jacket that closed from behind, to force a spirit of cooperation and, evidently, as it was groups of men, body closeness. It evokes also groups such as freemasonry which has mostly been gender-separated throughout history.

Charles Fourier may have found in the St Simonians, for his sole name resounded with them, an inspiration in socialism and constituted a group with his own followers including Victor Considérant with whom he had a close relationship. *Fourierism* evokes the French word *fourrer*, and the behaviour of the man might have been to become obsessed with his own name. The utopia of the *Phalanstère* would allow close control of the bodies and is a typical set up for behaviours of sexual harassment and ploys of rape. It could have been an underlying idea of Fourier to promote his group utopia in the hopes of being seen as a founding father, to gain control of many women as ways to forget his own « incapacity ».

Quesnay has been reconstructed ex-post as a free-marketeer he was a prominent member of the French court, friend to Louis XV himself, « loved » by him (for which precise reasons?) and an apologist of the Chinese taxation system and, in general, of that typical authoritarian liturgical State (as noted also by authors such as Carol Blum). He had, as many others in this article, a « particular friend » (Vincent de Gournay). The economic model of Quesnay escapes somewhat the common

until the new North German Penal Code recognises the *droits du cul* [rights of the arse-hole] then he will operate quite differently. Then things will go badly enough for poor frontside people like us, with our childish penchant for females. - MECW, Volume 43, p. 295. First published: in *Der Briefwechsel zwischen F. Engels und K. Marx* Stuttgart, 1913. available at https://marxists.catbull.com/archive/marx/works/1869/letters/69_06_22.htm

sense. It is presented as mathematical (presenting the same symptoms as Keynes, who is a particular case as his homosexuality is no mystery now but clearly was repressed throughout his life) but does not show actual logic and rationality, only cyclicity and a religion of farmland as the only actual source of added value. There is no doubt on his repressed homosexuality.

Adam Smith himself was not a full proponent of the free market. His views on the « invisible hand » and acceptance of human passions make no doubt yet the last book of the Wealth of Nations is clearly and openly Statist. Here two views conflict :

1. One simple hypothesis would be that Smith did not write the last book of the Wealth of Nations with passion but only as a way to be ensured publication and quick promotion while hoping to defend his own views in the first four books.

2. Another would be that he firmly believed, as opposed to Mandeville, in the need for a State, and that the Wealth of Nations was written wholly in the reaction of the failure of Townshend's laws as Smith certainly seeked a new public – the secret relation between Smith and Townshend can be presumed for Townshend offered Smith to become the tutor of his stepson Henry Scott – and he accepted. Smith was possibly looking mostly for popularity and for a public - it could be an attempt to gain more followers by building a strong group of supporters while hiding his secret preferences. Smith met Quesnay once *and Quesnay died immediately after*. What exactly killed Quesnay ? (Who, perhaps, may be the question¹¹)

Rothbard points to « The mystery of Adam Smith [that is] the immense gap between a monstrously overinflated reputation and the dismal reality ». Smith's labour theory of value is certainly tortuous, as is the Wealth of Nations difficult to read and his Theory of Moral Sentiments is an even more tortuous attempt at defining how humans feel (with the implicitly homophobic reference to love as « the passion which unites the two sexes ») which is extremely dissatisfying if we consider it in the perspective of the spontaneous order. The obvious conclusion of Smith's repressed homosexuality should make no doubt.

The case of Rousseau is obvious for he himself wrote on his « folly » which could not but be anything else than a moment of suffering linked to his repressed homosexuality. Rousseau explains his fear of scientific investigations involving « smelly » things such as chemistry and medicine, yet wrote on « herboristery » (as Blanqui later, certainly in a livid attempt at imitating Rousseau, wrote totally hypothetical conjectures on astrophysics) – he is well known for his taste of being spanked by women and perhaps less known for having abandoned all his children.

