

Establishment Misogyny and Paedophilia, how and why has it continued so long.

Philip & Willow Stokoe

Introduction

I want to begin this talk by thanking David Morgan for allowing me to continue to share my views on this platform; I have contributed to each season of Political Mind.

The stimulus for this paper was the release of the Epstein Files and my memory of my own discovery of what would have been more accurately titled 'Societal misogyny and paedophilia' (The problem with giving a title before the paper is written is that it often falls out that you wouldn't have offered the same title now).

When it was known that I would be presenting this talk, there was a response that suggested that women should be speaking about this rather than men. It seemed to me that this also indicated both a fixed belief about the only place from which to 'observe' the phenomenon and an assumption that I would, entirely because of my gender, be unable to address it fairly.

Of course, it is absolutely true that women have been the butt and object of this assault and have been speaking about the attitude, expressed by men, since the beginning of feminism. I have been very influenced in my thinking by the literature from that source. I also take the point that, since the Epstein files were released, male commentators have filled the airways with banal avoidance of the accusation of complicity. I shall be basing my part of this paper on my discovery of my own complicity.

In order properly to collate this body of work, I invited my daughter, Willow, to be my co-author. She has carried out meticulous research into what has been written on this subject in the last few years. This research has revealed the impervious nature of the source of the continuing assault on women; by impervious I mean astoundingly resistant to all challenges and critical exposure of the misogyny that feeds it.

This research also revealed an unexpected identification with the belief system that accompanies the misogyny by a large population of women.

So, the first part of this paper is Willow's report. Bear in mind Willow has a rather dry sense of humour... no idea where that came from.

Establishment Misogyny Research:

"Institutional responses to sexual harassment and misogyny towards women teachers from boys in Australian schools in the post-#metoo era"

Xuenan Zhao, Stephen Roberts and Stephanie Wescott, 2024

This paper examines sexism and harassment perpetuated by young boys against their female teachers and school staff, demonstrating that anti-feminist, misogynistic behaviour starts being normalised at a very young age, and is often excused by (often male) higher authority within the school.

It examines the “school leadership’s hesitancy accurately to name particular behaviours as misogyny and sexual harassment, often identifying it instead as a disrespect/discipline problem” - there is simultaneously a fear and a disregard for the terms ‘misogyny’ and ‘sexual harassment’ here.

There is some sort of noble idea that you cannot accuse a young boy of such a thing because ‘think about his future!’ which minimises the experience of the women or girls involved and decides, on their behalf, that what they went through couldn’t possibly have been that serious. Clearly, with this standard of behaviour and lack of consequences as a precedent when it comes to protecting the adult staff members, young girls who are receiving similar treatment are growing up with a totally skewed view of acceptable behaviour and the types of things they are allowed or expected to feel upset about. They will be moulded by these early-life experiences into better victims for men in the future.

The paper highlights the blame-shifting that takes place - “Yet, in many cases of sexual harassment in schools, it is women teachers – rather than boys – who are seen as the problem (Keddie 2007; Robinson 2000)”. Because why would it be a sensible idea to curtail harmful behaviour and teach the young boys involved about real-world accountability and consequences? Clearly the better alternative is to encourage them to believe that they can get away with anything. If one can freely harass and degrade an adult, let alone a teacher, then who’s to say what can happen between a male and female pupil.

The paper refers to the enormous increase of “red-pill”, anti-feminist material (e.g. Andrew Tate) online, content which is within reach for anyone with access to the internet. Not only are young boys learning from their day-to-day experiences at school that misogynistic behaviour of various degrees is fully acceptable (perhaps even encouraged), but they are also being exposed to very enticing, manipulative rhetoric that places them at the top of the food-chain, makes them feel special and entitled to behave in whatever way makes them feel good and powerful.

Just to clarify, the Red Pill is a reference to the film, ‘the Matrix’ when Morpheus offers Neo the choice between taking a red pill (which opens his eyes to reality) instead of the blue pill which maintains the delusion.

