

HERBERT MARCUSE



by Miles Mathis

First published November 21, 2021

I finally get to use my new skills to tear down my own philosophy education. Though I admit I am starting with someone who never meant anything to me.

When they teach guys like Marcuse at university now, they never tell you the interesting stuff. You are taught he was a Marxist and a leader of the New Left, but those things are normally sold as big positives and selling points. They don't mention his bio is one long red flag, but that is why I am here. He was Jewish, being a Kreslawsky on his mother's side. He must have been recruited by Intelligence at a very young age, since he was a Spartacist by 1918, before he even entered university. He took part in [that fake uprising](#) with Rosa Luxemburg and the rest. He entered university late at age 21 and within three years had allegedly completed both a bachelors and a PhD—meaning, his transcripts were faked by Intelligence. No one completes eight years of study in three years. He then “worked in publishing” for five years until 1928, when he returned to school to work with Husserl and Heidegger—in some postdoc program for 30 year olds, I guess we are supposed to believe. For four years he supposedly did this, while publishing nothing. His first papers came out in 1932, when he was 34.

For some reason (which you are beginning to understand) he was hired by the Institute for Social Research in 1933 (which Wikipedia lists as the *Institute of Social Research*). As a Jew, he couldn't openly work in Frankfurt in those years, so he was sent to Geneva to their branch office there. In 1934 he moved to the Institute's New York branch at Columbia University. That figures. He soon segued over to the CIA, where he was set up at least by 1942 (and maybe earlier). There he worked for Wild Bill Donovan in the Office of War Information and then for the Research and Analysis Branch of OSS. So he was a producer of propaganda from the beginning. Marxism was just his assignment. You should reread everything he ever wrote in that light. Or, since that would be a waste of time, you can now throw everything he ever wrote in the trash in that light.

After the war Marcuse was hired by the State Department to help create and disperse the Nazi story via his *Secret Reports on Nazi Germany: the Frankfurt School Contribution to the War Effort*. So you can flush the Frankfurt School as well. Unless you like reading war fiction.

In 1952 Marcuse returned to Columbia as a professor. He also worked at Harvard, Brandeis, and UC

San Diego. At Brandeis, at age 66, Marcuse published *One-Dimensional Man* in 1964, an autobiography. No, just kidding, it wasn't an autobiography, it was the usual cloaked propaganda. Many readers will be shocked by my blithe dismissal of that book, since it is normally sold as a confirmation of all I hold dear. Except that it isn't. As all controlled opposition does, Marcuse leads with a lot of sober and correct analysis to hook you, then drives you out in the bushes later. Compare him to many others, including Ted Kaczynski, who also led with a cogent critique of Modern industrial society before going off the deep end. Marcuse doesn't crash and burn to that extent: his target audience in academia wouldn't fall for that. But he more subtly turns the screw in a variety of ways.

For instance, he leads with a critique of contemporary Communist societies like Russia and China to score the usual points, but you know that as a Marxist he won't leave it at that. He will have to misdirect mightily on Marxism, and soon does. One of the ways he does is the standard way, by making you think Marx came out of Hegel. In other words, Marx is sold as a serious European scholar, extending several lines of philosophy. While the truth is Marx's ideas didn't come from Hegel or anyone else: they came from the capitalists themselves, [like his uncle Phillips and his cousins the Rothschilds](#), with Hegel only used as a cloak. More serious and extensive theories were used to dress up Marxism, making it appear scholarly. But Marxism was never more than a mishmash of pseudo-philosophies and other Alexandrian gibberish, pegged together to create maximum confusion and to explode Republicanism in as many ways as possible. Marx had about as much in common with Hegel as Harry Potter has in common with *The Lord of the Rings*, or Rowling has in common with Tolkien. Which is to say Marx and Engels were just the usual fronts for a semi-literate Intelligence committee of shallow Jews, working the Project Chaos of their times.

In this way Marcuse was cementing in recent history while pretending to critique it, you see.

Which is not to say Hegel was especially deep. I will hit Hegel later. But you see my point. Hegel had a certain intellectual cachet in the 1840s that Marx could benefit from. Hegel was a great name to drop at the time, a great source to quote and misquote.

It is ironic, because I am the perfect embodiment of the free and “negative” man Marcuse was arguing for, since no one has ever torn down so much of the contemporary world around him; but Marcuse scholars will hate me. They will hate me because my position as this man is what has allowed me to see through him, and them. That was the last thing he intended. Nietzsche's ghost would thrill to my rise; Marcuse's, not so much. The job of Marcuse, like the job of everyone else in Intelligence, was to make people like me impossible, while seeming to bustle for our promotion.

