

# Table of Contents

<i>Forward</i>	2
<i>Chapter 1 - The 'I Am Right' Axiom: You Think You're Right About Everything</i>	4
<i>Chapter 2 - The Problem of Projection: Predictable Behaviors of Ideologues</i>	31
<i>Chapter 3 - Collectivized Projection: Shared Characteristics of Ideologies</i>	49
<i>Chapter 4 - Ex Post Facto Justification: An Exploration of Narratives</i>	84
<i>Chapter 5 - Ideology in Practice Part 1: Feminism</i>	121
<i>Chapter 6 - Identity: Axiomatic Origins and Identification of Purpose</i>	186
<i>Chapter 7 - The Political Binary Part 1: Individuation</i>	216
<i>Chapter 8 - The Political Binary Part 2: Antithesism</i>	245
<i>Chapter 9 - Ideology in Practice Part 2: Social Justice</i>	275
<i>Chapter 10 - The End of an Error: Our Literal Emancipation</i>	336
<i>Epilogue</i>	364

Forward:

This is the problem in writing about something one genuinely feels is important: one can't help but aggrandize in ignorance of whether their contribution is worthy of praise or even if the subject matter is of any import at all. My claims can only be substantiated after the fact so I imagine that I'll come off as an egomaniac, which is ironic considering the subject matter. Well if I didn't feel strongly about the truth of my position I wouldn't share it, now would I? Call my conviction in this regard a necessary evil.

Considering the nature of my argument you better believe I have challenged my position. Hell, this entire treatise is a means for me to seek out such challenge. Of course I'll get some satisfaction about being right, it will validate me, but better yet I want it to be nigh impossible to consider alternatives. In other words, it's not about *my* being right and the validation that comes with it. It's not about thinking *I'm* right or feeling that *I'm* right. It's about *knowing*. It's about *knowing the truth* regardless of who communicates it. That's all I really want. I don't want for dreams, desire praise, hope for the future or wish for anything so unreal. The only thing I want is reality. I want the one thing we all experience everyday yet cannot fully comprehend. Instead of using desire to escape I use it to drive me to capture as much of reality as I can. To break the wall of subjectivity, of self-perception that forever divorces me from the truth.

As an observer I can only communicate what I perceive and what I reason to be true. That what I say is truth is almost absolutely false, especially insofar as the limitations in our language are concerned. We may not even have a language sufficient enough to describe reality, yet this is the humility inherent to the quest for truth. See, we cannot produce truth. We can only communicate it. Truth exists irrespective of our desires for it and we must remember our place with regard to it. So I can only hope. I can only predict that I will be a suitable vector for the truth.

Now should you take my arguments as truth, regardless their validity and regardless your desire to champion me as a vector, there will be and must be a part of you that will hate me for it – at least along the way. If not then I invite you to read it again and as many times as needed until it is made manifest. Here, hatred is necessary to your understanding and edification. Hatred not just for what I say about you, implicitly through my exploration of the mind, and not just for what I know about you. Instead a hatred for all you'll know of yourself by the end. One of the products of this clarity will be remorse and so an anger toward me for having forced it. Your false innocence will not survive this treatise, but I promise you a powerful and righteous obligation in its stead. This is the exchange I offer so please, consider the trade carefully. I make no apologies. ~ V.



CHAPTER 1 - The 'I Am Right' Axiom:

You Think You're Right About Everything

## Introduction:

When it comes to matters of the mind it's necessarily a personal one. No matter what I say, no matter the conclusions I draw, it will invariably affect you in some manner. More than that, it will represent the attempt to define you, to explain you. As such it puts me in the position of claiming to know something of yourself that you don't. Furthermore in claiming some expertise regarding my position and the information therein, I implicitly claim an expertise regarding your very self, at least in part. More often than not this comes as both a challenge and an insult. A challenge in that I reveal your ignorance regarding that which you certainly claim the greatest expertise. Also in being able to do so without having met you let alone spoken with you, it comes as an insult to your comprehension. An insult to your very ability to perceive and understand something and in this case, the most intimate of somethings: yourself. That said, pride is the defence mechanism of choice here. Should you seek refuge in pride it will work for a time – some time in fact. But it won't last, especially under the weight of curiosity, itself only stymied by fear. So I don't mean to say this as an insult, but should you reject this treatise all the while manifesting such pride and underlying fear well, you're acting the fool. Foolish in that such behavior is anathema to the pursuit of truth or at least the pursuit of a differing opinion, which I assume is what led you to me in the first place. Also it's foolish in that now I've already warned you of it. So if you're keen to read through this entire treatise and with that to engage with everything I argue within it, then recognize that your very self is the greatest hurdle here. I'll certainly cover topics and peoples that you, in one way or another, are opposed to; that you seek to undermine or reform or heal or to destroy. But really, you're the enemy here. You're your own enemy, 'your own worst enemy' to borrow the phrase. Fundamentally it's you who'll first be undermined, reformed, healed, destroyed – any or even all of these things. It's unavoidable. Moreover I'm not the one who'll be doing it. You will be. I'm only your guide. I will provide you with the tools and avenues of thought required for such introspection and personal change but I can't make you use them. I can't make you 'walk the path' as it were. I can only show it to you. Furthermore no one prevails as some exemplar, some paragon standing as a testament to the benefit of this process. There is no such standing nor any hierarchy of greater enlightenment. It's not like that. It's more a matter of replacing that which you believe with that which you'll know. Replacing that which *you think is true* with that which *is true about what you think*. You gain knowledge certainly, hopefully actually, but what's more important is your loss of falsity. That you will lose false beliefs and the righteousness that accompanies them. So yes, there are people with far more

to lose than you and even those with far less to lose. But this doesn't form some hierarchy of greater enlightenment or achievement. Those with more to lose have more to gain and those with less to lose, less to gain. Should I be so successful, by the end you will all be equals in this. To the extent to which I can guide you, which is measly by my own admission, you will come to 'know thyself'. So that said, I'll first need to demonstrate that you don't.

### Seeing Things My Way: Can We Just Agree on One Thing?

What if I told you that many people, even a majority don't understand why it is they do anything? That for all intents and purposes they are living their lives on autopilot? There is a haughtiness and egotism in all of us that is eager to stand with such a claim. We are willing to lay this accusation at the feet of those whom we've disagreed with, with whom we share different views. We lay it at our ideological rivals. We mask the accusation in words like 'sheeple' or 'herd-mentality'.

Be honest with yourself, do you agree with this claim? Could you envision the people whom you'd lay such an accusation of unthoughtfulness? Did certain topics come to mind? Did you immediately think of me, your author? On what side of this divide did I fall? Was my position as the observer of such behavior enough to exempt me from my own observation? Maybe you felt some kinship with me, however fleeting, in the moment? Many do feel such kinship. They start to get the feeling that I'm an alright sort. If you felt this kinship then is agreeableness all that is required to excuse me from scrutiny? Surely not you say, but unscrutinized as I was from most of you did I not also earn a place at your side even if only in your mind? Was I not right alongside you by sheer virtue of claiming something that you agreed to with no greater evidence than that of your own experience? Are you so narrow-minded? Are you so shallow?

I observed the phenomenon and put it forth to you, the reader, so perhaps it's only natural to assume that I, the observer, should be exempt from my own observation. But what excuse do you have? Do you not fall under the category of 'the majority' or are you really so special as to claim, on your own merit, that you are unlike *most* people? Are you so egotistical? Is it perhaps because you don't take such an observation as a revelation? Maybe it's been obvious to you for years. Maybe you've heard it before. Maybe it's become an old and tired rhetoric you're sick of hearing as if it's new.

I want you to think on your answers to these questions. I also want you to engage in a bit of roleplay. Take on the persona of someone whom you would lay the accusation in question upon. In other words, assume the persona of someone you know whom you think lives their life without knowing why it is they do anything. Okay, now go through these questions again. Were your answers any different? Did this person deviate in any significant way from your own answers?

Well if you're like most people you immediately agreed with my claim and identified with me through it. A brief moment of kinship was felt and a bond, however fragile, was formed between us. I will have earned a small amount of your trust - enough to keep you reading - that with careful attention I can grow into an acceptance of my opinion and even a reverence for me personally. I could become a favored author whose works line your shelves and whose release dates you mark on your calendar. That sounds rather nice and is a harmless relationship between us, no? It's healthy fun for both of us founded on mutual agreement and also on trust. You trust me to provide you with what you like and in turn I trust you to purchase it and hopefully learn from it. You grow in knowledge, I grow in wealth, and we both grow in spirit. You may never meet me personally, indeed if I have my way you'll never know my name, but you will treat me as kin regardless. It's all the more romantic when you really think about it. I may even become your hero and the hero of many others penning book after book of mind-shaping, courageous thought. I wonder, do you already have someone like this in your life? An author whose work you admire and whose character you revere? Have a bit of fun now and compare me to this author. How lofty my dreams must be to even compare myself to the likes of them! So what was it that distinguished this author? Was it insight? Beauty? Humor? Perhaps you can't quite place it, but you know it's deep? Surely it's not something as trite as merely being agreeable, which is all I hope to have achieved by this point. Surely not.

Lost in Generalization: Applying Generalizations to Individuals

So I'm curious dear reader, what do you suspect my thoughts are on this whole matter? That is to say, what do I think about my claim and yourself? Do I find you the sort to live your life not knowing why it is you do anything? Well I couldn't, I don't know you. I don't know what it is you do or why. It would be

unjust to accuse you of such a thing not to mention unreasonable. Then again, didn't I make the claim that 'most people' lived their lives not knowing why it was they did anything? If most people were reading this right now it would be equally unjust to lay such a claim at their feet. I wonder dear reader, have I made a mistake? What exactly was I claiming and for that matter what exactly were you agreeing with? I was just making a generalization regarding human behavior right? Generalizations aren't fair though they are useful. Yet I find myself unable to accuse an individual person of whom I know nothing about of the very thing I was previously able to accuse the majority of people whom I know nothing about. That's weird isn't it? What changes between the majority and an individual? Surely it should be more difficult to accuse a majority than it is a minority and a minority of one at that. Yet the reverse is true. I suppose we are assuming an unspoken caveat. That is we mean to say that most people *in our experience* don't know why it is they do anything. Is that really true though? Can we really claim to know the motivations and intentions of others more intimately than they themselves? Can we further claim that their unthoughtfulness extends to a majority or even all of what they do, even that which we do not observe? Can we truly say anything about these people at all and if we cannot, why were we so quick to agree to something that is entirely untrue?

This is perplexing. Why would we make such an error and why were we so willing to make it? I wonder, what did you get out of it? You received a sense of kinship; fast and fleeting though it was. Do you think it was worth it for its own sake? I can't imagine it was. We understand however that this sense of kinship can turn into something much greater. Nurtured correctly it can become trust, respect, friendship, all of which are fine things to pursue for their own sake. Yet such behavior is ridiculous between us. I mean, how on earth do you expect me to reciprocate? I have no time for one of you let alone all of you. How are you going to trust a man you never meet? Respect a man you know nothing about? And friendship? I have no desire to know you. There is nothing mutual about this feeling you have. So why are you so willing to extend a sense of kinship to me? So willing to spend your time on an anonymous author? So willing to preserve a bond that you alone have created in your own mind? Are you so willing to bond with the consciousness of another person for a sense of what, I wonder?

Tutelage? Are you so bereft of teachers?

Companionship? Are you so bereft of friends?

Knowledge? Are you so bereft of thought?

Expertise? Are you so bereft of skill?

Authority? Are you so bereft of power?

Hierarchy? Are you so bereft of station?

For some of you this line of questioning has made you uncomfortable. For others intrigued. While others are puzzled. Some believe they have the answers to such questions. They know why they felt a brief moment of companionship with me. It was merely psychological. I appeared to share their opinion and so can be seen as an ally, at least thus far. Seems fair. But what are we allied in? They also know why they took the position they did with regard to my claim. They have observed such behavior prior and so put themselves in the position of an observer too. Given their feelings toward such behavior maybe they have rightly ceased it in themselves giving them moral sanction to lay the accusation on others? I wonder, is that what they think of me? Have I given myself moral sanction and so judge others with it? Seems fair. To such people this book is a waste of their time whose only saving grace is that it has wasted only a small portion of it. But they are wrong and it is exactly their sort of pride that will keep them reading despite my saying so. Or it will send them off as their pride is merely a mask for their insecurity.