"Red Pill Women: Heterosexual Fantasies in Misogynistic Spaces"

Pauline Hoebanx, 2024

This paper specifically examines women who subscribe to red-pill ideology and “TradCulture” (“idealized re-imagining of the white, American, heteronormative, and middle-class family model [that] naturalizes gendered roles and obscures underlying racist and classist systems of power”)

It finds women on this subreddit are ‘taking and leaving’ what they like from the male-centred ‘red-pill’ ideology. There are individuals who, whilst embracing the red-pill ideology, claim that they are *not* subscribing to the oppressive dominant/submissive gender roles inherent to that ideology, seemingly without any awareness that it ALL comes from a place of internalised misogyny and adherence to a male-centric way of thinking and behaving. It is giving away your agency and individuality. It’s safe to assume that many of the women who are drawn in by the red-pill or traditionalist way of being grew up surrounded by what everyone else would call misogyny, but to them it was the natural way of things.

"#MasculinitySoFragile: culture, structure, and networked misogyny"

Sarah Banet-Weiser & Kate M. Miltner, 2018

All about toxic masculinity.

"In September 2015, the hashtag #MasculinitySoFragile was trending on Twitter. The ostensible purpose of the hashtag was to illustrate the precariousness of "toxic masculinity," a (heterosexual) masculinity that is threatened by anything associated with femininity (whether that is pink yogurt or emotions). Certain groups of men conflated this attack on the construct of masculinity with an attack on maleness and responded, rather ironically, in a macho and violent manner. In a tweet that became emblematic of the entire kerfuffle, Twitter user Mech of Justice (@mechhofjusticewz) sneered, "I challenge any female tweeting unironically with #MasculinitySoFragile to last three rounds against me in a fight. We'll see who's fragile.""

It is genuinely scary to segue so immediately to gleefully threatening violence.

There seems to be a real, ingrained entitlement and feelings of deserved superiority over women that makes men take any little thing, no matter how irrelevant or unrelated to them or their masculinity and find a way to be victims about it.

These kinds of men have decided that women wanting to be equal means that they will be forced to submit. Very telling.

This paper makes me think of the "Man vs Bear" dilemma/thought experiment that swept over social media recently. The question was essentially, 'would you rather be alone in the woods with a man or a bear?' Men were not happy about this. Women who chose the bear were harassed online by men who took this as a personal insult, and proceeded to prove the experiment right by threatening violence, or describing all the ways that the bear would brutalise the women in the imaginary scenario. The fact that these men, simply imagining themselves not being favoured over the bear, immediately started imagining violent ways that the woman in the scenario would suffer and die is a uniquely unsettling thing. How many other ways do these men justify fantasising about femicide.

"Institutionalized Misogyny: A Call to Action"

Nora V. Becker, Nicole M. Hadeed & Allison L. Ruff

This paper refers to medical misogyny!!

"Furthermore, these assumptions can bear fruit in unexpectedly dangerous ways. During the recent COVID-19 pandemic, the availability of personal protective equipment (PPE) became newly important. But PPE is constructed, by default, for men's bodies and faces, and in fact, recent data shows that women fail "fit testing", the testing that verifies that N95 masks provide adequate protection, at rates twice that of men. The design of PPE quite literally sends the message, in turn, that female bodies and faces still do not belong in the role of medical provider."

This is likely passed off as a matter of "well since men's bodies are bigger on average, it makes sense to make the equipment to fit them because making them all made to fit women would make them too small for the men!" even though this literally makes no sense because the sensible thing to do is clearly to diversify the sizes of PPE as opposed to make them ALL aimed towards one body type??

There are just so many examples of medical misogyny. Beyond the above there a reference to a textbook, Advanced Techniques in Orthopaedics, that recently came under scrutiny for being filled with unnecessarily suggestive pictures of women in their underwear, while the male figures were fully covered and wearing shirts and suits.