Sismondi is a simple example of obsession for virility, hatred of homosexuals, race for networking and seeking of political power through contacts with even those politicians he presented earlier as most odious to him – as with Napoléon on June 6th 1815 after having spent years attacking him in his books. Sismondi is presented by Francesca Sofia as having had « many failures with women through his life » but did not have the same failures with men – at least regarding homoerotic bonding without actual mating. Sismondi was himself a prude Protestant. He met also later with Louis-Philippe, exchanged longly with an American unitarian priest (William Channing) and had many disciples (Pellegrino Rossi, Jules Michelet for a shorter period, and Eugène Buret which could have been his secret love - Frédéric Bastiat notes that Sismondi's articles, in conjunction with Buret's, opened a new « age » in the disappearance of « virility » and Bastiat might have suggested that in a primitive form of what is purported in this article) – Sismondi keeps, in his writings, talking about « Ricardo's law » and never mentions Say, which is extremely hypocritical and may have had the purpose of establishing some form of bond, beyond economic theories, with Say. Sismondi had an absolute obsession for military history, writing thousands of pages later presented as the general

11 Let us quote again Murray Rothbard : « The Rev. Carlyle's comment that Smith had 'some little jealousy in his temper' seems a vast understatement, and we are informed by his obituary notice in the 1790 *Monthly Review* that 'Smith lived in such constant apprehension of being robbed of his ideas that, if he saw any of his students take notes of his lectures, he would instantly stop him and say, 'I hate scribblers'' » - the last phrase suggests the assassination of Quesnay.

history of countries, for epic drama and actually taught courses of literature in which he actually gave lessons of taste and romanticism, and a cult of state authority which is more and more evident through his writings as he aged. For he became weaker and full of pains and as he gained weight up to obesity he made it more evident to the readers and seeked new readers by attacking imperialism and colonization (which he defended in the past). Sismondi evokes a man attempting to seduce with infatuated words and lots of tortuous irrefutable theories scattered in disorder in his many books, a typical repressed homosexual.

Sismondi used Smith's name repeatedly but did not even mostly follow up on his theories and was the first one to evoke revolution, thinly and distantly, as a way to achieve forms of social and national progress *after* the French revolution. Sismondi prescribes violence as way to reform human behaviour – in the reeducation of slaves in a seemingly social system which has in fact an *ab terrorem* clause – and has a great tendency to, in general, hide the « intolerable » parts of his thinking in the bottom of pages or in light expressions. Could he have taken a secret pleasure in this permanent quasi-lie ? It is certainly an hypothesis. The repressed homosexuals of course take pleasure in inflicting to others pains – it is in fact the only pleasure they can take as repressing yourself only leads to pains everywhere, incapacity to think, etc., and these « sneaky » ways of putting « evil in the margins » evokes the practices of all demagogues and sterile monstrous of power, the manipulators. Sismondi certainly was the first to actually seek totalitarian power.

The Blanqui brothers are a different example in which family relationships are tied to a strange homoerotic relationship. Adolphe is a much earlier children than Auguste, and he decided to support his brother financially. Adolphe supports industrialism, in ways reminding very clearly of St Simon, is considered a « liberal » thinker but expressed in 1849 his clear statism as concerns education and morality – with a strong religiosity. Adolphe was very obviously deceived by the revolutionary, anarcho-communist tendencies of his brother, and adopted a « magic wand » reaction, promoting State intervention for education of the young and promotion of Catholic virtue, while in the same time writing things such as « The great mistake of these times, is to believe that government... can everything, and to make it responsible of the fate of everyone »¹² and to denounce the cult of the « paternity of the State », a « fiction from which it is dangerous to abuse ». The relation of Adolphe to his younger brother was obviously not healthy and testifies of repressed homosexuality.