Choose now those among you.

Quite honestly the people most in tune with the nature of what I'm really asking are the first group: the group that feels uncomfortable. You *should* feel uncomfortable. Something isn't right at all with this scenario. First you agreed with me. Then I did what I could to destroy my own position. Now I'm questioning your motivation for agreeing with me in the first place. I won't let it go. I'm fighting hard for you to question yourself. It's as if you had disagreed with me and I'm fighting for my own opinion to win you over. Indeed, where have you seen this behavior if not in disagreement? Have you ever met with it when you've *agreed* with someone? There is merit in such criticism of course; playing Devil's advocate as it were. We understand the danger of an echo chamber. So am I merely honing your thoughts and forcing introspection in an attempt to shape you into a greater purveyor of my own opinion? To make you a better representative of our shared belief? Is this all a test?

Were it so simple.

Dear reader it is none of these things but all of these things. That is to say all of the conjecture of the last

few paragraphs is true, but not in how you think it is. Yes, I am trying to make you a greater purveyor of my opinion. Yes, I am honing your thoughts and forcing introspection. Yes, your siding with me is psychological. Yes, you see yourself as an observer and so lay this accusation at others rather than yourself and yes, I am testing you. Yet if this is all true, how can it be false? How is it true but not in the way you think? It is not true because we don't share the same opinion. We don't agree at all with the claim and we especially don't agree on our motivations for accepting it as true. In fact, we've not been bound through any common ground at all. I disagree wholeheartedly with you and forthwith lay the exact accusation at your feet. It is you who does not know why it is they do anything.

You *never* agreed that 'most people don't understand why it is they do anything.' You thought you did, but did not. It was something else entirely. Now I don't presume to know what goes on in your mind or anyone else's. I can only speak for myself and how my own mind operates. But this behavior cannot be restricted to just me. Alas to wish that it were sequestered only in me is to wish for the impossible. And the utopian. But before I get to it, you know I could have used many accusations of impropriety? Don't believe me?

Most people are too quick to judge others.

Most people won't entertain a different opinion.

Most people aren't as nice as they could be.

Most people are more foolish than they think.

Most people are too self-righteous.

Most people are too stubborn.

Most people are too afraid of change.

Truly what you've just read could be a reverse horoscope of sorts. Instead of being complimentary though vague enough to apply to most everyone as horoscopes are made to do, they are critical yet broad enough to apply to everyone *but you* or *with you*, as the observer. Did you think yourself above the psychological tactics employed in mere horoscopes? Think again. So it didn't matter what I chose. My particular choice was chosen for this very moment. It isn't enough for me to prove you wrong. Even more I wish to prove you a hypocrite to better drive home the personal nature of this bizarre relationship you have to your beliefs. Face it reader, you have no idea what is going on. You have no idea why it is you do anything. You're so in the dark you don't even know what you thought you were

agreeing with. First you thought it was my claim except it wasn't. Then you thought it was with me except it wasn't. Now I've told you it's something you created in your own mind yet you still have no idea what it is. You are clueless and yet you lay this accusation on others?

### Characteristics of the 'Other': It's Not *You*, It's *Me*

So just what is going on here and what am I going on about? Well, what we're doing when we succumb to this impulse is to *seemingly* join rank through a singular observation that we all share. In this case the claim that 'most people don't know why it is they do anything' is another way of saying that most others lack introspection. This is the observation that we synergized with; that of witnessing unthoughtful behavior in others. Now there is comfort in such a position. There is a secureness experienced when one's personal observations find support through others. Without the validation of others such observations could be as delusional as those we lay such a claim against, right? Otherwise how do you know you're not mistaken? By what method do you determine this other than through the validation or repudiation of others? This is all natural but alas it is not wholly rational and especially considering the subject matter it is woefully ironic. Why?

The very behavior of assuming our own position as the observer of such phenomena on impulse and not as the subject of it demonstrates a lack of introspection on our part. Think about what we're doing in such a circumstance: there is no questioning of one's own thoughts and actions, even in the face of an observation that encourages just that. This absence of an understanding of our motivations is basically a form of determinism. So I had basically claimed that most people are deterministic and you replied, "Yes *they* are." Even a, "Surely not I," is willing to question one's own integrity in this regard. Such assumptive behavior moves in lockstep with the unthoughtful. Indeed, one can only recognize the need to change course, to think differently, to question one's own motivations if one can entertain the idea not only that they are wrong but that those whom they believe to be wrong could be absolutely correct. Yet you, most of you anyway, immediately assumed that you were correct in your beliefs and that we, that is myself and yourself, shared a common belief because of it. Still it's actually worse than that. We didn't just form ranks on the idea that others lack introspection, essentially around the idea that, '*They* are wrong,' because whomever 'they' are changes for each person. We have no idea who these people are.

Hell, some of the people whom you believe to be wrong could be reading this very book thinking exactly the same thing about you. So what idea did we truly rally around? What belief informs what we think about others without any knowledge of them? What belief forms this 'other', this 'they', this majority that we can make claims of and accuse and judge without any knowledge of them? On that note, why does this belief function just fine regarding *others* but not regarding a single individual? Why was it so binding that we would forgo any introspection and immediately assume a camaraderie between us that, in truth, doesn't exist? Why was it so fast and so fierce? Why did it act unquestioningly of our motivations? Truth is, your assumption had nothing to do with others. Not only that, it had nothing to do with facts, evidence, reason or any methodology for determining truth. In this way it had nothing at all to do with reality; it didn't even reference it. The truth is that we joined together under the single assumption:

'I am right.'

The 'I Am Right' Axiom: Universally Disparate Beliefs

Think of something you know to be true. Now think of something you're genuinely right about; pretty much the same thing but bear with me. Now think of something you wish to be true. Now think of something you *are* genuinely wrong about. Not something you *were* wrong about or something you know to be false yet express as though it were true for the sake of meeting the criteria of this question. No, tell me something you *are* genuinely wrong about. Something you are wrong about right now. You cannot. Indeed, in everything we believe we believe we are right. The common defamation, "You think you're right about everything," is in fact true. Completely true. Sure, you're not right about *everything*, but you're right about *everything you know*. A very important distinction.

The closest one can come to being wrong is their identification of a desire, a belief one wishes or longs for such as, 'I will become a millionaire.' Matters of faith are, in effect, the closest one can be to being wrong without realizing it. See, when someone realizes that they are wrong they instantly become right about *having been* wrong. There is no middle-ground. You cannot oppose your own beliefs. You cannot take a position of contention with yourself. If you know it, you're right about it. Period.

This leads me to believe that regarding knowledge claims the opposite of truth isn't falsehood but rather the desire to believe in a falsehood. That to wish something true is the opposite of knowledge rather than ignorance since even ignorance admits to the truth of one's ignorance. Ignorance is a humble position unless the person, ignorant of the truth, claims such knowledge or acts according to his desired belief transforming their humble ignorance into arrogance. In other words, the opposite of reality is fantasy; pretending. It's easier to understand that way but offers less explanation into how our minds work.

Building on this, the desire to believe in something is the first sign that we know it is untrue or rather that we do not know if such belief is the truth, whether it is or not. Truth comes with it no desire to believe it but rather an unfeeling acceptance or even reluctance. For example: the earth is roundish, vegetables are plants, I have blue eyes, and I'm going to die someday. The first three elicit unfeeling acceptance and the last a reluctance. To desire something is to want it and wanting something to be true is only needed when you don't know the truth, otherwise you would not desire it because you'd essentially already have it. You would be possessed of the truth rather than longing for it thus wouldn't desire it any longer. Simply put, we don't want for what we already have. It is such desire-based belief, this motivation to believe in a possibility or outright falsehood as though it were true, that is the motivation behind all ideological thinking. Any motivation to believe something is itself a red flag. It demonstrates to us that we desire for something to be true, not that it necessarily is. We should understand and seek truth, but the truth itself should not affect us emotionally.

#### Complexity Extrapolated from Simplicity: The Princess and the Pea

'I am right.' Does this seem trite to you? I admit when I first identified it I thought it was trivial. I mean, of course people think they are right! People think they are right about everything they believe, at least most things. They wouldn't believe it otherwise. Hell, they *couldn't* believe it otherwise. You've got to think you're right about something in order to believe it. But it's not about the belief itself. The assumption isn't, 'I am right about [X].' The assumption is just, 'I am right.' It doesn't reference any claims or beliefs or the arguments and evidence that could support them. It exists only in reference to

the self. It exists in our subconscious and waits for claims to come along, say like the one I presented to you earlier, and applies itself to the claim one way or the other. So not just an assumption, 'I am right' is an axiom:

Axiom:

- 1) An irreducible primary. It doesn't rest upon anything in order to be valid, and it cannot be proven by any 'more basic' premises. A true axiom cannot be refuted because the act of trying to refute it requires that very axiom as a premise. An attempt to contradict an axiom can only end in a contradiction.

Belief and righteousness, of being right or rather feeling right, are linked. If you believe it, you're right about it. If you believe you're wrong you actually believe you're right about having been wrong and furthermore that you are right regarding whatever new belief took its place. Suffice it to say that, in your mind, you're already right about everything, even that which you are yet unaware of. So if I ask you about economics you'll tell me what you are right about regarding economics. If I ask you about politics you'll tell me what you are right about regarding politics. If I ask you about others you'll tell me what you are right about regarding others. Here's the rub though, will you tell me *what* is right about economics or *what* is right about politics or *what* is right about others? In other words, is what you believe the hard and fast truth of the matter? No, it's not. That's the difference between being 'right about everything' and being 'right about everything you know'. Well, "it's just my opinion," or "I'm entitled to my opinion," you say. What's so silly about this is that it's only an opinion because you know it's not true. If it were true you'd call it fact. Your opinion is just a self-referential means by which you determine truth or rather 'what is right'. Call it an egocentric modeling of the universe. An opinion is just something untrue that you insist is true because well, you're right. Since you've implicitly accepted the validity of your position there is no need to question it. You already believe you're right, in fact you believed it from the start, so why believe otherwise? Why challenge your belief when you're right? Why investigate the matter given you're right and thus what you believe is the truth? Why doubt, why develop a means of determining the truth, a rational or even scientific methodology, when you already have your conclusion? A conclusion regarding what *you* believe. What *you will* believe.

Even faith admits to the possibility of being wrong or at least the lack of factual evidence for believing it, hence why they call it faith. It is understood and accepted as a desire to believe, rather than an absolute

truth. The implicit assumption of righteousness, of 'I am right', is actually recognized by such people. But this? 'I am right' operating without any such recognition; enough to label it faith? It is something so much worse. It's the greatest mind-virus of mankind. What this axiom, what this mind-virus does is it eliminates the need for any standard for belief. Reason and logic, facts and evidence, none of these matter. At best they are used incorrectly or cherry picked to support your beliefs and really, we've all done this before. In this modern age we know there is a study on a website somewhere that will tell us just what we want to hear. Worse we never look into these studies, we just read a synopsis or a report about the study on some news site. We don't care to scrutinize the methodology and what's more we've hardly the expertise to do so. It's really absurd when you think about it. I mean, who are we kidding? Ourselves? Why do we bother? What is the point of reading headlines or synopses without discovering the real facts ourselves? If this belief is so important as to warrant this behavior, then why don't we try to actually substantiate it with research? Just what do we get out of this strange ritual and why do we participate in it? Well, the answers aren't flattering.

We do it because we're afraid. We're afraid of the truth. Even if that truth dovetails perfectly with what we think, the process of questioning it alone is cause enough to fear it. Doubt is terrifying, so terrifying that we don't even recognize the fear. Like an addict who denies their addiction, who claims they can 'quit at any time', we too make claims regarding doubt. Of opposing evidence and arguments we claim to 'look into it later' though we never do. Instead we seek out others who criticize such counter evidence and laud their efforts in doing so; never doubting if these others are apt to do so or indeed if they offered a legitimate refutation of the opposing position. We give them our praise and our trust, not unlike you granted to me, only because they are agreeable and only because we feel we can foist our responsibility onto them. They are, for all intents and purposes, a means to psychologically masturbate ourselves. This is intellectual pornography; simulation. It is absurd.