Consider just how difficult it is to get a hysterectomy, or even life-saving treatments. Why do so many women have negative or dismissive experiences when seeking medical attention, while men do not seem to be reporting anything similar. Women's health is historically not prioritised and not studied or researched as much as men's health is. It is so, so unbalanced, and it leaves women neglected, in unnecessary pain, or dead.

"Women between Submission and Freedom: An Interpretation of Social and Political Misogyny"

Huda Sha'arawi, 2017

The women and girls in Afghanistan who are being prevented from receiving an education, for example. The men in power are doing everything they can to bring about future generations of mindless, submissive, obedient women. To keep them uneducated is to increase their reliance on others (men). I believe the Taliban has created rules that prohibit women and girls from speaking in public, or else face punishment. Is this where it's all headed for the women in Afghanistan? Everything possible is being done to turn women into nothing but living wombs, this is their value and purpose as increasingly dictated by the law.

Epstein Files:

Jeffrey Epstein: Paedophiles, Prosecutors, and Power"

Blanche Bong Cook, 2023

One major reason why Jeffrey Epstein was able to get away with his atrocities was due to rape, sexual assault, paedophilia and misogyny not being taken seriously by the American justice system. The suffering of women and children is not significant to the American justice system.

Whether it was the literal state prosecutor who was supposed to be making a case for Epstein to never see the light of day again ("In sum, Acosta had access to opulent resources for prosecuting Epstein for child sex trafficking"), or any of the police officers approached by Epstein's victims over the years who never followed through on the multiple accusations against him of rape and sexual assault.

So much more could have been done.

Rape, sexual assault, paedophilia and misogyny will continue to be normalised, uncontested and idealised if cases like this keep happening with BARELY any repercussions or serious consequences for the vile individuals at various levels of responsibility (whether it's the rapist, someone who procured the victims, someone who knew about it and did nothing, someone who accepted bribes to look the other way or blatantly refused to use the powers at their disposal to stop these people).

As well as this, there is undoubtedly an overwhelming white-bias amongst the vast majority of those who were responsible for bringing Epstein to justice. Cook describes how the case takes place “at the epicenter of mass incarceration”, and this is true in particular for People of Colour – black individuals for example are incarcerated at 5 or 6 times the rate of Whites in America. Jeffrey Epstein, a wealthy, white man, was protected inherently.

“The preferential treatment prosecutors conferred upon Epstein demonstrates prosecutors’ active involvement in the social construction of white supremacy, white heteropatriarchy, white innocence, and Black demonry. The failure to prosecute Epstein constructs white male ruling class innocence in the same way that hyper incarceration constructs Black guilt.”

“Ultimately, Epstein was indicted for solicitation of prostitution”.

I can only imagine he laughed all the way home to his private island. The American justice system saw evidence that multiple children and women had been raped by this man and not only did they determine that these victims had been prostitutes (as in, not unwilling victims), they decided that all the punishment he deserved was a year and a half in jail where, out of the 13 months he actually served, he was allowed to LEAVE JAIL FOR THE ENTIRE DAY, 6 OUT OF 7 DAYS EVERY WEEK.

If that wasn’t bad enough, during his first “arrest” and “jailtime”:

“One of Epstein’s victims, identified as Kaitlyn Doe, alleges that she “was coerced into performing sex acts with” Epstein and another woman in his office during the time plainclothes members of the Palm Beach Sheriff’s Office were providing “security” to Epstein. Allegedly, Epstein was allowed to hire the deputies, paying them to escort him to and from jail.”

I believe this without a shred of doubt. It seems like almost every single individual who was in a position to change how things turned out was morally bankrupt enough to look away or accept a bribe, directly involved and thus not incentivised to do anything, or wholly incompetent.

Exactly what was happening in the paper examining the Australian school boys and their sexual harassment towards their teachers is happening here, but on a much bigger scale. The schoolboys were made exempt from the consequences through blame shifting and an avoidance of the specific names of the crimes/misconduct/behaviour in order to minimise it.

