

09/20//2002

**Conflict, Treason and Terrorism. An Attempt at  
Psychoanalytic Understanding  
by  
Humberto Nagera MD.**

The subject of treason has received very scanty treatment in the psychoanalytic literature. Perhaps one of the reasons is that there is in each one of us, at the very least, a "minor traitor", a fact that we cannot but contemplate with some horror, fear and shame. I refer to the fact that given the nature of the Oedipus complex and the role that bisexuality plays in the constellations it adopts (positive and negative) we have all been guilty of treason in so far as we have all wanted to depose the sovereign-father and/or the queen-mother and occupy their respective places. There are then the multiple consequences and derivations of the above all through our childhood and developmental histories. Glover (1940) in his book, The Psychology of Fear and Courage, describes graphically what I have in mind when he says: "...those who retain vivid memories of the seamier side of childhood, family and school life will have little difficulty in recognizing some of the predisposing causes of Quislingism<sup>1</sup>. The simple case of the younger son who 'gives away' an older brother...; the school-boy who sneaks to the teacher...; the child with a grievance against his parents who idealizes the head of the house next door..." (p. 55). If one adds to this our natural ambivalence, our tendency to love and hate the same object, etc, one can see the fertile ground for later forms of what I will refer to as benign (or minor) forms of treason. I

---

<sup>1</sup> Derived from the notorious Second World War Norwegian traitor Major Quisling.

believe these phenomena to be quite common, and possibly an unavoidable fact of life. But it is not to these types of treason, interesting as they may be in their multiple varieties and dynamics, that this paper addresses itself.

#### **A brief review of the literature:**

---

Beyond Glover (1940), there is the paper by James Alexander (1969) which deals briefly with the issues of dissent, and particularly treason and sedition as the more destructive forms of dissent. He concluded that: "Intrapsychically treason or strong treasonable and seditious potentialities implicate large areas of the total personality and the character structure of the individual in a pathological process" (p. 162). As he sees it " "The primary structural sites of these pathological processes are defects in the super-ego and ego-ideal." (p.162).

Greenacre (1969) refers to "a fissure-like defect in the superego (including the conscience and formation of ideals)" of the traitor to which she adds "the invasion of emotional relationships by the excessive need for possession and power" growing out of unusually strong and unresolved infantile jealousy; distortion of the sense of identity sometimes with secondary disturbances in reality testing..." (p. 203) .

Kapp's (1968) "Ezra Pound's Creativity and Treason : Clues from his Life and Work" throws some light on the role of Pound's manic-depressive illness (perhaps one should say schizo-affective disorder)

in his diatribes against the United States, Roosevelt and the Jews broadcasted from Rome in 1941. They led in 1945 to a charge of "giving aid and comfort to the enemy." But his paper does not discuss treason as such.

Jacobson, in her paper (1970) "The Paranoid Urge to Betray" described the tendency of "patients with paranoid personality structure to commit acts of betrayal...as an expression of their major intrapsychic conflict" (p. 72).

From the above is clear that treason can take many forms, appear in many contexts and obey many causes. It is clear too that we are in need of some systematization of the many possible varieties of these phenomena, if individuals and nations, are going to be able to protect themselves from the severe forms of it. But first we need to clearly define the terms we will be using.

#### **Definition of treason:**

The definition of the term treason according to the Scribner-Bantam English Dictionary (1979 Edition) reads as follows: "n. betrayal of allegiance to one's sovereign or country, as by yielding vital secrets or aiding an enemy in time of war".

Treachery is defined in the same dictionary as: 1. treasonable or disloyal conduct; 2. betrayal of trust; treason; faithlessness. The definition of traitor is: 1. one who betrays another's trust or is false to an obligation or duty. 2. one who commits treason.

For my purposes I will define treason in somewhat more general terms. Thus I define treason as a betrayal of the allegiance or trust that is due one's country, family, friends, . meaningful relationships

and one's general principles. A traitor is the person who commits such a betrayal.