The mere act of challenging your views creates everything from anxiety to anger, but always based in a fundamental fear of the truth. Still this answer isn't sufficient since as we engage in this behavior we know, *we know* we're not really substantiating our own beliefs. We're just reading headlines and quoting, often erroneously, the synopses of studies we didn't read and will never read. We're praising YouTubers and other internet personalities whose expertise we dare not question as they are but an extension of our position, our self-righteousness, to begin with. So what are we after? Mere confirmation bias? Not so. Again we are aware that this behavior is nonsensical and does nothing to

confirm what we believe, not really. This isn't an error of perception resulting from our biases but a purposeful placing on of blinders meant to limit our perception to only what we want to see. It's entirely overt. So if not confirmation bias then why do we do this?

### Shared Self-Righteousness: A Heard Mentality

What we receive from doing this is something so much more primal and indeed that is why it is so irrational. What we're doing is retreating into the comfort of the herd. Truly, this behavior is just to find others that believe as we do – even if erroneously. Yet notice it's not about being correct nor does it have any regard for the truth. Instead it seeks the like-mindedness of others. Strange though that an axiom as egocentric as 'I am right' seeks refuge in like-mindedness when challenged. One would think it wouldn't care for the opinions of others. Well, you're right. It doesn't care about these peoples' opinions, or rather it doesn't care that these opinions have people attached to them. It doesn't so much matter what likeminded people think on the subject of our beliefs but rather how the induction of those beliefs will affect our axiom of self-righteousness; in particular to strengthen it. See, this comfort we receive isn't because we've found others to back us up or to stand beside us or to argue our position for us. It's not the collective that brings us comfort even though it appears that way. Instead we're selfishly seeking more 'facts' that supposedly bolster our axiom ex post facto i.e. after we've already concluded it. The people who provide them are largely irrelevant though in their shared position they provide a comfort of sorts since, by virtue of their shared position, won't ever challenge us. They are allies in the truest sense of the word: association through a common purpose. That purpose being the maintenance of 'I am right'. To maintain it as it is, without any challenge to it. Essentially these allies fill the role of evidence for our axiom. They are in a way a physical embodiment of evidence; a social substantiation of which we often call validation. Truer still in that no emotional connection nor any mutual relationship of any sort is required for such allegiance. As such they have formed a collective of people bound only through their mutual agreement to continuously buttress this belief and to never challenge each other. They aren't so much bound through a shared belief, as 'I am right' is by definition an individual belief, but rather a shared behavior of maintaining this belief. This behavior, though not originally defined as such, I have identified as the phenomenon of creating a 'safe space' where our beliefs, but most importantly the foundation of these beliefs, that of the axiom 'I am right', will not be challenged. The

comfort we feel comes not from the content of this safe space or the people in it but the recognition, by others, that 'I am right' should go unchallenged. But what is so significant about not challenging this axiom and why do we fear doing so? This fear that we feel when our beliefs are challenged is that what we take for granted, that we are right, isn't held by others of our tribe or another large tribe and is thus being threatened so we, we are being threatened. Our person is under attack and we require the protection of others. Others who believe 'I am right' and will similarly defend it and so us from attack.

Except that's not quite it either but we're getting close. Don't get me wrong that is an important aspect of it but it's not the complete picture. We seek likeminded people for the reasons I mentioned but rarely do we list who they are or associate with them after this act. Think of all the academics and intellectuals and experts of every sort whom you use to buttress your self-righteousness. They aren't your friends and well, you don't care about them to any extent beyond their role as evidence for your axiom. We may make mention of who they are through an appeal to authority if these people are noteworthy, but it doesn't go much further beyond that.

Now, people who don't believe as you do can be threatening of course. Consider all the battles throughout history that arrive merely out of disagreement. Yet also consider all the battles that don't. Consider all the friendships formed on mutual disagreement. Consider the myriad of things we disagree on, things that can be incredibly important to you, but that don't threaten you at all. Consider further that some of what you do find threatening doesn't threaten others and vice versa. Here's a list of them:

Music, movies, television shows, hobbies, favorite colors, foods, palettes, diets, exercise regimes, customs, dining etiquette, hairstyles, fashion, sexuality, religion, law, environmental protection, farming, politics, economics, this list *is* endless.

So what's the X factor that determines what someone will find so threatening that they engage in such tribal behavior? Well since it varies from person to person this factor must have something to do with individuals themselves but also since it generates the same behavior in people it must have applied itself in the same way. That is to say, it must apply itself to each person individually but in the same fashion so as to create the same behaviors in such individuals. So given all this, there exists a relationship that people have to some beliefs that, when challenged, is perceived as a threat and activates this tribal tendency in us. What is it?

## Identity: My Belief, My Person

Well there are some beliefs we hold that shape our identities. They aren't external to us. Who we are as a person doesn't determine these beliefs but rather these beliefs determine who we are as a person. See, the question, 'Who am I?' can only be answered with, 'What I believe'. It's strange when you think about it. The beliefs one person may hold that shapes all they are as a person may be completely trivial to another. Yet still to another such beliefs may have never even been considered. Think of it this way: some beliefs are personal and of those beliefs the strongest and most intimate form *persons*. They aren't just personal but rather Susan-ial, Richard-ial, Simon-ial, Michael-ial, [your name]-ial, etc. These beliefs aren't merely held strongly but the core of your identity forming your views on any topic they can relate themselves too. They form your perception of the entire world and yourself. This is especially true of your personal ethic which applies itself to absolutely everything you do.

So what's the link between these beliefs that shape our personal identity and the axiom, 'I am right?' Can you guess? These beliefs, this very core of our identity, forms the 'I' in that axiom. If you've got an identity, and you do, then it's these core beliefs that form it. Do you understand now the threat that comes when others challenge these core beliefs? They aren't just challenging these beliefs, they are challenging *you*. Now it's bad enough that our minds interpret this challenge as a physical threat which activates the fight or flight response, but worse is that this challenge threatens *our very identity*. That is where the real fear comes from. This is why we seek refuge in a tribe that doesn't challenge it. This is why we attempt to bolster it with hitherto unknown evidence and arguments to support it. We are running from the possibility that who we think we are is a falsehood, a delusion. We can't take the mere thought of it. All of who we are, all that we have done, a lie? Such introspection, if it reveals that we are not who we think we are, epitomizes devastation. People *die* from this, especially with regard to moral transgressions. To discover that you are indeed not the hero of your own story but the villain? Death is often preferable to even a moments more of contemplation and is chosen as one's only respite.

When one reaches a moment of terrifying clarity and realizes '*I am wrong,*' not '*I am wrong about [X]*' but *I, me, myself, who I am is wrong*, it is the single most horrifying human experience. It is horror

incarnate. The foundation upon which one's identity rests crumbles into the dark and who they are is left as intangible and unknown as the void it falls into. They become *nothing*. They lose themselves.

"I am wrong. I am not right, I am not moral, I am not good, I am not honest, I am not honorable, I am not fit, I am not righteous, I am not virtuous, I am not Susan, I am not Richard, I am not Michael, *I am not.*" This is followed shortly by the scariest question in the human experience, 'Who am I?' You can imagine the havoc wrought by this question.

Now for some they don't experience this fully. They react quickly to this falling away of their personage and seek refuge in the herd in a different way. It is similar to the gathering of new evidence and arguments previously unknown but instead of gathering these they gather new identities altogether. Perhaps this is because they know deep down that bolstering one's beliefs with hitherto unknown evidence is irrational because such evidence never informed their beliefs in the first place. So in lieu of that they jump to grand, sweeping theories often social or religious; typically so convoluted as to defy their own understanding. This way such people take refuge in their ignorance and use it as an excuse to delay introspection. In their words, they *just became* a scientologist or Buddhist or communist or whatever it is. They 'need time' to fully understand it all. They are 'new to this'. Desperate for an identity and anything is better than nothing, they've jumped to yet another conclusion. A conclusion which is just another way of claiming 'I am right'. Now they've time to explore this new conclusion, time that offers them a reprieve from the anxiety of really doubting themselves. Though really this new conclusion is just their same old self-righteousness expressed in a new manner. See, using reason to determine not only what one believes but by what standard one determines the truth requires the very challenge to themselves that they are avoiding. Fundamentally though these people don't change. They are the same as when they were an atheist as when they were a scientologist as when they were a Buddhist as when they were a communist and so on. Once questioning your identity is sparked it kindles a flame that never burns out. Rather it burns you out. The best you can do is to desperately fill yourself with as many beliefs as you can in vain hope that one, just one stays true and stops it. They essentially become placebos of the mind and are in very high demand given how many ideologies you can find around the world.

'I Am Right' in Practice: Do You Dabble?

Given what we now know let's examine the axiom of 'I am right'. The 'I' in that statement stands for each and every one of us. That is not to say that *we* are right but rather that I, the author, am right when I stand by this axiom and that you, the reader, are right when you stand by it and Bertrand, a man whom neither of us have met, is right when he stands by it. We have all joined together under an immediate gut-reaction to questioning ourselves which, in this joining, we have agreed is not a correct thing to do. That it is the *wrong* thing to do. We may congregate under a political or moral or social label but that is all it is: a label. Were we just a bit different we'd share some other label in common or none at all. I understand that this can be difficult to understand so allow me to introduce an analogy.

Imagine if you will a paddling (group) of ducks dabbling (underwater feeding) in a pond. As an aside, those terms are just adorable! You notice however that the ducks are segregated; feeding in different areas in different groupings. Now the goal of each duck is to consume as much food as possible and where they choose to feed is where they *believe* they'll consume the most food. However, this decision is made irrespective of the other ducks. The groupings we see are merely the result of chance and not so much of choice. Yet the ducks in each grouping believe that the other ducks in that grouping are there for the same reason they are. That is, 'the best place to consume as much food as possible is directly under *me* and the other ducks here believe as I do'. The ducks then form bonds through this assumption and exclusively groom, protect, roost, share food, and mate amongst themselves. Thus a social grouping is formed under entirely false pretenses. Little do any of the ducks realize a fishery is located not a mile away that brings in literal tons of fish every day.

Now of course, each of us is a duck and the groups we find ourselves in are the result not of reason but of personal biases that aren't truly shared by others of that group. As long as we maintain that [X] is the one true belief and by proxy that of 'I am right', we find solace and support in each other.

So in response to rational scrutiny we instinctually take refuge in a herd; in the support of others. Oddly though for an attempt at sanctuary such refuge is compounded by an important and crucial oversight that we have exposed. That is, we don't necessarily agree with each other – at all. Recall that we are bound together by the central assumption 'I am right' which by definition cannot be true of all of us or most of us and truly any of us barring some ascendancy to godlike omniscience. I'm not holding my

breath for that. Thus our true positions are necessarily hidden from the rest of those that supposedly believe as we do. Every time we agree that [X] is immoral and [Y] is acceptable behavior and even that [Z] is our enemy we're further bolstering what is basically narcissism. This bolstering results in psychological and emotional highs which, I won't say are addictive, but create a positive feedback loop that fuels itself. This loop creates the behavior and associated highs experienced in something known as affirmation. This can take many forms be it political rallies, religious services, customs at dinnertime, etc. What you'll notice is that despite the different venues, this affirmation takes nearly the same form in all. It comes as a recycling or complete repetition of slogans and mantras with associated behaviors. Think the Lord's Prayer or Taps or the national anthem or the umpteenth time a politician has allowed for an applause break after repeating a catchy talking point. Or the umpteenth time you've had to ask your spouse or your children, "How was your day?" never questioning why they didn't tell you without being prompted. How many times a year does a preacher have to reread John 3:16 to his congregation? How many times must they sing the same songs in the same way at the same time and even for the same reasons? In whatever form it takes, the reiteration of one's beliefs to a crowd or as part of the crowd that supposedly shares the same views is invigorating and personally fulfilling. However, there are times when such affirmation results in a schism otherwise known as a faux pas. Can you guess why this happens? It's no mystery, we've all done it. It's due to the unspoken fragility of the participants' bonds. A person, oblivious to the real nature of his relationship with the others of his clan, will express a position the others take issue with but is at the core of his own beliefs. In keeping with the analogy, he is a duck claiming that all the other ducks in his group are eating around *his* spot. All at once the bonds of mutual agreement are threatened if not severed and met with this truly Orwellian retroactive evaluation of one's past interactions and contributions to their clan. Does this sound too extreme or absurd to you? Have you never seen it before? Ahem:

"Can you believe [X] said [Y] about [Z]?"