The total neglect of consequences reinforces these types of crimes. The fact that none of these people have suffered for the suffering they’ve caused is calling it no big deal. A man who commits rape and sexual assault who sees women and children as nothing, who doesn’t care about consent, has certainly grown up consistently getting away with more and more heinous things.

Take the case of Sarah Everard, who was kidnapped, raped and strangled to death by a met police officer in 2021 during the Covid lockdown. The officer had previously been charged with FIVE counts of indecent exposure from 2015 to 2021, and yet nothing had been done.

This should never ever be possible. This should be a criminal offence in of itself.

State of mind

My part of this paper is to speak from the position of a man who has discovered how this "attitude" has been subtly introduced to my thinking and my perception of the world by those who represent most clearly this perspective of misogyny and paedophilia. In other words, I want to speak from the position of one who has been part of the male system which maintains this unconscious distortion of reality in the minds of men. In an attempt to find an analogy, I found myself settling upon recent debates about racism and particularly critical race theory. The description of how racism is unconsciously induced in such a way that individuals have a false perspective about others seems to me directly analogous to the process that I want to explore.

My claim will be that this attitude informs the thinking and perception of the world for an enormous number of men and women. I want to make it clear that I don't think this is a class thing; I believe it is a mind-warping phenomenon in every class. I shall begin with a brief description of the state of mind that accompanies holding such beliefs.

I found myself wondering why Mandelson was the figure getting the most attention from that enormous number of well-known men referred to in those files. My hypothesis was that the impact of the belief system that I'm addressing today was being enacted within the establishment media. There were many famous men amongst Epstein's group of contacts who had accepted his hospitality, in other words moved into a world where misogyny and paedophilia were graphically enacted, why were none of them being discussed in the media in the same way that Mandelson was being "analysed"? I think it's because the shock of the discovery of, often well-respected, men partying with Epstein instantly pulls the observer into that black-and-white state of mind described by Melanie Klein as the paranoid schizoid position. Shock will do that; some people would say that this is to do with the deeply embedded brain function of fight flight. I don't disagree with that, but I do say that this physiological reaction has a conscious cognitive expression. I have described in previous talks the characteristics of the paranoid schizoid position, which I think is often better entitled the fundamentalist state of mind, and I shall repeat that now.

RULED by the Ideal

GOVERNING PRINCIPLE: Pleasure

ANXIETY is about one's own Survival

LANGUAGE is that of Blame

MENTAL STATE of choice is certainty

SOLUTIONS are all omnipotent

THREAT is difference, e.g.

Help;

Valuing.

RELATIONSHIPS are either mergers or sadomasochistic.

When we inhabit this state of mind, the black and white view and the language of blame maintain certainty. It is often said that this means that 'thinking' is hated. I'd like to clarify this. What is hated is the precursor for real thinking, which is 'not knowing'. It is perfectly possible to produce apparently complex, even nuanced arguments that are built on the principles of logic. However, in my view, such arguments are always in the service of maintaining whatever belief is providing the feeling of certainty. Such writing is never an

enquiry, it is always some form of support for a preexisting belief, not always a conscious belief, indeed we shall come to see the importance of unconscious beliefs in what I shall argue is a specific iteration of the fundamentalist state of mind.

Phenomenon

As Willow has demonstrated, this phenomenon is not a simple attitude held by men; like the metaphor of critical race theory, it is ubiquitous although not identical. Women have been the objects of male disdain and denigration for a very long time. It is tempting to assign this to some sort of biological, by which I mean DNA difference and yet the historical respect held for women who are not so dis-empowered suggests this is not the case.

I shall apply one of the basic principles that I hold as essential to benign enquiry, which is to avoid the invitation to start from the iteration of whatever phenomenon you are exploring and take a step back to enable you to start your investigation at the beginning. If we're investigating the mind of a patient, it seems to me essential to have some understanding of 'normal' development so that you can get a sense of when something went wrong. It's not that we offer this view to the patient, but it helps us to maintain a compassionate link as we engage with the events in the consulting room.

It strikes me that we are encountering a problem not so much with thinking (although there is something about our thinking in this area which requires explanation) but with the impact of the discovery of difference between male and female.