The concept of treason implies that the treacherous act or behavior constituted a significant, even radical departure from expected behavior in a given situation. The concept includes that the treacherous act or behavior actually causes or could cause significant distress, damage, etc, to one or more individuals, to the self and/or to generally accepted principles, as well as to nations. It similarly includes the idea, that such behavior or acts of treason would be considered unacceptable, highly undesirable or even outrageous, by a large majority of those people who share a similar cultural background with the traitor. The implication that follows is that the act of treason will automatically call for the condemnation of the relevant social group.

But treachery and treason, as would have been noticed from the definition, may occur and be relevant in the context of two individuals such as two friends, two colleagues, lovers, etc. The betrayed one will show similar reactions to those described concerning larger groups of individuals, nations, etc.

**Malignant (or major) and benign (or minor) treachery or treason:**

It is immediately apparent that the severity of the treacherous act, in the ethical sense, and in terms of its consequences fall in a continuum. At one extreme the treacherous act will be considered reprehensible and the consequences of it may have catastrophic proportions. At the other end, there will be those acts that, though similarly reprehensible in the ethical sense, do not imply the same seriousness in terms of the importance of the principles violated or the severity of consequences described above. In between, there would be all kinds of gradations.

To simplify matters a little, we could refer to the higher extreme of the continuum as malignant (or major) treachery or treason and to the lower extreme of the continuum as benign (or minor) treachery or treason.

It is my contention that the malignant or major forms of treachery or treason can only occur in individuals with certain specific constellations of conflicts, or if you will, specific (and quite complex) forms of psychopathology with very idiosyncratic developmental characteristics, dynamics, defense activities and personality traits. I should add that though all major traitors share these traits, the reverse is not necessarily true, that is, not all those that share these traits are destined to become major traitors.

Thus, some sort of narcissistic fault seems to be a sine qua non element in the personality of the malignant traitor. But this must not be understood to mean that such a formula is specific to him and not to other forms of personality disturbances or psychopathologies. Indeed, the opposite would be much closer to the truth. In other words, narcissistic faults are quite common and widespread and are seen in many of the so-called character disorders, narcissistic disturbances and in the various forms of borderline personalities. And yet, the large majority of such individuals as belong to the three groups mentioned, do not partake of the other significant characteristics and developmental events that give the final and genuine hallmark to the potential traitor and its psychology which, in my view, constitutes a very specific and idiosyncratic group of individuals.

**The role of the ego:**

One of the characteristics of the hallmark of the traitor is a good, intact and not infrequently excellent ego. I mean here of course in the cognitive-functional-intellectual sense only, since in other areas their egos may well be somewhat impaired or dysfunctional.

Clinically, too, it would be observed that the genuine traitor is highly prone to be narcissistically injured, which given his deficits in this area frequently happens to him. The narcissistic elements in their personalities are clearly discernible and visible as the cause of these injuries as are the attempts, maladaptive or not to restore their narcissistic integrity or, in other words, a good feeling about themselves. That there are significant narcissistic problem in the malignant traitors is shown by the difficulties seen regarding their self-esteem regulation, self-regard and feeling of self worth and problems with their identities. This is clearly visible in the biographies of most major spies, prior to the act of treason. Philby, Burgess and Mclean are good examples of the above. They exemplified the type of profile the Russians had drawn in order to identify possible recruits in Oxford and Cambridge Universities, in England. They were recruited while in college and were developed through many years i.e:

- 1) Very bright, so that they could eventually occupy important positions in government. (Moles)
- 2) Poor father figures in their lives. Non-interested fathers, or fathers that played little or no role in their lives. Hence another narcissistic injury..
- 3) Poor self-esteem, self-regard and poor feelings of self worth, etc

4) **The Oedipus complex and treason:**

The would be "traitor" reaches the Oedipus conflict handicapped by his narcissistic lags. Typical, and specific for them, is an enormous unsatisfied wish for the father's love, attention and admiration, that for various reasons and frequently through no fault of their own, they do not seem able to obtain. Thus, a tormentuos and ambivalent attitude toward the father "who does not think much of them", or "does not pay them enough attention" or simply and truly does not care for them is quite a common complaint and an important part in the dynamics of the traitor. Generally, as one would expect by the time the traitor is an adult he reactively and defensively may think poorly of the father or see him as weak or worthless, a man of little accomplishment or value.