"You think you know a person..."

"Was he always like this?"

"Who filled his head with such nonsense?"

"What a fool."

Perhaps this is best shown in politics, particularly American, where political candidates live and die by even the slightest variation from their constituency, at least during an election. The less known about a

candidate the better for the simple reason that the more one knows the more one can and will take issue with even if it's seemingly irrelevant. By contrast the less one knows the more they can project their own attributes and aspirations onto the candidate. Ever wondered why politicians seem so off-putting? It's because they've trained themselves not necessarily to lie but to never tell the truth. The electoral campaigns of the last 25 years were an absolute zoo for this very reason and American politics in general exists as an extreme exemplar of our capacity to think and behave this way.

Of course this happens at a more personal level too. Ever had a friend who was just the greatest and most stalwart person you ever knew, until they weren't? Where did all that excitement and enthusiasm go? Did they betray you? Did you just 'drift apart'? Fact is the rush of excitement and enthusiasm you have for such people is a projection of sorts. You're attributing your own personal desires and goals for the relationship onto the other person. As a recipient of that it's flattering and intoxicating if you're vain enough to believe it has anything to do with you. For goodness sake, a person who just meets you has no idea who you are especially if you're not the open and honest type. Anyway, as you inevitably come to know who the person actually is should all your enthusiasm turn to disappointment it is through no fault but your own. Indeed through your projection and self-centeredness you had set yourself up for such disappointment. Take this back into the realm of politics. Remember that politician whom you supported and praised but then ultimately disappointed you? Yeah, that was all your fault too. Regarding this lost friend that face it, we all have, maybe you didn't drift apart but were instead betrayed by them? Barring some egregious actions on their part could it be, perhaps, that they didn't betray you but rather your expectations? Were they not who you thought they were? Could their betrayal merely have been a duck expressing what they thought was the best place to dabble?

Are you beginning to see how fragile these relationships truly are? How rocky their foundations? How deceitful and self-serving? Should I dare to bring up your relationship with your *parents*? How is the bond different with them? Stronger? Weaker? More extreme? Is there something you would never, *ever* tell them about yourself? Something you could never talk to them about for fear of what, I wonder? Look I won't sugar coat it, it's scary to really consider the nature of your relationships to people; especially to those you love. But prevention is cheaper than cure dear reader.

Lost in Excommunication: Controlling Affirmation, Managing Schism

So when it comes to affirmation how do large organizations build upon this 'I am right' axiom without succumbing to such a schism? Well truth is they don't. None of them do. Just look at what happened to Christendom: shattered into a thousand sects and why? The affirmations every Christian participated in, every action, every word, every song, everything they did to show their belief, everything that had so much meaning poured into it by every Christian, everything they knew in their heart affirmed their love of God, was in a language they didn't understand. None but the priests understood it. Martin Luther, God bless him, translated the bible into the vernacular and not soon after Christendom shattered and still shatters to this very day. However, there is of course something to be said for religion's ability to limp on in spite of this. This ability is seemingly intangible and attributed to all manner of emotional and psychological needs for religion on behalf of believers which I imagine are all real and valid reasons. I submit however that despite the shattering of Christendom and religion in general the methodology by which religion keeps itself together remains as strong as ever. What's changed is the methodology by which an individual *leaves* their tribe. This process has become almost streamlined. The old methodology for keeping people rallied under false pretenses still works and is still strong in its own right, but it simply can't compete with what is essentially its rival. That is information and critical discourse. The sharing of opinions. The internet, where religions came to die. So let's examine just what exactly this methodology is for keeping religions and other groups together.

#### Judge, Jury, and Excommunicator: Appeals to Greater Purpose

By now you understand that a declaration of one's true position is antithetical to keeping such groups together. The mutuality between all members must remain forever implied or always submit to personal interpretation. So how do people do that? The trick is to frame all personal beliefs within a larger purpose and employ a different language that's specific enough to describe the belief but nebulous enough to have multiple interpretations most of which are never realized or examined. Essentially the belief expressed is interpreted differently by everyone, perfectly in keeping with the 'I am right' axiom. So for example Christians can proclaim, "Forgive me Lord for I have sinned," but what each Christian believes to be sin actually varies widely – even within different sects. However, what each Christian

hears is *their* version of what constitutes sin. Similarly their interpretation of the Lord is heard along with their version of forgiveness. In the case of sin, even when disagreements arise over what constitutes sinful behavior both parties inevitably appeal to this larger purpose to settle things. In this case the identification of sin is used to determine what should call for a prayer of forgiveness from God. The purpose of forgiveness from God is to achieve and maintain a degree of holiness but also a relationship with God through an act of intimate honesty. So asking for forgiveness for something that isn't sinful is merely being overzealous or extra cautious which can be admirable. However, when one views something that is sinful as not sinful the appeal is made to the greater purpose of asking for forgiveness i.e. the relationship with God. Therefore we hear suggestions from detractors such as:

"Ask God if it's sinful."

"Does it not *feel* wrong?"

"I *feel* like God is working through me to tell you that it's a sinful behavior."

"I'll pray for you."

See, rather than resort to immediate ostracism the greater purpose of a relationship with God provides a buffer zone or limbo of sorts that slows this process down. Since the Christian religion is necessarily evangelical Christians take it upon themselves not to cast off sinners but to attempt to, well, indoctrinate them back into the fold. So with an overarching purpose applied to it, what would normally result in *ostracism* transforms into an *obligation* to 'steer this errant brother back onto the path of righteousness' or in layman's terms convince the member of his error and return him to the tribe. This is a marvelous feat of social engineering. Not only is the behavior of ostracism stymied it is actually reversed. Such engineering serves as a testament of the ability for the Christian religion to last for millennia.

Of note is that what is right or 'holy' and what is wrong or 'sinful' operates not on some logical system but through a subjective standard; fundamentally God's own opinion. So rather than one's standard for right and wrong requiring some objective metric, it is instead replaced with a subjective standard a la the opinion of God. This essentially subverts any rational foundation for such considerations. However, that God cannot ever express his opinion on the matter regardless if you believe in God or not, throws an interesting wrench into this process of discernment. In essence, Christians are left to determine the will of God rather than to merely express their own standards and will therein. Now naturally they will

project their standards onto God as such is the nature of self-righteousness, but as such they will be met with other Christians doing the same. Since God is necessarily an external actor, while they are still self-righteous they can't be as self-righteous regarding God's character. That is, they *know* who they themselves are, but not who he is. So even though they follow a tribal leader of sorts, this God, they've got to come up with a means of determining his will. One that all can abide by lest they be torn apart by schism. Dear reader, this is a wrench that will prove very useful to us as we continue this treatise. A wrench that has already proved very useful to us in the West.

All that said, it's integral that this over-arching purpose that gives rise to stability within such organizations must almost always be subjective and basically unattainable. In the case of Christianity, there is no possible standard method for establishing and maintaining a relationship with God. Yet why must this purpose be unattainable? Simple really, it cannot submit itself to objective scrutiny and reason. The moment a tangible and real purpose is outlined, objective methodologies will arise that can achieve it as with any other outcome we may seek to achieve in reality. So what was presented as a desire in perpetuity, a relationship with God in this example, becomes more or less a problem that can be solved. Also such objectivity creates a standard by which actions can be judged and ultimately submits the entire social group be it religious or otherwise to reason. For example, say a person's stated purpose is to feel better about themselves. How? It's necessarily subjective and quite personal. It submits itself to value judgments, to personal taste. Ah, but the moment that person submits an objective goal, say *becoming physically healthier* as a means to feel better about themselves, we now have a standard. Even simpler, should the person provide a tangible means by which they feel poor, say chronic obesity, we can also develop an objective methodology by which they can be made to 'feel better'. Thus we consult doctors and dieticians and create an exercise regime and diet plan catered to losing weight in an effort to make them healthier and all in order to achieve the purpose of them 'feeling better'. So consider what such an objective methodology would do to the purpose of Christianity. It would outline precise beliefs and behaviors particular to Christians, even necessary ones in order to be a Christian. Thus it would eliminate the ambiguity both in the term Christian and the language around it thereby eliminating all vectors for projection. The primary assumption of 'I am right' no longer has an ambiguous language to root itself and so collapses the entire foundation of the ideology, of any ideology.

So if an ideology is at its core a manifestation of the 'I am right' axiom and its associated behaviors, does that mean that all ideologies, no matter how seemingly divergent, are fundamentally the same? Yes. They vary appreciably only in the outcomes they seek to achieve. Their methodology, or rather their behaviors based on their relationship to their beliefs, is nearly uniform. Nazis, communists, Christians, Hindus, Scientologists, feminists, social justice warriors, whatever. They are all the same. Now I understand that this is mighty contentious but consider that you probably already had a few terms to describe all or most of these ideologies each with their own vast array of implications: false, irrational, dangerous, etc. The addition of my own observation is just another one of many.

### Unattainable by Design: Idealism as Ideological Adhesive

This use of an overarching purpose has always been a means of social cohesion typically through appeals to the 'greater good' or 'bigger picture'. Due to this we sometimes forgive others if their intentions aren't in keeping with this purpose. It's where the 'ends justifying the means' debate comes from though more on that later. Now in this way it operates much like that of the religious model but again, the benefit of the religious model is that the purpose is subjective and unattainable, yet interpretable. So it ensnares far more people than it normally would, indeed to the tune of millions more if not billions. This allows for religions to maintain greater cohesion over time than secular belief structures like communism which failed disastrously. Granted the purpose of communism is subjective and interpretable, but not unattainable. That is, the desired outcome of communism is a particular societal model defined through objectively demonstrable characteristics. Ergo it is attainable or rather tangible. So while the means by which these characteristics are created submits itself to subjectivity and interpretation, the ends do not. So communism, not unlike other political ideologies, seeks to achieve an attainable or at least tangible outcome and thus eventually adopts methodologies in an attempt to produce this outcome. From here communism, or any similar ideology, develops particular beliefs and behaviors necessary to supporting their methodology for achieving their desired outcome. Call it being a 'good communist' or 'comrade'. This alienates ideologues by virtue of eliminating the ambiguity of the identity and the language used to describe it thereby eliminating individual projection of meaning into the ideology. Yet it further alienates ideologues also because the methodology, in its attempt to create a particular outcome, can objectively fail in its claimed purpose. With the methodology itself, rather than

an individual's projection, defining the beliefs and behaviors of an ideologue the ideology can thus be seen to fail. This translates to a disillusionment of the individual with regard to the ideology or an even stronger, or rather worse, denial of reality. A denial that develops in order to defend against the challenge to their axiom of self-righteousness, of 'I am right', that this demonstrable failure of their ideology invariably courts. This is typically where we see such excessive denial of reality that it borders on, or is indeed tantamount to, madness.

Consider that any societal model that purports to be the best system under which humans operate shouldn't merely produce the outcomes it claims it can but must also be self-sustaining. To not be self-sustaining means, in very real terms, that it is incompatible with humanity and reality. It is self-defeating or self-destructive rather than a means by which we could all co-exist in the same fashion, according to the same guidelines. It must not be a system designed just to attain but also to maintain. A system designed to get something and to keep it. Not akin to 'having your cake and eating it too', more like having your health and keeping healthy. Self-sustaining societal models should be similar in structure and in purpose as a healthy diet is to our physical well-being. It both creates and maintains that which we desire. It's not a question of ends and means, but questioning the rationale that any such distinction should be made or that it even exists. Keep this in the back of your mind dear reader for it's going to become rather important.