This requires us to begin with what we know about the biological differences. Some of this knowledge derives from actual biological analysis, a lot more from the vast canon of psychological study of children and adolescents. What follows is my understanding of this and, like everything that I think and write about, it has to be seen as where my thinking has taken me to date; I look forward to the discussion as an opportunity to improve my hypothesis.

To begin with what comes with the DNA. You only have to watch the films that David Attenborough has made to recognise how closely we resemble the great apes. For our purposes today I want to focus on only one of those, the difference between the sexes. Males from the beginning enjoy play fighting, females not so much. There comes a particular moment in the gorilla family's day by day existence when a young adult male gorilla challenges to accepted leader to a fight. Females don't do this, they provide calm and clearly thoughtful support to the dominant male.

We might conclude from this that the aggressive drive is more powerful in males and this is certainly my claim. Furthermore, I am suggesting this is also true of human beings. You only have to be a parent and attend events where young children are brought together to see that boys have an urge to engage in aggressive play.

At this point it is necessary to anticipate something that I shall describe more in detail in a little while; successful alpha function enables feelings to be thought about rather than acted on. Action is the result of a loss of the capacity to tolerate not knowing. Aggression is action; we all know the temptation to 'confront' the bad driver and we all know that the wisest thing is not to give in to the temptation.

There is a particular evolutionary difference to the higher mammals; namely the fact that human babies are born premature. We know that this is because it would be impossible to give birth to a baby that was mature enough to stand up and move around because the size of the head would make giving birth impossible. It follows that human females have a biological predetermined instinct to care for the vulnerable. As with all 'instincts' or 'drives', these occur in both male and female but have less intensity according to sex. It's not that girls lack aggression, it's just not so central for them; in the same way boys don't lack the urge to care for the vulnerable, it is just less powerful in the make-up of their drives.

The converse is that babies expect to be 'unconditionally loved'; Bion would call it a preconception. Those of us who are psychotherapists or psychoanalysts are well aware of this because we see the enormous damage it does to babies when they don't receive that. The success of our species hangs upon this single evolutionary development.

These differences in intensity of the drives between the sexes, sets the scene, inevitably, for comparison. We might ask ourselves how the greater aggression in boys is perceived by girls and how the greater expression of care for the vulnerable is perceived by boys. I shall argue that this is the fertile ground on which an attitude of misogyny and paedophilia can be indoctrinated unconsciously.

Managing Feelings

I shall turn now to a psychological view of how this particular form of unconscious indoctrination happens. Not surprisingly, it is all about the management of feelings. Freud's view, as summarised in *Instincts and their vicissitudes* (1915) was that:

the nervous system is an apparatus which has the function of getting rid of the stimuli that reach it, or of reducing them to the lowest possible level; or which, if it were feasible, would maintain itself in an altogether unstimulated condition... let us assign to the nervous system the task—speaking in general terms—of mastering stimuli.

As I understand it, Freud's position is that the behaviour of all animals is stimulated by feelings. Mark Solms puts this very well

... let me be absolutely clear about what I mean by the term 'feeling': I mean that aspect of an emotion (or any affect) that you feel. I mean the feeling itself. If you do not feel something, it is not a feeling. (2021)

Freud assigned the term pleasure principle to sum up the link between feelings and behaviour: the intensity of the feeling drives the animal to seek an object that will satiate the feeling and thus allow a return to a pleasure state which he described as "an altogether unstimulated condition".

Freud's next claim was that human infants, in distinction to the rest of the animal kingdom, develop the capacity to turn to face reality; the reality principle. The only problem is that Freud does not describe the unique attribution of the human being that enables this to happen. Bion does. In what I am about to say, I draw upon him and James Fisher, but I also offer a development from these views.