Thus far this is not very different from the developmental history of many other human beings. The difference consists in what this patient needs from the parents. Somewhere between the ages of two and a half and five (at the peak of the Oedipus complex) he longs for the father as the only possible restorer of his narcissistic damage and needs. Father's admiration, attention and love, much more than mother's, was felt as a palliative whenever it was experienced. Perhaps this is due in part to the fact that the early narcissistic injuries do happen in the context of the mother-child relationship when they take place during the first year of life. On the other hand, the same is true if the narcissistic problem comes from the beginning of the secondary narcissistic stage that again happens to start with, essentially, in the context of the mother-child relationship. The mother is not only the first meaningful object but the regulation of self-esteem and the establishment of self-regard is mostly dependent on the interaction with her. The father as we know plays at this early stage, and in relative terms, a very secondary role. Thus, with the move to the triangular awareness

and relationships that are characteristic of the Oedipus complex, the father's importance and significance comes into its own, not only vis a vis the child's relation to his mother, but in regards to many other developmental processes.

It is now, and because of the earlier failure of the mother-child interaction to help him regain a stable narcissistic feeling, that the figure of the father as the possible "restorer or healer" of the narcissistic injuries becomes all important. In this type of psychopathology the father, for the above reasons, is seen as omnipotent and omniscient and as the only promise of relief. Given that this basic fault cannot be corrected in reality by all of the father's admiration, given that this type of child is highly prone to narcissistic injury through any real or imagined neglect, he is soon disappointed in him. Further, given that the child's oedipal strivings for the mother are in conflict with these special "longings" for the father, the situation cannot but end catastrophically.

From that moment onwards the father (and later by extension the fatherland) becomes the subject of a sordid discontent. He is seen as unfair, unjust to his children, unwilling to recognize their merits, to soothe their pains, to restore their well being, in short, to give them their dues (retranslate this in your minds into complains about society social ills). The reinforcement of these hostile and destructive feelings that comes from the positive Oedipus complex seals the fate of the father (potentially the fatherland) and the child. He will be forced into the path of revenge and, since his unconscious hate knows no limits, sooner

or later, in one form or another, he will attempt to destroy the father. The act of treason will become the means to his revenge and to the symbolic destruction of the father.

**Treason looked at developmentally:**

The "act of treason itself needs to be examined and understood in all its ramifications and its symbolic meaning in order to clarify the psychology of the traitor. Thus in the "potential traitor" the disappointment in the father's ability or willingness to make him whole drives him to the disappointing mother, now dressed in her new oedipal robes. Two developmental currents now converge and reinforce each other and the outcome is as much the result of an act of revenge towards the father as of interest in the mother. From this moment onwards his whole psychic life and endeavors will be devoted to supplant the father, to surpass him in terms of the mother's affection, indeed to take possession of her. Here again we are in the familiar territory of the Oedipus complex. But there is a significant difference in the traitor's psychology that makes his Oedipus complex somewhat unique. For him it is not enough to gain the affection of the mother at the expense of the father, to surpass him in her affection, while the death wishes are kept strictly confined to the realm of fantasy, as would undoubtedly be the case with normal people or neurotic patients. Unfortunately, in the case of the malignant traitor this destructive fantasy must be acted out in real life just as the conquest of the mother is acted out in real life, though in a displaced form. What I want to underline at this point is the similar necessity for the traitor to act out, at times, in a very concrete, specific and dramatic manner, the

destruction of the father. Think for example of the actual assassination or attempts of assassination of presidents in this country or of political leaders around the world all through history. Of course this is the extreme of the destructive acting out continuum towards the father frequently carried out by psychotic or otherwise very disturbed people. At the other end of the same continuum there are infinitely numerous, but somewhat less dramatic, examples, though not necessarily less malignant, of the same behavior. All this is in sharp contrast

with the simple, normal or neurotic vicissitudes of the Oedipus complex of human beings, that do not reach the acting out heights that I am describing here. Indeed, the authority of the father figure gets imbedded in the superego of the normal or neurotic individual. From there it modulates and controls behavior so that these intended violent, savage, damaging acts (whether they include an actual death or not, or they actually result or not in the malignant consequences that are desired) are forbidden. These acts can only be performed in the case of the ordinary neurotic personality in a highly displaced symbolic and mostly non-vicious form. This difference I consider of the greatest significance and of important differential diagnostic value.