Stability through Ambiguous Language: I Won't Affirm nor Deny That

You'll have noticed the use of a specialized and importantly undefined language when describing Christianity. So what exactly is righteousness? Holiness? Sin? What is the Christian standard for forgiveness? These are all important questions that are almost never addressed by the common Christian. They are left to personal interpretation and the camaraderie it creates isn't questioned but rather used as an example, erroneously, of the binding power of the Christian faith. Such ambiguous language shares in common the ambiguous nature of the label of Christian that they rally under. It too remains essentially undefined yet individually interpreted. The use of ambiguous language allows these individual interpretations to persist unrecognized and unmolested. So in the same way each Christian projects their version of the identity into the term Christian, they too project their own meanings into

the particular terms used to describe it. Without the ability to project individual meaning into both the ideological identity and the language used to describe it the true individualistic nature of the belief would be revealed and threaten the collective. This is why every ideology, not just Christianity, has its own specialized language or should I say ambiguous, undefined language. Given that such ambiguous language is necessary to maintaining the ideology, to maintaining a false collective, it shouldn't be viewed as a mere characteristic or byproduct of ideology but as a necessary component to it. Suffice it to say, an ideology cannot exist in anything but ambiguous terminology. Indeed with projection at the core of ideology, projection of 'I am right' in particular, it requires a suitable vector through which it may root itself and transmit itself. No ideology can persist in the presence of defined and indeed definable language, both coherent and logically consistent.

However, such interpretations of Christianity are scrutinized at the level of priests, pastors, preachers, and the like to discuss amongst themselves. So what do they do with their inevitable disagreements? Why, they form different churches under different sects of Christianity. See, at some level the belief these groups are formed under becomes irreconcilable and succumbs to schism. When Christianity expresses itself as a peaceful religion it preaches tolerance for the other sects. When it expresses itself as a violent religion it pretty much just kills everyone. It varies from person to person and well, when they're all operating on the base assumption of 'I am right', it's to be expected that they would form different sects merely as an expression of their disparate individual beliefs. At its most basic, 'Christian' becomes a placeholder for 'me, myself, my identity' rather than a characteristic a person may possess that shapes their identity. To them it *is their identity*. It is yourself rather than a characteristic of yourself or a belief system you possess. In other words, Christian isn't what they exist *as*. Instead Christian is *how* they exist. It is no different than how you would see yourself as Kevin, Karen, or whatever your name is. It becomes an absolute, immutable truth of your reality.

Think of ideology, all of ideology, as variations on a central theme not unlike a remix or cover of a musical score or song. While the differences between ideologies are often stark, obvious, and even oppositional, their core of self-righteousness, their core belief of 'I am right', is entirely unaltered. No matter how distinct and even antithetical one ideology appears in contrast to another, they have not diverged in any way from the same core belief. In this way no matter how divergent they appear, no matter the subsequent beliefs that are used to justify the central position of self-righteousness, the structure of both and indeed all ideologies is exactly the same – equal in fact. Moreover that this shared

belief forms the foundation of ideology itself, it is responsible for behaviors shared across all ideologies. Behaviors designed only to justify this one singular belief. Given that his belief, that of 'I am right', comes first and foremost before any other belief, means that the justifications ideologues provide for their actions are false. That they are essentially excuses for believing their self-righteousness first and foremost. See they need some reason, some rationale, so they generate one only as a necessary logical requirement to their initial position of righteousness. They begin with a conclusion then seek a rationale for it, putting the cart before the horse. This reasoning, this justification after the fact also known as ex post facto justification, goes on to form what we typically identify as the ideology. This is Christianity, liberalism, Islam, Scientology, you name it. Yet given that such ideologies are all essentially excuses designed to justify and to conceal from recognition and so challenge the shared belief of 'I am right', such ideologies as we identify them are entirely superficial. That is to say, with regard to our exploration and understanding of ideology, they're most irrelevant. In fact, given that such excuses are themselves a matter of an individual's choice i.e. how they choose to excuse their self-righteousness, ideologies are little more than an expression of preference, of a preferred rationale for ex post facto justification. Finally given that ideology necessarily references the self through the base axiom 'I am right', this expression of preference is so much an expression of the self, or self-identity, masquerading as a collective identity. Their shared behaviors are really the result of their shared relationship to their subsequent beliefs; that they are all excuses for a primary assumption of self-righteousness no matter what form they take. In other words, ideology doesn't so much demonstrate *what* an ideologue believes but *how they believe it*.

#### Summary:

All of us are stuck with a particular axiom, that of 'I am right', which exists prior to any belief we actually have. It applies itself to our beliefs as they are created which develops a self-righteousness with regard to them. This self-righteousness, especially with regard to deeper, more personal beliefs comes to form our very identities: the 'I' in the axiom 'I am right'. Thus when 'I am right' is evoked it refers both to your person but also to these beliefs, which comes to form your perception of yourself and with that reality as you perceive it. When these beliefs are threatened we feel our very person being threatened and so seek refuge. We seek refuge in others who are merely agreeable. Those who, like us, have agreed not to challenge their self-righteousness, albeit such agreement isn't consciously recognized. In order to stave off any means of recognizing the true nature of this unspoken alliance we resort to projection. We

project our status of self-righteousness onto others and they onto us. That they believe we are right. This is all done through ambiguous language with vague appeals to overarching purposes such that meaning can be individually interpreted. That what each person means by 'I am right' can coexist. Thus the axiom 'I am right' can actually be a shared one regardless of its personal and individualistic nature. Due to 'I am right' forming the core of this belief system, this ideology, it results in a particular relationship between it and ideologues. In essence, it determines how they believe and with that it manifests as behaviors particular to all ideologues that reflect this relationship. Specifically behaviors designed to protect the 'I am right' axiom from scrutiny.

## CHAPTER 2 - The Problem of Projection:

### Predictable Behaviors of Ideologues

#### Introduction:

Here we begin our exploration of the shared behaviors of ideologues. Many are catalogued in what we term logical fallacies, though such fallacies aren't necessarily particular to ideologies. Some will be explored as they pertain to ideology in their manifestation as ideological defense mechanisms, but the vast majority will remain unexamined. I leave it to you to explore such fallacies at your own discretion though I recommend that you do if only to improve your own reasoning.

I had discussed but did not define and so took for granted your understanding of the term projection. Considering that it is integral to ideology and a shared ideological behavior, we must explore it exhaustively. That said consider the following:

Projection:

- 1) The tendency to ascribe to another person the feelings, thoughts, or attitudes present in oneself, or to regard external reality as embodying such feelings, thoughts, etc., in some way.
- 2) In psychoanalysis, such an ascription relieving the ego of a sense of guilt or other intolerable feeling.

However there is a slightly different form of projection that I define. It is similar to the latter definition but with an important distinction:

Projection:

- 1) The tendency to ascribe to another person *the responsibility* for feelings, thoughts, or attitudes present in oneself, or to regard external reality as *the progenitor* of such feelings, thoughts, etc.

Notice how I introduce responsibility into the definition. The first definition of projection is useful of course and can, and often does, manifest in the behavior of the people whom I would ascribe my own version of projection to. This projection manifests in one of two ways. Either the person projecting is aware of their own thoughts and feelings and through their projection onto another person finds that person more agreeable, or they are unaware of their own thoughts and feelings and find the person they project them onto everything from innocuous to strange to hostile. Really it all depends on how they react to whatever thoughts and feelings they project onto others. Part of the distinction I make is that the thoughts and feelings ascribed to others aren't necessarily the same of those who are projecting these thoughts and feelings. For example, if I believe myself to be in danger I may project onto you threatening behavior and ideation. I am ascribing *the responsibility* for my feeling of being in danger be it fear, anxiety, stress, etc., to you instead of just projecting that fear, anxiety, stress, etc., onto you. So rather than sharing in my fear you are now seen as the cause of it. Essentially I become an effect in search of a cause. A victim in search of a perpetrator. This is different from guilt in that guilt requires some standard that can be applied to causes and effects which is necessarily subjective i.e.

good, bad, immoral, etc. The identification and ascription of responsibility is an objective methodology and one divorced from any such standard. Hence the reason I do not refer to this simply as guilt.

The definition of projection used most commonly has the one projecting, the projecter, treating the other person, the projectee, as a mirror of sorts that reflects what's true about the projecter right back to them whether they recognize their own reflection or not. Imagine talking to a mirror as if it were a flesh and blood person. My definition has the projecter treating others as a mirror too but whose reflection the projecter not only doesn't recognize but believes is a distortion of how they truly appear. Thus they place the responsibility for how they appear onto the mirror, the projectee, and not themselves. They see the error in the mirror and not with themselves and their own perception. Notice in both cases the individual projecting preserves the 'I am right' assumption by either not even recognizing the possibility of it being wrong or by rejecting any such inference at all. Ultimately projection is a mechanism designed to facilitate denial, in particular denial of the 'I am right' assumption. To ascribe to another what originates from oneself is done in the attempt to deny oneself as the source of its origin. Furthermore it is my contention that these twin forms of projection aren't simply alternates but operate in tandem with each other in accordance with the 'I am right' assumption. This puts the assumption at the root of projection itself and indeed I believe this to be true. To put it in a single sentence:

'A belief about one's self is the root of all projection, not a belief about others.'

#### Projection in Practice: Forming Alliances, Fostering Hostilities

Recall the dabbling ducks. The ones who gathered together believed that others gathered where they did because others shared in the knowledge that underneath them *as an individual*, was the best place to dabble. This belief is the more commonly understood form of projection. Each duck projects their own thought that 'underneath me is the best place to eat' onto the others and so forms bonds through a false sense of like mindedness. 'You are right *because* I am right'. We'll call this Allied Projection.

Consider again these ducks and how they would view ducks that are not a part of their group. Since each duck believes that theirs is the most bountiful spot for dabbling, they view ducks far away from them as wrong. Furthermore they believe that those faraway ducks believe in turn that they, those ducks

observing the faraway ducks, are wrong themselves. In other words each duck believes 'the faraway ducks are wrong but they in turn believe that I am wrong.' Thus an imputation of erroneous belief is made onto another merely by virtue of believing that one is correct without any real knowledge of the other's position. 'You are wrong *because* I am right'. We'll call this Hostile Projection. I'm going to take this further however. Consider now a duck who is starving as the result of her own choice to dabble where she does. Yet instead of admitting to her own responsibility for her starvation she blames other ducks. She claims that the only reason she is starving is because the other ducks are overeating or scaring the fish or whatever else, and so rather than relinquish her position and paddle over to a more plentiful dabbling spot she remains where she is. It is this erroneous ascribing of responsibility to others for one's own choices that makes this form of projection hostile. Not only is responsibility erroneously ascribed to another individual but, with the introduction of some subjective standard for the effects of this responsibility, so too is the blame for these effects.

So while projection necessarily requires a belief about other people, the root of all such beliefs comes first from the implicit assumption that one is correct about themselves and with that their beliefs with regard to those other people. So before say, an accusation of insanity can be made one must believe they are sane in order to make such a judgment. See, the corollary to the 'I am right' axiom is that 'others/everyone else is wrong'. 'I am right' creates a dichotomy of yourself vs everyone else thus anything you believe you are right about admits to others being wrong, in particular those who outright disagree with you. In fact, I believe the creation of such a dichotomy is where the ability to generalize comes from. 'People in general' is another way of saying 'other' though admitting that it's not everyone. The reason we can even make such claims about large swaths of people with whom we've had very little to no interaction with is because we believe so adamantly in the truth of what we believe about ourselves. Without this belief about ourselves we wouldn't have any merit with which to judge others. We necessarily require some knowledge, whether actually true or not, to base our claims on. It requires a point of reference and in this case our point of reference is our self-righteousness, that starting point that we are correct. This is why the reverse horoscope is effective because it references our own beliefs about ourselves and applies the corollary of those beliefs to others. So remember in chapter 1 when it was so easy to generalize others? It was because we generalized according to a belief about ourselves, not about others. We had extended a corollary to a belief about ourselves to everyone else.