Auguste is an anarcho communist who, in spite of an apparent interest for science, wrote tracts demanding death to the rich (« the death of a rich is a good », 1834 ; « not a single rifle must remain in the hands of the bourgeoisie, out of this no salute, weapons and organization are the decisive element of progress, the serious way to end misery ; who has iron has bread », 1851 (in a letter to an assembly where he had been asked to write a text as in the very « bourgeois » use of *toasting*, in evenings certainly accompanied by lots of alcohol) but keeping *as well* the St Simonian mythology of the bee and hornets. He attacked religion to secure his position as a rationalist by targeting a precise priest in a whole book – quite a ridiculous attempt given the number of priests into politics and quite certainly the result of an homoerotic interest in the man – but *also* used some religious myths (for instance the Essenians, and Cain & Abel) to defend his equalitarian views so that property is presented as against a *religious* order. In the typical trope that Mises calls chiliasm (chilling yourself by convincing your ideology is bound to succeed) Blanqui uses the disappearance of slavery to convince himself that property rights in general will disappear, *and* prescribes *what* should replace property rights i.e. the « association » of anarchists (simple symptom of polylogism as his elder brother both attacking the myth of the « paternal State » and demanding it for education and morality). It is obvious that Auguste built his whole theoretical background out of hatred for Adolphe – perhaps because something else happened and some sexual contact was attempted by Adolphe while he « cared » for Auguste. It is difficult to know.

12 « La grande erreur de ce temps, c'est de croire que le gouvernement, quel qu'il soit, peut tout, et de le rendre responsable du sort de chacun, comme s'il pouvait donner plus qu'il ne reçoit, et faire plus pour tous les citoyens réunis que chaque citoyen pour lui-même » (1849)

Karl and Michael Polanyi embody the other form of homoerotic bonding transferred onto the family : not through mutual hatred but consistent cooperation in spite of the apparent opposition between the liberal and the socialist ; Karl Polanyi attempts to build another historicist proof for the naturalness of socialism (after Rousseau's, Sismondi's and Marx's, to quote the main ones, each inspired by the earlier authors) and Michael Polanyi attacks positivism and Popper in spite of his defense of liberalism ; both joined forces to not understand that fascism, which they commonly hated, relies naturally everywhere on non-popperian dogmas to gather strength.

Mises was the first to point out how national-socialism is simply a subpart of socialism (and how Sismondi was the first actual thinker of national-socialism) – Karl and Michael Polanyi seem to have stayed in an homoerotic incestuous relationship in which they worked against their own interest by attacking one brand of socialism they rightly feared while actually promoting refusal of positivism and of Popper's refutability criterion i.e. the equivalent of castrating themselves – in the typical sado-masochistic relationship of Communists and Fascists – refusing Popper's theories to *present the « pooper » to the (fascist) imagined boyfriend* as a way to forget your own repressed sexuality.

In history the closet relations between national-socialists and socialists are rife. Among politicians Jean Jaurès is one simple example for he had close relations with the ultra right-wing Maurice Barrès and shared with him antisemitism. His assassination by the far right might have been the late product of some kind of love failure between the two men. Salvador Allende's eugenic theories as a young man are well known (they also included the belief that homosexuality can be cured by implanting testicle tissue in the abdomen, that « Hebrews » are « well-known » « committers » of « crimes » including « usury », as stated in his PhD dissertation), and his intervention for the protection of a former German Nazi, Walter Rauff, in 1972, as well. A love issue can very very very certainly be proposed as a simple and rational explanation of Allende's behaviour as regards Walter Rauff. Allende's relation with Pinochet is also problematic in that Pinochet was granted his position in the Army by Allende himself, and Allende « trusted him to the end » according to most reports. The strong cooperation between the USSR and Nazi Germany has already been discussed but the use of Medieval-era nationalism by Ceausescu, the racist policies in socialist Bulgaria in the 1980s (leading to the expulsion of about 150 000 Turkophones), the antisemitism in socialist Poland (for instance in March 1968), the close cooperation today between North Korea and Iran as well as Syria or the presence of a national-socialist party in Syria along Bashar al-Assad as well as the known sympathies of British Labour leader Jeremy Corbyn for negationists and for Hamas and Hezbollah or the closeness between French far-leftist Jean-Luc Mélenchon and right-wing thinkers Patrick Buisson (Jean-Marie Le Pen is also known for having paid compliments to Mélenchon in 2017) can be taken as simple examples.