But this is by no means the only important difference. Perhaps more important is the fact that the rage towards the father must include the simultaneous damage, sell out, or symbolic destruction of that which the child thought to be most important to the father, that is, the father's wife, or in other words, the child's own mother (and by extension the motherland). It is thus a doubly vicious blow that must be accorded the

"father", usually in the form of its symbolic substitutes in the case of traitors. What I have in mind here can best be exemplified by the many (and nowadays quite common) stories of "spies", "moles" and "traitors". In other words, at the same time that

the father is betrayed, included in the very act of betrayal is a sellout of the mother, i.e, the motherland.

### **The multiple scenarios of treason:**

What I am saying is that the Oedipus complex can and is reenacted in a large variety of scenarios. There is for example one's country as representative of the mother who is felt as possessed, controlled and in the hands of the politicians in power, presidents and prime ministers, who thus become surrogate father figures.

In a smaller scenario, such as a corporation, the corporation itself represents the mother (motherland) and the president of the corporation, chairmen of the board, etc, represent the father who is seen as in possession of the mother (motherland). It goes without saying that the many forms of the childhood Oedipus complex are frequently reactivated and acted out in these different types of scenarios.

I can say, without a shadow of a doubt, that after seven years of experience as the director of a mayor program and hospital in a mayor university center, that such positions automatically places one in the situation of a father figure vis a vis the hospital or the university. The latter two representing the mother, "owned, possessed and controlled" by the director-father. The staff members become the children of the family and re-enact their sibling rivalry among themselves in their attempts to gain the good will of the parents (mother-hospital,

father-director).

If any rational decision was made by the father-director that proved beneficial to one member of the staff, the other "children" get quite upset wondering why it is that they are not automatically bestowed a similar or greater favor. By the same token, the father-director position is eyed by the younger and upcoming ambitious professionals as a highly desirable situation. In their fantasies they long to oust the father and take possession of the mother. At times, the situation becomes, for a detached observer, like a three ring circus.

In fact, the success of the father-director in running an efficient organization, is very much dependent on his ability to recognize all the above, and to reduce it to rational proportions. Disturbing and disruptive as these situations can become, they lack the malignancy that we see in other cases, as long as they involve only the acting out of the Oedipus complex of "neurotic" individuals.

Unfortunately, all these myriad of possible scenarios, particularly those at the national government level and international politics, are populated by individuals whose character structure and personality embodies forms of psychopathology that must be considered somewhat outside the "neurotic realm" though not necessarily psychotic. Such individuals may be potentially dangerous in rather lethal ways. **(Read The Venona Papers)**

Naturally, the same line of thought would apply to actually psychotic individuals, since their enactment of their Oedipal fantasies in real life is not subjected to reality testing, and is furthermore under the compulsive motivational forces of their delusional ideas, their disturbed thought processes and their lack of

good judgment. All of this combined makes them particularly dangerous as the assassination attempt in the case of President Reagan so clearly demonstrated. **(Judy Foster)**

Yet many attempts at political assassination are done by so-called political idealists, the discontented and/or fanatics who cannot, by any stretch of the imagination, be considered psychotics or borderline.

The kind of treachery I am trying to deal with here can be observed in many different contexts and acquire many forms.

The three most notorious British spies, Philby, Maclean and Burgess, after years of spying for the Russians defected to the Soviet Union (once their covers were blown apart) are another example of the various forms that lethal, damaging treason, can take. The extent of the damage done by these individuals, is difficult to ascertain, but according to Page et al. in their book on Philby, it might have been considerable. They said, "Clearly, this is what was in the mind of one Foreign Office man when he said that 'Philby robbed European countries of their freedom'". (p. 290). **(EXPLAIN THIS)**

The biographical studies of spies and the observation and treatment of patients with the makeup of the personality of the traitor, the psychology of the traitor, throws some light on the mechanisms of defense that are frequently employed by such characters, as well as on some of the various other conflicts involved.