Recall however that this manifests in the twin forms of projection and not just one or the other. So it can manifest in either the Allied or Hostile form. So others are unthoughtful because we are thoughtful

*or* others are unthoughtful because we are unthoughtful. Others are cruel because we are not cruel *or* others are cruel because we are cruel. Others are arrogant because we are humble *or* others are arrogant because we are arrogant. What all of these criticisms of the other have in common is that they reference the self and our standard for determining thoughtfulness, cruelty, arrogance, humility, etc. While necessarily subjective such standardization requires criteria upon which it may be based. Criteria that isn't observed or indeed isn't even countenanced when using only the self or rather our own self-righteousness to make such claims of the other. Now I know what you're thinking, 'How do you know that?' Simple really. What is your standard for unthoughtfulness? Cruelty? Arrogance? Humility? Can you even define these concepts? If you can, do you take for granted that others believe as you do a la Allied Projection or that you are correct in your definition and standards a la the 'I am right' axiom? Furthermore, by what standard do you derive even those standards? Hard questions to be sure and we'll answer those soon enough. So in lieu of an objective standard we rely solely on an egocentric prejudice. We submit to bias, unwarranted discrimination, irrationality, whatever you want to call it. So without any standard to attribute our beliefs to and without the knowledge that we are operating on mere prejudice, how do we explain our beliefs and especially our behavior with regard to them? Ex post facto justification: the bane of introspection.

Regarding generalizations, this dichotomy created by the 'I am right' axiom is why it's harder if not impossible to apply such generalizations to individuals. When we change the other into Bertrand or Sally Sue we break the dichotomy. A belief about ourselves no longer informs our beliefs about these people as they have become individuals in their own right rather than a corollary of any belief about ourselves. In other words, what is true of myself doesn't inform me of the truth about Bertrand even though it does inform me of the truth about others in general and even though Bertrand is a part of that other. Basically once Bertrand is made a subset of the whole our generalization of the whole no longer applies to him. In more mathematical terms, we simply cannot apply a trend to a single data point. This very fact, that of being unable to apply a trend to a single data point, is integral to the fight against such irrationality and will be discussed later on. But now that we've identified the twin forms of projection, Allied and Hostile, let's examine how they can influence our behavior.

Black and White Thinking: You Against the World

As discussed, the belief that one is right necessarily admits to others being wrong. This results in an 'all-or-nothing', 'with-us-or-against-us' perception of others. Such perception naturally creates a lot of conflict as is expected of Hostile Projection. This becomes particularly dangerous in the realm of morality and personal ethics wherein one feels not only certain of their virtuousness but justified in their defense of it. This allows for any number of means developing to facilitate such a defense be it an unhealthy ostracism of opinions and the people attached to them or indeed the killing of such individuals for what is seen as egregious moral wrongdoing on their part. We would think such measures are extreme and indeed they are, but the ability to justify harm to others is easily justifiable, though falsely, through this attribution of one's personal responsibility to the other person.

This ascribing of responsibility takes the form of blame and transforms the unwitting recipient of this blame into a perpetrator and the one projecting such blame into a victim. In a bizarre twisting of the victim vs perpetrator dichotomy, instead of a perpetrator creating a victim through their actions, a victim creates a perpetrator through *their* actions; or rather their denial of their own actions. Now everything this 'victim' does in response to their victimizer, this 'perpetrator', is to them a justifiable form of self-defense. The greater the victim the projector believes they are the greater the perpetrator they believe the target of their projection. So for example if one believes themselves to be downtrodden, enslaved, oppressed, stolen from, and all other manner of transgression at the hand of an individual or demographic, they'll feel justified in whatever means they utilize to free themselves from it. Now objectively speaking we understand such behavior, that of a self-described victim targeting others with accusations of perpetration, as an act of perpetration in and of itself. Yet in lieu of this perspective it is often mistaken for what it presents itself as at a surface level. People fooled by this truly evil method of victimization often ask in earnest, "Why would they lie?" More on that later, but to name a few reasons: power, cruelty, but above all else validation.

Another aspect of this black and white thinking is the projection of personal, subjective values onto others. Such projection isn't itself hostile as such projection is more or less in keeping with Allied Projection. However, this imposition of personal values onto others eventually and inevitably results in conflict since such values are merely ascribed to others and not necessarily shared by said others. Recall the phenomenon of affirmation and how it can result in schism. It's the same thing. Though what is most dangerous with this imposition of personal values onto others is that these values are often unexamined both in their validity and their origin. Whomever projects these values has not considered whether such values have merit in and of themselves by testing them against some objective standard

like outcome or other universals. Neither have they considered what brought these values about and why they are valued to begin with. For example, does one value an appreciation and interest in video games because they are a powerful medium of communication capable of expanding the translation of thought and experience between people, or because one values escapism as a means of denying and delaying their need for introspection and self-help which has transformed gaming into an addiction? Whether or not we consider an appreciation and interest in video games to be a value, we can agree that the former reason for such a value has merit according to a standard of progressing human communication and experience while the latter does not have merit with regard to a standard of maintaining mental health. So with this imposition of values onto others comes inevitable disappointment upon the discovery that while such values can be shared, they are not shared for the same reasons. Said reasons may be so damaging to one's ego that they refuse to even acknowledge them.

This imposition of values onto another can also be used in a different fashion wherein such values are used to judge others that do not hold to them. So for example one may value video games for the communicative reason I stated earlier and so judge those who do not value or dislike video games outright as regressive, censorious, ignorant, and may even attribute malicious intent to their devaluation of video games as some conscious moral transgression. They believe others devalue video games as merely a proxy to their devaluation of their communicative power or even communication in general. A leap in logic to be sure, but a common one. Judging others according to one's personal values in lieu of external standards and in the ignorance of why others do not share or are hostile to your own values offers up a bizarre standard in and of itself. Essentially what one is doing when they engage in such evaluation is to hold others to a standard of how much or how little they synergize with one's self. Evaluating others according to their synergy with yourself isn't a harmful thing on its own, but rather the harm in it comes from how we define ourselves. Are we merely referencing the 'I am right' axiom or are we holding ourselves to a higher standard? Higher standards such as liberty, justice, integrity, loyalty, virtue, respect, morality, or even something objectively determinable like outcome? The real danger of judging others irrespective of such higher, and I would argue necessary, standards comes with the addition of power and authority. With it there is no recourse to escape judgement and its subsequent punishments other than conformity. There can be no appeal made other than to the individual in power and their own values and judgement. A judgement that no longer submits itself to any socially instituted standards nor facts, evidence, and ultimately reason by which everyone from the mightiest ruler to the lowliest serf can appeal to. So rather than being judged according to outcomes in reality, some contract

or ethical code, or a government constitution for example, judgement becomes entirely arbitrary. Such arbitrary judgment operates on what is essentially whim and epitomizes the abuse of power. Now, what do we call the arbitrary and abusive use of power? Tyranny. This is why such accusations, accusations of tyranny, are not at all hyperbolic but rather entirely fitting for those who have adopted this behavior.

#### Conflict Therapies: Introspection by Proxy

This term describes the behavior wherein people will seek out others of the opposite opinion and argue with them incessantly but with three distinctive characteristics:

- 1) Despite the fruitlessness of prior efforts they continue to argue with the same people about the same thing(s).
- 2) Never relinquish their position or submit to reason and evidence.
- 3) Never reference or recognize their defeats in past arguments.

The question is why do people engage in such behavior? Why continue a fruitless argument? Why not submit to reason and evidence? Why no heed to past losses? This curious behavior, in my estimation, is the result of an inability or rather an unwillingness for the individual to think for themselves. Instead they seek out others who hold an opposing opinion and through arguing with them allow that person to do their thinking for them. The individual is suffering from a cognitive dissonance of sorts but is unable to fully consider the contradictory position, often the logical one, due to their own prejudices. Suffice it to say the thought is there, but it cannot manifest fully as it may be too threatening to the ego. So instead of manifesting as an inner dialogue it manifests as a desire to seek out detractors who will provide this dialogue externally. Such people are merely using their detractors as a proxy, often for the more rational position that is causing their cognitive dissonance, while they in turn argue for the more irrational position. This is again a result of the 'I am right' axiom because the position that contradicts their identity, the rational one, is such a threat that to even consider it brings anxiety, fear, and other mental stresses. Thus using a proxy to embody this position relieves them of the responsibility for this stress by attributing it to an external conflict rather than an internal one. So long as the external conflict

is maintained and perpetuated they can remain in denial of the true internal source of this conflict. This is why this behavior is so incessant and the proxy is now very much required in order to deny the true internal source of this conflict. So to reiterate, this behavior denies the true source of their internal stress by attributing it to their detractors while at the same time relies on those detractors to do their thinking for them. It externalizes the conflict and recreates it through with what is seemingly an individual in possession of the reasoning and evidence required to sway and ultimately terminate the erroneous belief of the projecting individual. Hence the term Intellectual Conflict Therapy and the paradoxical attraction to detractors it describes. Often such people frame their motivation to essentially doubt themselves as an obligation or duty, intellectual, moral or otherwise, to seek out and challenge those of opposing opinions. Those who hold they exact opinion their minds are unable to entertain internally.

Intellectual Conflict Therapy (ICT) can also manifest on an emotional level irrespective of any beliefs, which I've dubbed Emotional Conflict Therapy (ECT). It's rather straightforward. Instead of a particular challenge to one's beliefs causing cognitive dissonance and the stress associated with it, an emotion whose origin is internal is attributed to an external source be it an individual, a concept like culture, the Jews, whomever. The ability to blame another for the source of an internal conflict allows the projecting individual relief from it if only momentarily. Using this proxy as the source for their emotional response allows them a target which they can act upon being as of yet unable to act in any meaningful way to assuage this emotion internally. The ability to finally do something to *seemingly* address this emotional response is quite relieving. Yet such relief ensures that the individual will continue to project the responsibility for their emotional response externally lest they be overcome with that emotion. Furthermore if the proxy is both wise and patient enough with the projecting individual they can guide that person to the internal source of their emotional response in the same way a therapist would. Naturally they are not nearly as skilled nor as informed to do so, but nevertheless they can fill that role. Indeed sometimes such people are preferable to a therapist as seeking therapy is an implicit admission to something being wrong with yourself. Controlled by denial as they are, seeking therapy is simply out of the question. Remember that introspection is antithetical to denial. Thus those in denial may use a layman as a therapist of sorts.

Examples of this behavior abound on the internet as the internet has made interpersonal conflicts simpler to seek out and much more fervorous behind the veil of anonymity. Now granted this behavior does tend in one direction; that is of the more irrational belief seeking out the more rational opposing

one, but it has less to do with the rationality of the belief itself and more to do with the rationale for the belief. So for example you tend to see this behavior more in the religious seeking out the irreligious or atheist. That is, those of a more irrational position seeking those of a more rational one. However, the reverse can and does occur wherein an atheist who holds their belief irrationally may seek out a Muslim whose rationale for their belief, while not reasonable, is more rational or logical than the atheist's and can thus sway the atheist to Islam. It isn't the position, the conclusion an individual operates on but rather how they arrived at their conclusion that matters. This is especially common just amongst the religious themselves as you'll see them jump between one denomination and another and even between separate and opposing religions.

Once the challenge is made to their theism however, that there even is a god, it cannot be undone since they cannot challenge their theism outright as religious views are very much the foundation of these peoples' core identity and thus form the 'I' in their axiom. So as a form of denial they interpret the challenge to their theism as a challenge to their religion. Each time they reach a breaking point in their current religion, having considered the often logical arguments against it, they break off from it and find some new religion; particularly one that claimed their former religion was false. So a Catholic may jump to Protestantism then to Islam then to Judaism and so on. They jump to a religion that insisted their former was wrong believing erroneously that its ability to successfully criticize another religion translates to the validity of its own; another instance of the black and white thinking. So long as this individual can maintain this behavior their foundational belief of theism, that a god exists, is never challenged. Only the nature of their theism changes. Recall this same scenario in chapter 1 and how it facilitates denial of the 'I am right' axiom. Such is the placebo effect granted by migrating between different ideologies.