It is also interesting to take a look at Célestin Freinet, a « pedagogue » which embodies for many in France and elsewhere the positivist dream of educating the young to solidarity, a socialist education which of course does not take into account natural tendencies of humans to not care and prefer their own egos to others – Freinet met the spouse of the deceased Lenin in september 1925 in the Soviet Union, he had *of course* strong links to other men, for instance famous communist Henri Barbusse and the lesser known Henry Poulaille, both a « communist libertarian » and a man inspired by Michelet¹³, Péguy and Sorel, the most famous theorician of the national-socialist revolution and the theorizer of the revolutionary lie – the « myth ». Sorel was a engineer of the high corps of the nobility of State (Polytechnique, Ponts et Chaussées) who formed a couple with a... illiterate worker, a woman that died early – it is more than tempting to diagnose, as in Althusser's strangulation, a femicide followed by a simple revolutionary myth : dedicating *to her* his *Reflexions on Violence*, most brutal and joyful, for a hater, ex-post insult to somebody not seen as a

13 A paper of Pirot (2018) discusses homophobia, antisemitism and non-Popperian theories in Machiavelli, Rousseau, Sismondi, Michelet, Marx and Keynes, it is available on HAL : <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01869265/document>

human but solely a tool. Later Sorel had a close disciple (Edouard Berth) with whom he shared the same mysticism – the « society of producers » - in what obviously was homoerotic bonding between repressed homosexuals.

Repressed homosexuality has its forms. It produces narcissism – obsession about your own persona for you cannot truly love others. Each repressed homosexual attempts to exploit the others yet is easy, very easy to manipulate as well ; however the needs of manipulation require constitution of enemies – for scapegoating – making the dreamed socialist unity impossible – it is another, simpler form of stating Mises' socialist calculation impossibility for most humans in collectivity, repressing their homosexuality, focus on hating others and groups naturally divide over time. The story of Trotskyist chapels fighting each other is in this regard a very simple example but the story of nationhoods in general – as demonstrated by historians such as Benedict Anderson and Eric Hobsbawm, through the deconstruction of what generations of national-socialist historians such as Sismondi and Michelet, spent their time building in the so called invention of tradition – demonstrates the same tendencies. Discrimination is always and everywhere the essential tool of arbitrary power as it allows in many implicit or explicit ways to construct foes as animals and the group to which the self belongs as the « only legitimately human » i.e. heterosexual group.

Hitler bonded with Lenin, he may have kept the hooked cross as a souvenir as Lenin was Kalmuk (Mongol) and the swastika is a typical Buddhist symbol (this is just an hypothesis, it may also evoke the double S of *Sozialismus* and maybe also St Simon and Sismondi as well as a useful design for the lightnings of his elite forces – Hitler certainly knew their writings at least through the reading of Lenin, which attacked Sismondi openly in a text on populism which thus certainly was favoured by Hitler, in mimetic rivalry with the ex-lover – or maybe simply all that together). Hitler's scatophilia should be no mystery to anyone. Stalin's love with Lazar Kaganovich can be evidenced through a clearly cutted picture of the early 1930s in which Stalin has got his image pasted *along* Kaganovich – one leg slightly flexed while he stands in front – the posterior thus facing the anterior of Kaganovich¹⁴ – before Kaganovich went highly involved in the Holodomor and in the purges – he survived very long, until 25 July 1991, knowing perhaps « the last secret » on a man he survived *and killed*, as he acknowledged later to a journalist (Stuart Kahan). Kaganovich and Stalin look extremely similar – Stalin's narcissism clearly led him to fall in love of a mirror image of himself (Kaganovich is physically very similar to Stalin) that he kept preciously as a kind of talisman, refraining to purge him (and Molotov who *also* lived extremely long, until November 1986). The famous picture of Leonid Brezhnev and Erich Honecker actually kissing is another simple proof of their hidden homosexuality. An interesting case study is a 1972 movie produced in the German Democratic Republic (« Nicht schummeln, Liebling! ») in which women are invited to repress themselves and accept the dominance of men and of Communists : a woman that hates soccer eventually falls in love with a mayor who is using tax money to sponsor the local soccer team. In the German Democratic Republic in which sports were a rare entertainment produced for the masses, with very strong involvement of State authorities to promote doping, it was an accurate depiction of the repression process. Most movies produced in mainstream movie factories (Hollywood, Bollywood, etc) still depict, today, as well, heterosexual behavior as dominant and link heterosexuality and the traditional family model with freedom and social success. According to gay and transgender group GLAAD, 12,8 % of the 109 releases by the largest 7 studios of Hollywood included LGBTQ characters ; and these characters have a tendency of dying at the end of these movies. Nevertheless it is obvious that Hollywood also adapts itself to the average demands of the public which are directly impacted by the massive repression of homosexuality...