Thus for example, the passive homosexual longings for the father, remain quite active all through their lives and constitute a constant source of conflict that represents a serious threat to the masculinity of those in this group that have achieved a more clear sexual identity. In such cases the "I don't love you, I hate you" defense mechanism becomes operative. Denial in action, by means of an unnecessary defiance and

militant attitude against "father figures" is of course seen, as are all the varieties of difficulties in relating and accepting figures in authority, pecking orders and hierarchical structures.

**Treason, externalization. projection, rationalization and intellectualization:**

Another hallmark is the nearly incredible tendency of these patients to externalize, project, rationalize and intellectualize their own inner designs.

Typically, the genuine traitor is generally unaware of the true nature of his intentions, or his actual treachery when it occurs. Though obvious to everyone else, in most cases he is totally oblivious of his behavior and the consequences of the situation he may well have created. This incredible feat is due to the amount of denial they use in combinations with other defenses.

In fact, the genuine traitor manages to believe that his behavior is fully justified. Indeed, they see it as the only honorable behavior left to somebody who thinks of himself as they do, as highly principled individuals trying to correct "injustices," or stop the "unprincipled behavior of others", or to correct what are considered by them "intolerable social ills". As the result they are led to idealize, with the help of many rationalizations and intellectualizations, socio-political regimes that are in fact paradigmatic of those evils that they mean to correct. Obviously to get to that result substantial amounts of denial, externalizations, rationalizations and intellectualizations are necessary. These defense mechanisms are used on an ad hoc basis or in other words in specific situations that arise suddenly, and where the patient, in order to be congruent, to remain sane, to keep his psychic order and integrity, must achieve quickly a considerable distortion of both his internal and external reality.

Still more important is the fact that these types of defenses are needed constantly in place as well, in order to keep internal and external reality permanently distorted. In this way they escape the overwhelming conflicts that would otherwise arise, with the accompanying guilt, anxiety and depressive feelings that need to be constantly warded off.

It follows that many of the traitors do in fact build a character structure that fulfills a double purpose. On the one hand it solves the conflict that would otherwise become manifest. On the other hand, it actually allows an idealization of the objectionable behavior, so that the genuine traitor actually believes he acts motivated by the highest of principles.

Page, Leitch and Knightley, in their 1968 book, Philby, The Spy Who Betrayed A Generation, (which accounts for the lives and exploits of the three British traitors mentioned, Philby, Burgess and Maclean) stated: "essentially they were moved by a quasi-religious faith: they believed the Soviet Union was somehow cleaner, purer and better than their own country because it claimed to have adopted Communism. Like religious zealots in many ages before, they would justify everything in their careers—treachery, cruelty, even murder—by pointing to the cause. Like the chorus in Brecht's classic of Communist revolution, The Measures Taken, they would say: 'What baseness would you not commit to root out baseness?'" (p. 289).

### **Treason and the distortion of ego and super-ego ideals:**

I want you to notice and reflect on the distortions that all this implies in terms of their ego and superego ideals. It has to be pointed out that these mechanisms are the ones frequently

operative in the ego and superego ideal formation of the doctrinaire, the fanatic and other similar fellow travelers. The importance of this in terms of the struggles among various political ideologies, socio-philosophical systems, etc., cannot escape anybody. One only needs to be reminded of the recent acts of terrorism such as the attempt at assassination of the Pope, the assassination of President Sadat, the events in Iran, the Oklahoma bombing, the Pan-Am incident, the Twin Towers in New York, the suicide bombings in Israel, etc.

Of course, the same line of thought applies to the assassination of President Kennedy, the attempts on the lives of Truman, Ford, Reagan, and others just to mention a few.