### Self-Fulfilling Prophecy: Fulfilling Self through Delusion

I imagine you already understand how projection creates a self-fulfilling prophecy for the individual. Basically an individual, by making assumptions about others or by ascribing them some intention, transforms them in the eyes of the projector into that which the projector expects or predicts. So if a projector believes themselves to be so attractive as to be constantly ogled by every man she meets, she views every man as a creep or pervert or whatever denigration of their sexuality she sees fit to lambaste

them with. So wherever she goes and whomever she meets she believes herself to be ogled and interprets all men's behavior accordingly. Yet this prophecy can actually manifest in reality and not just as a delusion of the projector. Take for example someone who believes others are their enemy and acts accordingly, treating them as hostile not just defensively but offensively through violent actions. The people subject to this violence become the enemies of the projector by virtue of their own self defense against what is in reality an aggressive perpetrator who sees themselves as a victim. In this way a self-fulfilling prophecy can be made a reality despite the impetus to it being false. However, there exists an important criterion for this to occur. This occurs only when such beliefs lend themselves to a dichotomy, especially a causal one. A belief that the Earth is flat for example cannot be made manifest in reality in any way, shape, or form. No matter what one does according to this belief they are powerless to change reality. Yet as we saw with the belief that you are a victim of everyone else's perpetration and thus they are your enemies, one can transform others into true enemies. That is because there is a dichotomy governing such beliefs: ally vs enemy. It's seen as moral vs immoral, myself vs the other, victim vs perpetrator, naturally with the 'I am right' axiom at the root of it all. Thus in the presence of a dichotomy, one can actually transform reality into what it is they had erroneously believed. They can make real their prophecy.

'A belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.'

So behavior informed by a desire-based belief is not a reaction to reality but a goal to make it a reality. Though the behavior manifested is a chosen one, it is not consciously attributed to *this* goal but another one entirely. Typically this other goal is some moral crusade be it an ending of violence or the championing of some demographic. It's all just superficial. Since the true goal is unconscious it is thus not intentional, regardless that the other subsequent goal is itself intended. So such people consciously act to achieve a recognized goal, but in reality they're acting to achieve an unrecognized, unconscious one. In essence, they don't understand nor recognize their own intentions. Now normally you'd label such instances a mistake, of producing what one had not intended, but this pattern of behavior and the logic for it is too well-established to attribute to mere accident. The true goal, the unconscious one, is the validation of one's self and in particular their desire-based belief. With validation as the goal and that validation inextricably tied to one's erroneous beliefs, manifesting those beliefs in reality actually becomes the goal since that is the only way with which to validate one's self in reality, as opposed to entirely self-righteously. In other words, if you want nonsense to be demonstrable, to meet an objective

standard for existence, you have to make it exist in reality. Furthermore should you desire to believe something, you're expressing your desire for it to be true, not that you know it to be true. In fact such desire demonstrates that on some level you know it's false. Again, you don't want for something you already have and you can't lose truth. It either is or isn't. Simply put, you *want* it to be true so you'll act in a fashion to *make* it true. Ergo a belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.

### Consistent Need for Validation: Addicts Chasing a Lie

Though it may seem paradoxical given the unquestionable nature of it, an assumed identity is actually quite unstable and in need of validation on a regular basis. This instability comes from the *ex post facto* justification that is required to rationalize our assumptive beliefs; our axioms. As mentioned in chapter 1, an individual will not identify an axiom as such since doing so admits to it being desire-based and without rational justification. Though there is an exception made for some of the religious who recognize this yet claim faith is virtuous in and of itself. Naturally this only shifts the goalposts to an argument regarding the validity of that position which is itself a flimsy one tackled by everyone from ancient Greek philosophers to modern day atheist proselytizers. Given that there is no rationale for an axiomatic belief other than an egocentric bias, it requires supplementation. So *ex post facto* justification arises from the need to identify one's rationale for their position as anything but pure assumption. Yet no supplement is enough for a false belief because such beliefs are inconsistent with reality and will always fail to create a consistent framework to support them. So for example some fool who believes the earth is flat can certainly find evidence to support her position but this position can never square itself with the myriad other evidence in support of a roundish earth. This creates a perpetual need to supplement one's erroneous beliefs, like trying to mortar cracks in a crumbling dam, and has the individual ever seeking new reasons for their beliefs. In lieu of that they may also outright ignore all evidence to the contrary, typically by criticizing the source of it which is a prejudice in and of itself. For example:

"I'm not going to believe anything from the mouth of an atheist."

Atheist in this context is essentially the 'other' who is wrong by virtue of this individual 'being right'. This

is just another ex post facto justification of course. It's just rationalizing why one need not submit to contrary reason and evidence which epitomizes their axiomatic position in the first place. It is similar to how some of the religious move the goalposts by claiming faith as a virtue.

This need for validation creates a bizarre and abhorrent relationship between the individual in need of validation and the source of such validation. It operates like an addiction wherein the addict seeks validation for some form of pleasure or relief, especially for a feeling of vindication. Now this can be innocuous of course. If a geo-centrist gets giddy and excited when she reads yet another article in support of her position it's certainly not dangerous though nevertheless idiotic. Consider however a belief with regard to victimization and that same woman getting giddy and excited every time someone is victimized. So now instead of a single evil party, the perpetrator, being interested in and indeed receiving some form of pleasure from the victimization of others, we now have a second party who is similarly interested and pleased with their victimization. Though of course not in the same way. In their need to be validated such people *actually want others to be victimized* and this need is tied inextricably to their own identity. In very real terms, who they are requires the victimization of others. This is in stark contrast of others who believe rightly, and not axiomatically, regarding such victimization. With their belief grounded in fact and not their own identity, there is no joy or validation in the further victimization of the people they believe to be victimized. Rather sadness and anger and other rational emotional responses manifest. These people don't *need* others to be victimized but rather seek to end such victimization. If anything what they need is such victimization to end altogether.

Where this becomes especially dangerous and not just abhorrent is when this need for validation through the victimization of others is further compounded by the addition of some sort of dichotomy, again a causal one. It is in these circumstances that those in need of validation manifest behaviors that bring about more victimization by flipping such dichotomies squarely on their head. Remember, a belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality. This will be covered in great detail with the phenomenon that is, or rather is not, victim blaming.

Entitled to Be Erroneous: The Right to Offense-Taking

As with any desire-based belief, claiming the right to be offended is really communicating the *desire* to be offended rather than the entitlement or even ability to be so. Implicit in this claim however is that it is truly the right *not* to be offended that people advocate for. See, offense is a claim of some antagonism on the part of another so to say that one has the right to be offended is to say that one has the *right to be antagonized* or at least to *feel* antagonized. But why on earth would anyone claim the right to such a thing and especially in protest to the very thing that offended them? Well they first claim the right to their feelings, which they have and that we recognize as inalienable, but then through Hostile Projection they attribute their responsibility for their emotional response onto the so-called offending party. Thus with their right to be offended acknowledged and protected, and in having projected their responsibility onto the offending party, the offending party is seen as not only the progenitor of their emotional response but also responsible for mitigating it as it is of their own making. See, the offended party has the right to feel this way and that 'right' cannot be taken away by something like, say, getting over it which would be seen as victim blaming.

Furthermore the prevention of offense-taking doesn't lend itself to any universal principle. As has been said many times by greater voices than my own, "Either everything is offensive or nothing is offensive." This sentiment is taken as hyperbole by most though acknowledged for its identification of a 'slippery slope'. Fact is it's not a slope but a sheer cliff. There is no maintaining of an Aristotelian mean, of some centrist position regarding offense. The issue is really one of our axioms and how they form our identities. As you've no doubt noticed, an offended party derives offense through personal identity. Take for example Muslims offended as Muslims because they are Muslims by anti-Islamic cartoonery. In lieu of terroristic threats, people may cow-tow to their demands by virtue of not wishing to appear racist or antitheist or otherwise anti-Muslim or anti-Islam. Instead of a cartoon offending a number of individuals, it is taken as an offense against an entire demographic and thus submits itself to accusations of bigotry rather than mere personal insult. No centrist position of, "well we're just offending the Muslims" can be taken because it begs the question, "Why the Muslims and not the Hindus?" See, any standard that denies them their 'right to be offended' is an implicit criticism of their identity as not being worth consideration for offense if, and only if, other identities are to be protected from such offense taking. In other words, once you choose to protect one demographic or offend another, you must do so for all otherwise such discrimination, on the grounds of personal identity, is an obvious bias. Now normally this is where one could simply choose to target every religion or race or whomever in order to include everyone in such treatment, but that fails for two reasons.

Firstly, you can never target everyone. Even if you were to target every religion they would complain that you are targeting one stronger than the other or focusing too much on certain topics, etc. There are just too many subsets within any social construct.

Secondly, your criticisms of religion would most certainly lend themselves to other areas such as politics, culture, etc., and will elicit accusations of antitheism in general by targeting religion exclusively. Basically there is always another categorization of human behavior and identity, some larger social construct that one's criticisms can be grouped into in order to manufacture a disparity. There are just too many supersets that a single social construct can fall under. For example, criticize all religions and you discriminate only against the religious. Include atheists and you discriminate only according to beliefs in god(s). Furthermore the religious will complain that, by virtue of having so many religions with which to target, that one is not splitting one's criticism evenly between theist and atheist which the atheist will naturally protest. If you somehow manage to balance this supposed disparity, others will demand you criticize all ideology rather than those relating to religion. As you can see, the whole thing eventually breaks down. It is impossible to please everyone, especially when you're essentially trying to displease them.

No matter what you do there is always going to be a dissatisfied party and some method by which to sort your targets into visible minorities and majorities to accuse you of some form of unfairness. This is the issue with any form of equality, institutionalized or otherwise. Trying to appease such people in this way is pointless and it will be demanded that you apologize no matter what you do as you've no doubt seen. Consider though the behavior of *demanding* an apology. What sort of narcissist demands that others submit to their sensibilities? I mean really, demanding an apology entirely defeats the purpose of an apology. Asking for one is certainly kosher but demanding one? You can't demand an apology. You can only demand submission and that is very much a part of what offense-taking truly is. It is the expression of the desire for others to submit to you. It is a demand for submission or rather first an insisting that others acknowledge your offense. That they validate your identity in which you've based your offense. Also demanding an apology is a demand not to challenge you or rather your identity. In this way it is a call for censorship and lo and behold it produces that very thing. With that in mind, the required behavior to manifest the 'universal right' *not* to be offended is censorship. Period. On that note, this is why so few care much about offending the retarded and use 'politically incorrect' terms to describe them. Quite honestly, few if any are intimidated by the retarded and understand that their offense is often taken at one removed, by a third party condescendingly acting on their behalf, and thus

lacks any real credibility as a demand of submission. Basically those who take offense for the retarded are essentially communicating that we ought to be careful should we insight reprisal from them. This notion is absurd and hence offending the retarded is something in which few take much concern. This is yet more proof that offense and the fear of offending is representative of a fear of reprisal from the offended group and nothing at all to do with notions of fairness or equality. We do not fear to offend any group of little ability, population, or social power. As many are want to do, this is instead inverted into claims that those of 'greater privilege' are merely 'punching down'. That it is always some bully-tactic and means of oppression. Hardly. Rather it's a demonstration of a lack of fear, as any speech fundamentally is. Ergo it can exist between friends as much as it can enemies. This is why when met with accusations of such impropriety we caveat with claims such as "I have black friends" or "I'm Jewish so it's okay." This is done to refute claims of bigotry and the hatred inherent to it yes, but fundamentally it's to demonstrate our lack of fear of such demographics. That we do not fear them and thus do not hate them. That said, are those who call for censorship, for 'political correctness' as it's called, fearful themselves and attempting to instill fear between different demographics? Why yes, obviously.

Summary:

Projection is fundamentally a belief about one's self that is attributed to others in one of two ways. Either they attribute their personal beliefs to an individual and so perceive them as believing such. Or attribute the responsibility for their own personal beliefs to an individual and so hold them as responsible for these beliefs. Such projection is typically more emotional rather than intellectual, but the root of any emotional response is a belief, whether it is recognized or not. Regardless which form it takes, the act of attributing something internal to something external is shared in common. From this we conclude and rightly so, that a belief about one's self is the root of projection, not a belief about others. As such projection communicates much more about the individual projecting and less of those whom are targets of their projection. This egocentric means of attribution results in a dichotomy of 'me vs everyone else' or 'self vs other' which results in black and white thinking. Narcissistic at its root, conclusions are falsely drawn through a rationale of 'I am [X], therefore you are [Y]'. This allows for a self-fulfilling prophecy to manifest; perceptually though also tangibly if operating according to some causal dichotomy. Perceiving yourself as a victim for example results in treating others as victimizers

such that their defense against you is perceived as an act of victimizing you. So the prophecy of 'I am victimized' becomes self-fulfilled by virtue of merely believing it and, of course, the subsequent actions taken according to that belief.