Narcissism is the only product of repressed homosexuality. Be it preference for humans with a similar name, or similar look, or things evoking what they feel as « failures » in their own past in a permanent repetition of the attempt at reproducing the impossible heterosexual relation that is not

14 The picture can be seen here

https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/8/88/Dzhugashvili_with_Kaganovich.jpg

made for them, it produces only sterile relations bringing no real happiness, only perverted pleasures relying on sadism, masochism, that instill sufferings in the conscience and self-damaging behaviours. Suicide is such a behaviour. But repressed homosexuals always want to take others with them in the ultimate lie to themselves. They attempt to bind together with others, to deface them so as to mark them (to manipulate their mind) as a form of « property » that must « obey », before the final act of suicide. Expressing his narcissism through the *fait du prince* is the dream of any dictator : having a city with his own name, as Alexander the Great, or pretending to be the liberator of a people and having portraits of your own person everywhere. Understanding that promising to others gifts to their own narcissism works with most people allows to make way to more « security » for your own secret homosexuality. Yet the greatest projects have a tendency to fall on the actually feared laws of nature, competition and rivalry. Providing to everyone the social welfare promised (either informal social welfare in community projects or actual social welfare) may not actually work for several reasons, one being simply that social welfare discourages work and thus lower the average productivity of the economy, another that there are competing churches inside the State as, of course, repressed homosexuals always fight each other for the simple threat of being distanced and at threat of being outed is enough to incentivize lots of efforts and new aggressive behaviours, new attempts at moral entrepreneurship that can be expected to come with them to hide them, etc. The story of all imperialist states, in which that process was accelerated always very quickly, is a simple quasi-pedagogical exposure of this permanent acceleration : the inflating bubble of imperialism and its huge economic costs to society, producing inflation and actually encouraging improductivity for, in fact, watching the successes of the imperial State (*instead of actually working*) is presented as a natural behaviour ; yet all regimes in which the State intervenes in the economy are doomed to the same fate, as exposed for instance simply by the impossible sustainability of fiat currencies and of the other forms of economic interventionism which are needed absolutely always everywhere for sustaining the lifestyle of the imperial machines, by inflating artificially confidence in the State and ensuring to investors that it constitutes a good investment¹⁵.

The economics of sexual freedom

Repressed homosexuality produces improductivity. It leads to narcissism. People spending their time looking at themselves, comparing with each other, never make a positive contribution to society as a whole as they do not understand what love really is, and, as a reply, attempt to impose products of their own ego to others. The general theory of mankind is the fear of animals and nature, and all socialist institutions cultivate that separation which breeds in humans more fear of animals, animal spirits, nature and love. Those who pretend natural selection can be escaped attempt to select preys for their bonding and will progressively invade their lives to attempt to dominate, secure confidence in themselves, in spite of their natural handicap, by proving themselves permanently they can dominate others and forgetting their own pain, by focusing on the sufferings of the other. The State and socialism have proven consistently to be the most significant vectors of homophobia and producers of repressed homosexuality. The bubble of statism is coproduced by men and women everywhere who approve of oppression and encourage it through their own behaviour.

States need repression because they feed on the divisions to offer « services » of government-provided cruelty against the scapegoats that the repressed use for catharsis. It is obvious that the only stable set up in which people roam free is an end to States everywhere in the globe, and solely a free market, with contracts between consenting individuals, including for security, defense,

15 This is also discussed more in length in Pirot (2018)

justice... Wherever there is – for instance, a state-free continent and another area with a State it is obvious the remaining State will turn into an imperial machine using homophobia to try to invade and the simple threat, for bisexuals, of being hunted by an enemy State may be enough to encourage repressed homosexuality and start destroying from the inside the free market. This is *another* Lipsey-Lancaster paradox, its direct complement (the consequence of the « first » Lipsey-Lancaster paradox being that economic reformism from the inside to achieve a 100 % free market with no State is void and useless (It is a singularly well confirmed paradox as the « neoliberal » policies of the last forty years have mostly increased inequalities without producing more growth, exactly as predicted by Lipsey and Lancaster in 1971) and that the free market can be only achieved from outside the State and *not with its levers*).