Bion suggested that there had to be a third innate drive that could account for the different human behaviour. (I should say that a drive represents a collection of feelings) He called this K or the urge to know. I call it curiosity. He said it works through alpha function which he defined as a process turning raw data into symbols that can be thought about. My image of this is that it is like a computer programme in our minds that requires us constantly to explain what's happening to us. These explanations, of course, will never remain fixed because, the next time that we encounter what seems to be the same situation there will be sufficient difference to require a new explanation. Bion calls this learning from experience. However, there are occasions when an original explanation is not modified in the light of experience. Britton described how these kind of explanations operate as unconscious beliefs. This phenomenon will prove to be central to my thesis as we progress.

It is clear that there are two necessary steps which will enable the development of thinking. The first is to turn down the intensity of the feeling that is acting as a drive because it is the intensity that forces action rather than any other response. The second step is the development of a place for thinking. The psychoanalytic observation of children had already described the provision of the volume control; these are the first explanations about the experience of powerful feelings and are usually called primitive defences. Every single one of them involves the creation of a distance between the infant and the apparent source of the feeling. I believe that this space provides the same function vis-à-vis intensity of feeling as the volume control on an amplifier. The provision of a template for a space for thinking arises from the experience of container contained. The baby experiences mother as staying with their feelings until she is able to discover the meaning. At which point she demonstrates her understanding by providing the appropriate response for her baby.

It is the ability to think rather than act which enables the infant to turn to discover what is really going on and alpha function requires this. Thus the curiosity drive is vital to the development of thinking and to the maintenance of the capacity to face reality.

Now we have the necessary structure for thinking and it is time to consider when these things break down. In order to do this, I want you to imagine the mind made up of three drives love, hate (or aggression) and curiosity. These drives can also be described as links because the activation of any one of them requires an object in exactly the same way that Freud described.

Bion added the very helpful deduction about the mis-representation (NB. the hyphen) of these main drives which he distinguished with the minus sign. The opposite of love (-L) is indifference, of hate (-H) is the denial of hate/aggression and of K is -K mis-understanding. When the mind is in balance, L, H and K are also in balance. What I want you to imagine today is a mind that has no place for L.

The resolution of the impact on males of sexual difference

The most important part of the baby's experience of containment, as Irma Brenman Pick and Dennis Carpy have described, is the baby's awareness of mother's capacity to absorb their distress and stay with not knowing what it means while her alpha function (curiosity drive) allows her to turn the raw material into meaningful information (what's going on here?). It's not the outcome that is transformative, it is mother's capacity to manage not knowing.

This is a state of mind that Klein called the Depressive Position because it requires the capacity to mourn. Britton described how a current Depressive position (or reality facing in Freud's terms) will become a certainty or paranoid/schizoid position at its next iteration and that healthy development requires us to give up that view in order to embrace a new Depressive/reality facing conceptualisation.

When a feeling is too powerful, we move straight into the paranoid/schizoid state of mind where action is a reasonable response to that intensity and the aim is certainty. Dominic Cummings shows this clearly, his famous trip to Durham and the testing of his eyesight are a series of actions that he later tries to justify in an apparently logical series of propositions. Each 'dilemma' was resolved by an action. But his speech in the Rose garden at 10 Downing Street demonstrated something else as well, the existence of an unconscious belief in his own superiority.

The belief in one's own superiority will turn out to be critical to our understanding of the continuing belief that women are inferior and little girls, the only real opportunity to feel superior.

However, there are a few more psychoanalytic ideas to share before we get there. The first is the concept of unconscious beliefs. Ron Britton introduces this concept in his 1998 book, *Belief and Imagination*; he describes how, when he was a little boy, a slightly larger boy told him that Santa Claus didn't exist. He realised that he'd assumed Santa Claus to be a fact but now he could see it was only a belief, which, becoming conscious, could be tested. Thus, unconscious beliefs are not part of our awareness, the aura of them appears in ordinary life simply as facts.