Another way he did that was through a purposely convoluted writing style, which immediately buried any reader under a jumble of imprecisions. In short, Marcuse was a terrible writer, and I have to think that, as a Marxist he was terrible on purpose. This is the way they do it. An indirect and longwinded writing style dulls the brain, setting it up for failure. Compare it to modern math, which does the same thing. Just as Modern physicists bury you under a bunch of incomprehensible operators, purposely to hide their fudges, these propagandists like Marcuse bury you under a foggy and inartistic expression, and the only way you can continue reading is to accept the squishiness they are foisting upon you. In such a state you are sure to miss most contradictions and other tricks. Your analytical abilities have been dulled by the oil-less medium you are swimming in. You start out by no longer demanding the language be clear, and end up no longer demanding the argument be clear. In that state of faux-rapture Marcuse can pass anything by you.

They later added two endless introductions to the book, and if you have any interest in reading any of

this, I suggest you notice the difference between the style in the introduction and Marcuse's own style. Douglas Kellner is the author of the first, and although he is no master of the language, his style is a breath of fresh air after that of Marcuse. Kellner doesn't exactly pack his sentences with content, but at least reading him isn't like walking through knee-deep jello. Again, it isn't that Marcuse is dense, it is that he makes you think *he* is. It makes you think maybe he doesn't really understand what English words really mean. Every sentence is a compendium of near misses, with word choice always being a bit off in some intangible fashion. The style is the opposite of conversational, being what one might call stiff and heavy academic. In short, it is a chore.

But that could be said of most writers in philosophy, all the way back to Kant and before. As I say, I suspect Marcuse took his style from Marx, and took it with the original purpose: planned chaos. Kellner tells us in the introduction that Marcuse's style is difficult due to the dialectical method, the necessary abstraction, and the requirement to think in a new way. But that isn't it. Kellner is just making excuses. Modern man definitely needs to think in a new way, but that new way should be clearer, more penetrating, and more dense with content. Marcuse is the opposite of that.

We have already seen the main contradiction of Marcuse's theory: he wants you to believe the Marxist/Hegelian dialectic can be used to free Modern man from his alienation, narrowness, and uncritical mode of existence, when in fact there is no chance of that happening. The Marxist/Modernist regimen was invented to enslave man and to turn him into this herdable beast, so it can hardly also be his ticket to freedom. Marcuse has just circled you back into the pen, you see.

Another thing Marcuse does that Marx famously did—and that Modern science also does—is muck up every problem on purpose, making it far more difficult than it should be. Reading Marcuse, one would think every problem of government policy or personal enlightenment is infinitely difficult, requiring knowledge of and nods to philosophy, sociology, economics, politics, and all human thought going back to Plato. The nearly pointless jawing is endless, and it never goes anywhere. His chapters and books never lead with a clear and limited problem or end with any sort of legible solution. Rather, we are drawn through a maze of complicated and fuzzy exegesis that never actually rises to cogent analysis. His commentary is never sharp enough to cut through even the smallest gap, and so we trudge on leaving behind us an ever-mounting pile of unchewed and undigested mulch, which is incapable of fertilizing even the smallest acreage.

Of course this critique isn't limited to Marcuse. One could apply it to just about anyone promoted in the last three centuries.

I beg you to notice that my critique of Marcuse is not the normal one you see, coming from the American right at place like the Heritage Foundation. Marcuse has been tied to Critical Race Theory and is currently being used as a pawn in that fake dialectic. But remind yourself that Marcuse was CIA and therefore not really Marxist or left at all. He was just that flavor of fascist, while the spooks at the Heritage Foundation are a slightly different flavor. But the divisions are mostly manufactured, since neither the right nor the left have any interest in making Modern man more multi-dimensional, more free, more empowered, more artistic, or more interesting. Some factions of Intelligence wish to enslave you with one set of ideas, while other factions wish to enslave you with others, but none wish to see you become any larger than you already are. If you became any larger you would be a threat to them. That is because all these people in Intel, the media, the government, and NGOs are working for one set of billionaires or another, and of course none of those billionaires got to be billionaires by educating their target audiences in any way.

In that, Marcuse was completely right, and the [Heritage Foundation obviously wrong](#). Mike Gonzalez at Heritage argues against Marcuse by claiming the US in the 1960s was never materialistic or narrow or one-dimensional. It was a paradise of freedom and opportunity that Europeans like Marcuse envied and wished to destroy. Ridiculous on the face of it, since Marcuse was CIA. Is Gonzalez suggesting the CIA wanted to destroy the US, or that Marcuse somehow fooled and infiltrated the CIA? Get real. The Heritage Foundation has been in a love-fest with CIA since the beginning, and is another front. So this is just agents pretending to squabble with one another, for your greater confusion.

Marcuse was of course right in his primary points, which is why he led with them: he knew the truth would ingratiate him to young college progressives, feeling the narrowness of their upbringing. His critique was the standard CIA critique of the US based on the truth, parroted by everyone from McLuhan to Chomsky to Kaczynski to Father Sarducci: compared to old Europe, the US was intellectually barren, creatively pinched, and artistically DOA. It was a stripped-down and dumbed-down culture led by Wall Street, Madison Avenue, and Hollywood. To deny that is just to admit to either naivete or chronic shallowness.