Indeed, one gets the distinct impression that the potentially lethal psychological structures and conflicts that characterize the personality of some of these individuals, is more easily actualized when a social, philosophical, political or religious (the case of the terrorists now) vehicle is found, offering the opportunity to create such "idealizations." By such means the otherwise objectionable potential behavior is turned into a highly desirable actual one by individuals operating within such systems. It is perhaps for this reason that at times when there are increases in the socioeconomic, politico-philosophical and religious struggles, we generally see these violent acts acquire epidemic proportions while in more "normal" periods, they are more in the nature of isolated events and more within endemic proportions.

#### **The role of externalization and projection:**

Another no less important component of the hallmark of the personality of the traitor is the direct consequence of the generous use made of externalization and projection. Deep down the traitors

are fearful individuals. They can in many cases show a cool and calm demeanor, but deep down, and in their fantasy life, they are enormously suspicious of everybody else's intentions vis a vis them. In a few patients that I have seen of this type in analysis\*, hours and hours on end were spent discussing and examining the imagined, negative intentions, plots and counter-plots that are being fabricated against them. Occasionally, such concerns reach truly paranoid proportions, though the type of patient I am referring to here is not a psychotic patient. The world is for them a jungle where in every corner, behind every tree, there is a conspiracy to smear, depose or otherwise damage them. The remarkable thing is the absolute blindness and the extraordinary resistance these types of patients display to any attempt to show them what they fear from this or that individual, this or that situation is nothing more in most cases, than their own intentionality externalized as well as the result of their liberal use of the mechanism of projection.

**Self-esteem regulation and treason:**

Finally, let me refer briefly to one very puzzling aspect of the psychology of the "genuine" traitors. It concerns the issue of the regulation of their self-esteem, since given their original narcissistic faults, it remains a constant and special problem. We should note too, the damage that overflows to the self-image, self-identity, sexual identity and particularly feelings of self-worth and self-regard.

---

\* These were ordinary patients, not spies. Not everyone with the recipe to become a traitor does so. There is the question of opportunity, proselytism, and very many other factors that determine the final outcome. These patients were better defined as "minor traitors".

It is interesting to realize that the preparatory stages to the act of treason, up to the point when the distortion of the internal and external realities are put in place, and the final "idealized" ego system is put in position, achieve quite efficiently what nothing else could achieve. In other words, they seem to heal over the narcissistic wounds in some cases more or less permanently, and at the very least temporarily. Similarly, a high degree of resolution is achieved in terms of the problems that pertain to their self-images, feelings of self-worth, self-regard, personal identity and self-esteem regulation. This "incredible feat" is achieved because the new systems of ideals are the new measurements against which the ego gets assessed, and they are fulfilling successfully its requirements. Out of that interaction they get a new self-image with sufficient self-regard and a very considerable improvement in their self-esteem. Now that they are totally devoted to the new highly idealized cause and that they work consistently, "loyally" and persistently for it, they become a "new persona"!, whose new system of ideals generously rewards their efforts.

For the first time perhaps, they come as close to a feeling of completeness and wholeness as they will ever have. For the first time, their wounds seem as if they were healing, their self-esteem improving. For the first time too, they feel truly important.

We need to understand now how the substitution of the old introjects and ideals, that regulated and modulated behavior previous to the change, comes about. We are after all well aware that these introjects, whatever their nature are stable structures that are not easily, if at all, changeable. We do know, of course, of situations in which this is possible

under special circumstances. I am referring here to the phenomenon that takes place generally under the auspices of group psychology. Under such conditions, substantial aspects of an individual's standards are substituted by those of the leader, at least temporarily. As Freud pointed out in his 1921 book, Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, under these conditions such individuals are capable of behaviors that would be objectionable to them under normal circumstances.

Looking in that direction we can further understand by which means the genuine traitor and some terrorists (the native ones) manage the many changes that take place in their internal world. Two factors are relevant here. First, there is the gradual cathexis in the most intense manner of a group of highly idealized, abstract ideas though generally quite distorted and deformed. To this is added the second factor, that is, at some point and in some cases he joins others, either overtly or covertly that are similarly devoted to the "cause."