For currency it is easy to trade stocks and shares and to slice them, with the associated rights (so for instance using phone applications, buying a piece of bread with 1/1000th of an Alphabet or Amazon stock... which is associated with 1/1000th of a dividend, 1/1000th of a voting right in the general assembly of the firm, *of course* – blockchain allows secure decentralized transactions). For defense, private companies willing to entice buyers to trust them will obviously be interested in owning nuclear missiles *and* these private companies *of course* have an interest in not having their customers nuked, so mutual assured destruction is ensured easily. Any company can take commitments and free competition increases the reliability of the shield, while diminishing costs steeply (as in States the classical overbilling and retroceding of tax money to private pockets of politicians is generalized).

On money disappearing from public accounts, a now-classical example is the research of Michigan State University scholars Mark Skidmore and his team on the 21 *trillion* dollars disappearing over 1998 to 2015 in Pentagon and Housing & Urban development administrations - it is sad however that these authors did not elaborate any explicit suggestion on the stealing obviously involved . Nothing like this can happen with private companies. No company can ever emit « currency » in this system for it becomes at threat of being buyed out. Plus, other currencies (gold, cannabis for instance) are always competing to deflate the value of overprinted stocks and shares. In other words, the free market is naturally balanced and this is no exception, there simply must be no authority around. What matters is to have no legal tender and to have an unlimited right of merchants to discriminate between buyers (no one should prevent a racist merchant to ask persons of another colour to pay three times as much for the same product than persons of his own colour, or even to refuse to contract with them – *contracts are free*). It is free competition, and solely it, which allows human progress and maximizes the amount of contacts between persons – for instance persons opposing the racism of that merchant organizing a boycott or setting up other stores with a different price range, and certainly highly enticed to innovate. Any ban (e.g. a ban on private weapons) means the beginning of a tyranny and vice-versa.

The obvious thing, however, is that refraining from sexual pleasure is extremely damaging for human health and that on the long run, all the repressed shall slowly be eliminated of the globe via simple natural selection, without *any* violence. *Patience et longueur de temps font plus que force ni que rage...* « Patience and more patience work better than force and fury » (Jean de La Fontaine).

Bibliography

Bruce Bagemihl, *Biological Exuberance: Animal Homosexuality and Natural Diversity*, 1999

Carol Blum, *Strength in Numbers*, 2002

Stéphane Courtois, Nicolas Werth, Jean-Louis Panné, Andrzej Paczkowski, Karol Bartosek, Jean-Louis Margolin, *The Black Book of Communism*, 1997

Fleur Daugey, *Animaux homos : histoire naturelle de l'homosexualité*, 2018

Victor Farias, *Salvador Allende: Antisemitismo y eutanasia*, 2005

Ludwig von Mises, *Human Action*, 1940

Ludwig von Mises, *Socialism*, 1922

Haig Patapan, *Machiavelli in Love*, 2006

Florent Pirot, *On totalitarianism and its levers : the study of Sismondi as a user's manual*, 2018, unpublished paper

Anne Régent-Susini, *Modèles et contre-modèles de la polémique religieuse selon Saint Simon*, 2008

Michael Rocke, *Forbidden Friendships: Homosexuality and Male Culture in Renaissance Florence*, 1997

Murray Rothbard, *An Austrian perspective on the History of Economic Thought*, 1995

Thomas Schelling, *The Strategy of Conflict*, 1960

Mark Skidmore et al, 2018, available at <https://msutoday.msu.edu/news/2017/msu-scholars-find-21-trillion-in-unauthorized-government-spending-defense-department-to-conduct/>

Priscille Touraille, *Dimorphismes sexuels de taille corporelle : des adaptations meurtrières? : les modèles de la biologie évolutive et les silences de l'écologie comportementale humaine*, PhD thesis under the direction of Françoise Héritier, 2005