The resolving of an internal conflict by the development of an unconscious belief is pivotal to my argument. Specifically, the conflict is a male problem and arises from the juxtaposition of those qualities arising from the powerful activity of aggression which are so clearly represented in the term, alpha male and the qualities equally clearly represented in the experience of women as personifying the ability to process the unknown through alpha function into a form that can be thought about. The conflict between facing the challenge that Britton described about the existence of Santa Claus, which would be an emotional challenge is protected by the unconscious belief that he exists. The knowledge that this is merely a belief and, therefore should provoke an enquiry is removed but the belief is experienced consciously as a certainty.

We can now consider the specific challenge for males raised by a potential awareness of the crucial difference to females. My argument is that the masculine identity is built around the dominance of aggression. A common accompanying belief is that the expression of aggression is essential to protecting the family. On the other hand, the female represents a capacity to manage not knowing because of her biologically based role of keeping her infant alive; her predisposition to care for the vulnerable. The contribution the female makes is to maintain the existence of the species. Put simply, the male might well be able to keep the family safe, but the female keeps the species alive.

My suggestion is that for most males, this difference, which recognises the more important contribution of females, is too much, so they develop a view of the world that enables them to hold onto a belief that they are more important than females.

There is a crucial next step (in psychological terms) before the final solution of the unconscious belief that I've just referred to is established. I'm thinking of unconscious envy.

Eric Brenman taught me the difference between conscious and unconscious envy. Envy is an inherent drive; the recognition of something good and the urge to have it for oneself. Here we have all the features of a 'drive' referred to by Freud; a stimulus that leads to a need to act to reduce that unpleasant experience. So babies who have not yet developed the capacity to symbolise, have to act and the action is to take the goodness.

One might see here how enormously important this is for the development of a conscious mind; it is not simply hunger and the urge to suck, it is the recognition of something more - we have already identified this as mother's capacity to transform raw experience into meaningful data that can be thought about. If baby has a 'good enough' mother, who tolerates this envy, baby will proceed to develop the capacity to symbolise and then the ability to 'turn to face reality'. This moment is for Freud the move to the reality principle, for others the start of the journey through the depressive position. Either way, the baby becomes aware of the truth that he depends upon this figure and that he is attacking her goodness. This crisis is resolved through the symbolic process by offering a symbol of that goodness that baby can achieve for himself. Thus, envy transforms into ambition.

Now let us consider the situation where mother is frightened of envious attacks. Her involuntary response to the baby's envy will be to pull away. Baby, whose primary need is nourishment, has to act to protect the source of this nourishment; and the action will be, not only to suppress the envy but to redirect it to protect his bond with mother. Envy is stimulated by goodness so, in the repression of this, the resultant Unconscious envy turns against all goodness. We can now say that it is only the unconscious form of envy that Mrs Klein was describing; unconscious envy attacks all goodness and thus creates a universe in which envy cannot function.

To put this back into the male perception of females; I suggest that the original knowledge of the difference provokes envy and, therefore the opportunity for an envious attack.

We have now assembled all the ingredients to complete the task of considering the means by which an attitude of misogyny and paedophilia can be 'indoctrinated'.

Male unconscious beliefs and the gateway to indoctrination.

As a male, I want to believe that I am dominant, if not the dominant alpha-male, then dominant in another context. This urge has been part of my sense of identity for all my life; it links to my aggressive drive and remains so powerful that its stimulation pushes me to action to reduce the intensity of the feelings.

When I mix with male friends, the context is filled with talk about winning and losing. If we are accused of being loud, we offer the excuse of being driven by our testosterone. Of course this is not true; we've been this way since play fighting in primary school; what is

true is that when testosterone finally did arrive, it caused massive anxiety because we found ourselves excited by the prospect of sex and terrified by the fear of failure. After lots of struggles, we found our different ways to form sexual relationships. But all male gatherings are still attractive.

I'm sure none of this is true for the men in this audience but I wanted to describe a recognisable scenario to make it clear that, although the Epstein files exposed a huge number of important 'establishment' men (and some women), his island is not the only venue that provides an opportunity to enact assaults on women. This is not a class thing.