Thus, the idealized but generally distorted abstract ideas, become the most significant "object" capable of substituting as new superego introjects for the earlier ones. Freud (1921) very precisely described this by saying: "Contemporaneously with this 'devotion' of the ego to the object, which is no longer to be distinguished from a sublimated devotion to an abstract idea, the functions allotted to the ego ideal [i.e., superego] entirely cease to operate. The criticism exercised by that agency is silent; everything that the object does and asks for, is right and blameless. Conscience has no application to anything that is done for the sake of the object [in this case an abstract set of ideas, i.e., the cause]; in the blindness of love

remorselessness is carried to the pitch of crime.<sup>5\*</sup> The whole situation can be completely summarized in a formula: The object [i.e., idealized system] has been put in the place of the ego ideal [meaning the superego]" (p. 113).

If we add to the above the changes brought about by joining the group We can understand what a powerful combination this can become. In the words of Le Bon's quoted by Freud (1921): "Whoever be the individuals that compose it...the fact that they have been transformed into a group puts them in possession of a sort of collective mind which makes them feel, think, and act in a manner quite different from that in which each individual of them would feel, think, and act were he in a state of isolation" (p. 73).

It is my opinion that this could explain what we see happening in the case of the "genuine malignant traitor" (much of this applies to the native terrorists as well). Thus, they substitute more or less extensive parts of their superego standards by those of the new "leader" which in any given case may be an individual, an ideology or even more important a combination of both. The latter seems to have been the case in many instances of treason of the spies variety such as Philby, Fuchs and others. It was so too with McVeigh.

---

\*Thus it is said that Philby led to their deaths, through betrayal, to as many as three hundred fellow agents during the course of his career, apparently without blinking an eye (In Philby, The Spy Who Betrayed a Generation, 1968).

These processes are facilitated by certain predisposing factors in the make-up of the personality of the genuine traitor. First, consider the inordinate disappointment in the father and the concomitant hate. There is here a peculiar in-built structural conflict between introjects that are acquired from a person that is marked simultaneously to be betrayed and possibly destroyed. This perhaps creates some sort of lack of stability in this type of introjects and in some form facilitates its substitution under appropriate conditions by a radically different set of introjects. Second, there is the perennial difficulty with the maintenance of sufficient self-regard and self-esteem. Yet the new introjects change this situation in important ways as we have seen. I believe that it is factors like these that explain not only the changes observed but the remarkable stability that some of the new introjects acquire. In the cases of Philby, Mclean and Burgess, they lasted a lifetime, and during it they were able to deal the most severe blows to their countries, friends and to democracy.

Treason, it seems, is a ubiquitous phenomenon capable of manifesting itself in large varieties of scenarios i.e., from national and international politics, where the consequences may well change the course of history, to corporate or departmental politics (in industry; campuses, etc.) where though the consequences may not be as dramatic as in the previous case, the disruption and potential damage is still significant enough.

### **References**

Alexander, James (1969), "The Psychology of Treason", Bulletin of the Philadelphia Association for Psychoanalysis, 19:158-166.

Freud, S. (1914) "On Narcissism", Standard Edition, Vol.14:67-102.

Freud, S. (1921), Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego, Standard Edition, Vol. 18:113.

Ibid, p.73.

Glover, E. (1940), The Psychology of Fear and Courage, London: Penguin Books.

Greenacre, P. (1969), "Treason and the Traitor", American Imago, 26:3, 1933.

Jacobson, E. (1970), "The Paranoid Urge to Be", Menninger Clinic, 35:72-76.

Kapp, Frederic T. (1968), Ezra Pound's Creativity and Treason: Clues from his life and work, Comprehensive Psychiatry, 9:414-427.

Page, B., Leitch, D., and Knightley, Ph. (1968) Philby, The Spy Who Betrayed a Generation, London: Andrew Deutsch Limited.

**Fatherland:** dutch (vaderland);german (vaterland). A person's native land or sometimes the land of his ancestors. **Motherland:**a person's native land 2.a country thought of as originator or source.

**Combined parents phantasy.**