But as I am showing you, that doesn't mean Marcuse or the CIA was on your side. They weren't. They were circling you back into the pen while petting you behind the ears.

Which brings us back to what I said before: I remind you that I am the one that did what Marcuse claimed needed to be done—I went beyond the given modes and allowed lines of thought and criticism, analyzing both from a higher level. I have shown you BOTH sides were always fundamentally wrong, and wrong *on purpose*. And I did it by transcending the given dialectic. I pointed out that even the word dialectic is part of the pen, since it implies there are only two sides to the conversation. But since both sides are wrong, the dialectic is misdirection from the first word. It keeps you constantly looking for answers in the wrong places. It keeps the right path forever hidden by allowing light on only the two wrong paths. In this case Socialism and Capitalism, which are both disastrously wrong. The same fascists are hiding behind both and always have been, and the first order of business is understanding that basic fact.

What they have never wanted you to understand is that neither Capitalism nor Socialism are really economic or political theories, or blueprints for anything. Capitalism and Socialism are both fronts for the billionaires, and as such are only words on a cloak. The real world doesn't proceed on Socialistic or Capitalistic principles and never has. It proceeds as a vast con-game of the superwealthy against the rest of society, hiding behind theories, ideas, philosophies, and other wordgames. Everything is a vast illusion except the steal. Everything, from science to philosophy to literature to media to art is just a veil to cover the steal and the thieves.

But if you don't realize that going in, it is very hard to glean that from the literature later. Young people aren't taught any of the useful facts of history, like who these famous people are and where they came from and how they are all related. Without that knowledge, you tend to give them the benefit of the doubt, giving them a more-than-fair reading from the generosity of your pure young heart. Which is how they snare you. To get ahead in this world, you have to glom onto someone somewhere somehow, or almost everyone does. I didn't, but that is another mystery to be solved by the Muses. The point here is that without a near-miracle, you will decide to trust someone when you pick a path, and that trust will be your intellectual undoing. You will put your eggs in some basket and find them very difficult to get back, they having hatched into chickens and being eaten long ago. Working on that strange farm, you will be very disinclined to question the crop rotations, the planting schedules, or the height of the barn. Unless you are prepared to board the next boxcar and live with the hobos, your

demise is set.

So Marcuse was right about that as well. Your society is happy to lock you in early, and the American system was never any exception to that rule. But I am showing you he wasn't as broken up about that as he pretended to be. Do you really think he wanted any of his students breaking through any ceiling? No, because if they had they would have soon displaced him. He would have been out of a job. Almost no one in academia or out of it ever wanted to hatch truly brilliant students, since brilliant students would have soon exploded the entire edifice from within. That is precisely why I was always sat upon: they knew if I weren't I would do what I have done. I slipped my bonds and am now exploding the entire edifice from within.

Is anyone cheering me on, left or right? No. Everyone is scared shiftless because the last thing they ever really wanted is transcendence of any kind, either for themselves or for any hypothetical person. The last thing they were interested in was the truth. What they wanted in their heart of hearts was a small conformity, one they could nestle in permanently with no fear of progress or change. The only upward mobility they were ever interested in was a bigger paycheck for less work and less responsibility. And at the top of the pyramid, the only heaven they have ever sought is a heaven of stupider marks and easier billions. Art was something that used to accidentally get done by some oddballs, but now that it no longer is almost no one misses it. The same is true of science and literature, which, if they aren't money laundering fronts or treasury dips or propaganda fronts, are considered worthless.

So, as a matter of dimensionality, things are actually much worse now than they were in Marcuse's time. Man is no longer even one-dimensional. He is now zero-dimensional, flatter than a formica countertop and harder on the head. The all-consuming media has masticated Modern man into spent gumball, stuck to the underside of the devil's desk. This "man" has shrunk down to a dimensionless point and finally disappeared into Dirac's vacuum sea, and to get anything out of him we will have to borrow from the future or invoke time reversals.

Of course I exaggerate for effect, trying to embarrass this man into crawling back through the wormhole and getting on his own two feet again. There is only one way to do it, and it ain't by reading Marcuse or the Heritage Foundation or consulting any of the other million Intelligence fronts posing as educators in this world. The only way is to tell all those on both sides of the "dialectic" to fuck off and get out of your way. You have work to do and it won't be done by bowing before any of the masters or mentors offered you by the mainstream, or by the alternative stream either. It will be done by listening to your own Muse, who has always been your best guide. Turn off all the contraptions and contradictions and conmen and return to Nature, who is your real master. If you can again conjure the quietude, you will hear her speak in the softest and gentlest voice.