I believe that the male self-image of dominance through the enactment of aggression is challenged by what they know but suppress, the more important role women play on behalf of the maintenance of the species. This evokes envy, which manifests unconsciously and seeks to spoil what is clearly 'good' in women. The yearning to believe that I am the most important requires the suppression of the knowledge that I am not.

It is now necessary to create a form of prison to keep this dangerous awareness inside, out of mind. This is provided by the belief that men are the dominant iteration of the human species. All that remains is to avoid the consequence of this claim being experienced as a belief and not a fact and that is to keep it unconscious.

This is the state that allows for additional beliefs that reinforce the central one to be welcomed in alongside what I've just described as the basic situation for most men. Thus, a belief that men are so important that they have a right to access young women who, by implication have no particular rights at all, is easily absorbed. I think that another word would describe this; indoctrination.

And here lies an important misunderstanding that occurs all the time in such circumstances; indoctrination suggests both another mind and a conspiracy. Hilariously those same 'minds' that failed to organise a successful governments are supposed to have maintained a highly successful conspiracy.

Nevertheless, it is indoctrination because it uses a previous unconscious process to act as a conduit for further and more specific beliefs.

Before I close on this description of how men are available for a particular indoctrination, I should pay some attention to those women described so clearly by Willow as the Red Pill women. How do we understand these women or others like them who appear to accept the status quo?

I think we must now register the internal conflict that arises, particularly at puberty, between an innate knowledge of your importance as the maintainer of the species and your lived experience of massive anxiety about whether you will ever get a man of your own. To be clear, the former comes with biology, the latter is one of the many vicissitudes of the development of a conscious, cognitive mind. It surely adds to your lack of security if you live in a small town where male camaraderie is part of everyday life. Here the conflict in question, i.e. the one that needs a magic resolution, is between what might feel to be somewhat mythical role of women and the direct issue of getting into a safe 'family' from

where to feel safe. Once again the same process, the resolution of an impossible conflict with the suppression of one side of the conflict using the mechanism of an unconscious belief (that women are born to serve men who, in return provide a safe family).

In this final section, I'm going to give an illustration of the power of these beliefs.

Evidence

Many years ago, I used to run the team providing a particular kind of intervention that was part consultation and part education that was very successful in the adult Department of the Tavistock clinic. Indeed, it was so successful that I had to develop a team to provide these interventions for a growing population of clients. My deputy was a woman. We were approached by a powerful religious organisation asking for help to develop a system for managing the incidence of sexual abuse by priests. A series of workshops were organised to work with the senior members of this organisation. Although a significant number of boys were abused in this way the majority of victims were girls. The request for our help came from a very senior female member of the establishment and we decided that the team should be led by my female deputy.

I found myself feeling very anxious about this intervention and, at the point where I knew there would be a morning break, I telephoned my colleague. She was extremely upset and described being the victim, along with the woman who had engaged us, of a massive assault. The apparent focus of this assault was on the psychoanalytic basis of the approach. It was viciously attacked as having being exposed as fallacy and therefore having no place with them.

I said the obvious thing, which was that she and her female colleague had to be attacked because what was intolerable was the female gaze and capacity to see below the surface, which was feared and envied. Apparently my words were helpful, and they managed to continue with the whole course.

I was left wondering about my position in this. I had justified the decision not to be part of the team on the grounds that I didn't want to appear to accept an idea of women as inferior to men. The more I thought about this the more uncomfortable I felt. It took a while, but it gradually dawned upon me that a part of me had actually set them up to be attacked.

This was the beginning of my discovery of those processes that I have described to you today. The method that we used, marked as psychoanalytic, was precisely the provision of a container in which it was possible to stay with not knowing until it became clear what was really going on in the discussions. In other words the method was an expression of that characteristic that I have argued is most clearly represented in mother's capacity to provide a safe container for her baby. I realise that I had used this way of working, which I had been committed to for a very long time to avoid having to confront my own aggression and my envy of the female capacity that I've just described.

I believe that I have managed to work free of my indoctrination, but you will be the best judges of that. On this occasion you may have noticed that I'm working alongside a woman.