Axiomatic belief, necessarily at the level of one's identity a la 'I am right', requires continuous supplementation as it has no reasonable means through which it can substantiate itself. Basically by operating on a conclusion without prior reason, they're forced to justify themselves ex post facto which in turn can never justify an axiomatic position; axioms never relying on any prior justification to begin with. So they're left with a need to validate their identity in perpetuity, seeking out any means of social substantiation that they can get. This is an addiction like any other and results in some depraved means through which they receive their 'fix' so to speak. The example used was of the victimization of others, say that 'women are subject to Rape Culture', which requires the addict to seek out news of feminine rape and sexual victimization in order to validate this belief and their identity with it. This in turn makes them a beneficiary of such heinous acts, whether they'd admit to it or not.

We also discussed the different means through which ideologues can entertain self-doubt through external proxies. Either as Emotional or Intellectual Conflict Therapy. This is required given the inability of such individuals to challenge their assumption of self-righteousness, the 'I am right' axiom. Furthermore we explored desire-based belief, of wanting to believe something rather than merely believing it. This was indicative of a desire, of a need for the belief to be true and thus actions taken in order to make it true. This is understood as intention and motivation, belief and action operating dependently on one another. Hence a desire-based belief betrays a motivation and intention to make what is desired a reality.

Lastly, offense-taking is a communication of threat, not of distress. It is a call for others to submit to your preferences, to cater to your desires for their conduct and with that to craft a life-experience you desire. The root of all offense-taking is fundamentally fear as demonstrated in peoples' lack of concern for offending nonthreatening demographics such as the retarded and friends and family alike. Though it should be obvious, it is a lack of fear that allows others to speak freely and with that speak in a manner that can and will offend. It is only fear that stymies such speech and so only in instilling such fear can free speech be effectively censored. In essence, self-censored by personal cowardice. Frankly the words 'offensive' and 'offended' put far too much onus on the progenitor of the subject matter in question. Instead of wondering why someone is so offended and why something is so offensive, we should instead wonder why someone is so defensive. With this the responsibility is put squarely on the defensive party

for them to make their case which is only ever a call for everyone to submit to them. Thus the fundamental nature of offense-taking, fear, is brought out into the open and attributable to those attempting to instill it. "I'm offended," translates to, "I'm defensive," and through their actions and advocacy for others to submit to their sensibilities, this is the only literally offensive action in this entire situation. That it is an act of aggression by virtue of censorship.

## CHAPTER 3 - Collectivized Projection:

### Shared Characteristics of Ideologies

Introduction:

Now that I've discussed the 'I am right' axiom and its effects on an individual level, let's examine in greater detail how it manifests on a social level. Before that however, familiarize yourself once again with the metaphor of the ducks and their interplay with each other, the phenomenon of affirmation and schism, and both the Allied and Hostile forms of projection. These are integral to understanding this group dynamic.

Collectivized Allied Projection: The Illusion of Agreement

We begin with Allied Projection which forms the means by which these social unions are constructed. The group is allied in the erroneous belief that they share the same interpretation of the group identity and the established purpose of the group. That is if there is one. This purpose can be something tangible or abstract though recall that this purpose is invariably superficial. The true purpose of any ideology is to conceal and defend the righteousness axiom from recognition and so any challenge. That said, a tangible purpose speeds the process by which standards develop for the ideology and so also the ideological identity. This increases the frequency of schisming by virtue of developing different means through which this tangible purpose is demonstrably achieved. In contrast, an abstract purpose is designed to exist in perpetuity. Through such mutual attribution onto others of one's own interpretation of the group identity, indeed the attribution of their own individual identity to others of the group, such ideologues form bonds through a false sense of mutual understanding and allegiance. In very real terms, others are seen as representatives of one's self, even as a form of social proof of their own interpretation of their identity. What we call validation or to be more precise, a form of externalized personal validation. When this delusion is shattered through schism and with no objective standard with which to appeal to, no rule set for the ideology or tangible purpose it seeks to achieve, the group or at least the individual who created the schism falls prey to the 'No True Scotsman' fallacy.

No true Scotsman is an informal fallacy, an *ad hoc* attempt to retain an unreasoned assertion. When faced with a counterexample to a universal claim ("no Scotsman would do such a thing"), rather than denying the counterexample or rejecting the original universal claim, this fallacy modifies the subject of the assertion to exclude the specific case or others like it by rhetoric, without reference to any specific objective rule ("no *true* Scotsman would do such a thing") – Wikipedia

The 'No True Scotsman' fallacy describes a situation wherein a characteristic not integral to an identity is treated as integral to it. This is often seen as a non sequitur such as, "No true physician would eat chocolate," or something seemingly more rational like, "No true physician would enjoy gory horror movies." The implicit rationale being that a physician wouldn't enjoy what is essentially the opposite of his craft. Of course this is false or rather isn't necessarily true.

Returning to the topic of schism, of note is that the individual who created the schism through an act of affirmation is the one attempting to ascribe some seemingly non-integral characteristic to the identity. They are being ousted or otherwise ostracized for doing so, but who is to say this wayward individual is wrong? That he is not a true believer? Nothing other than the subjective interpretation of others in the group. Yet were they to discuss what constitutes a true believer they'd shatter the illusory alliance that they've formed, given that all of them have projected their own interpretation of it onto the others of the group. So objectively speaking, the only thing that binds all these people together is the behavior of Allied Projection itself and not the content of what is actually being projected. These people are bound only through a common behavior which is informed by a universally shared axiom, 'I am right'. So in a way they do share a central ideology but one of a baser and unspoken sort. Remember that an ideology is the body of doctrine, myth, belief, etc., which guides an individual, social movement institution, class, or large group. That is to say an ideology allows belief to determine behavior in order to achieve a specific outcome. For example, the Christian believes in God and thus chooses not to 'sin' in order to avoid hell and to please God. This is the very essence of what the 'I am right' axiom is. Consider instead the opposite approach that is scientific methodology. In contrast to *ideology*, science is a *methodology* that is designed to achieve an accurate outcome that in turn determines belief. So while the ideologue who believes in God mutilates his child's penis in order to maintain his covenant with God, the scientist tests the age of igneous rock in the area and changes his belief about the age of that rock accordingly. The scientist submits to outcomes in reality and not to his own prejudices. The scientist, the methodeologue, operates on fact and on principle and so develops confidence through evidence. The religious man, the ideologue, operates on desire and on belief and so develops conviction through faith. Truly, ideology is first and foremost a conclusion based on no prior reasoning, a position of righteousness assumed into existence. An untrue axiom.

Collectivized Hostile Projection: The Illusion of Hostility

With Allied Projection transforming its recipients into de facto representatives of the individual, Hostile Projection lends itself to collectivization too. So an attack on one representative is interpreted as an attack on all, as an attack on the self. The identification of an enemy from one representative is made an enemy of all. So other ideologues, so long as they avoid schism, are given a free reign of sorts to govern the tertiary, superficial beliefs and behaviors of other individuals of the group insofar as the identification of opposition is concerned; both corporeal and behavioral. As you can imagine this behavior racks up enemies rather quickly. Well it would were it not for the fact that Hostile Projection is just that, projection. It's a one-sided ascription of hostility. Without a mutual hostility any such conflict fizzles out or never gets beyond the realm of idle threat. More often than not the target of this projection is confused by it because they judge this ideological group and their behavior either by their own axiom, distinct from that group, or by some objective standard. Neither of which support the accusation. Furthermore the frequency by which this happens without any appreciable negative consequences for its targets gains it a reputation of impotence; more indicative of childish name-calling and ostracism than legitimate threat. Think the impotence of the Westboro Baptist Church. Yet always remember that this occurs only in the absence of some governing dichotomy. Within a dichotomy Hostile Projection can and usually does create real enemies by virtue of becoming a perpetrator of victimization itself; typically of the exact sort of victimization they claim affects them or those they claim to help. As outside observers, any observation of hypocrisy on behalf of ideologues is more often than not operating on some sort of dichotomy that we would be wise to recognize.

#### Collectivized Behavioral Standards: Herd Mentality

This ascribing of one's own identity to others comes with it a strange behavior that almost lends itself to humility were it at all self-aware. It is that after rallying together as a collective around some ideology, subsequent to the 'I am right' axiom of course, they may convene to discuss what constitutes a true believer or paragon of the ideology. How odd that one doesn't just discern what behavior, what principles are kosher for them prior to an association with an ideology. Naturally from there they could form a social group based on what's kosher for them or seek one that already holds to them. I say it's odd but we know why. This behavior is the result of denial and the fear of introspection such people have. So in lieu of the rational behavior I outlined they seek out some ideology first and then agitate for

their own principles therein. This is why I say it's almost humble. It admits to being entirely ignorant of what a true believer actually is yet it falls short of true humility by nevertheless holding steadfast to belief in the ideological identity regardless of its lack of cogent definition. This agitation always results in one of two outcomes: schism or nebulization. However, before either occur there is a period where ideologues are lulled by their ignorance. It is then that we see collectivized behavioral standards. I'll state first that these behaviors aren't borne out of any objective principles. They are the result of a confluence of opinion from those of the group. Yet these behaviors do originate from their shared ignorance as to what constitutes a true believer. Now as I said this period where behavioral standards are born is a lull, a calm before the storm. It is a period of careful questioning, tentative beliefs, and conflict avoidance. Understandably however, with each person projecting their own identity and thus their own version of true belief onto the ideology, dissonance arises through their interaction with those in unspoken opposition to them. For example, should you observe Abdul acting in a way you think runs counter to your shared ideology, it operates as a challenge to your identity. Do you judge Abdul as failing to adhere to the ideology or do you instead doubt your own understanding of the ideology? Of your own identity?

Did you catch that? Something new? Some foreign concept? It's doubt. It's actually doubt. Finally, the counter to the 'I am right' axiom manifests and through social pressure of all things. Unfortunately it's not a rational form of doubt and so not a true counter. Instead it circumvents the axiom by manipulating it or rather the axiom manipulates itself. How? Through projection and the need for validation inherent in all false beliefs. When one externalizes their identity so greatly that such projection forms a core of their identity, it can usurp other beliefs that are simultaneously fueled by the axiom. For example, one believes that they are right as determined by the axiom, but when one believes that they are simultaneously right about being say a Muslim, and Islam informs them that they are *wrong* in their judgment of Abdul and so understanding of Islam, one has to choose between these two options. This choice is made subconsciously though and is fueled by the need for validation, otherwise it results in schism and disbelief in the ideology. Often the 'choice' is made to admit to one's error in judgment and submit to Islam – in this case. In effect Islam, or rather proponents of it, can now influence and change one's identity via their own interpretation of what constitutes a paragon of Islam. But I know what you're thinking, "How does admitting error validate oneself?" Simple really, in such circumstances admitting error admits to the truth of Islam and in having externalized one's identity as a Muslim it validates one's identity all the more. Essentially:

“I was wrong since Islam is truth. Hence I am a true believer because I submit to Islam and am now more righteous in following it. I am Muslim.”

‘Muslim’ has become one’s identity, or rather an incredibly strong part of it, and so the more ‘truth’ one can attribute to Islam the stronger one validates their own identity, even if this means admitting to error. Really such admission isn’t so much an admission of error but a proclamation of being even more right. Of being more right than they previously were. It is an act of affirmation, of yet more proof that one is a true believer and more so than ever. This phenomenon is the fully realized externalization of internal identity complete with the ability to shape this identity through the ever shifting definition of it by social forces. Forget threat, camaraderie, safety, a sense of belonging, this is the true power of social influence. Yet as ever at its core it’s a matter of individual perception and identity. It is still self-centered and narcissistic by design. No better is this demonstrated than in how the thoughts, arguments, the intellectual contributions of other ideologues that ‘prove’ the ‘truth’ of their ideology are attributed to the greater whole of the ideology itself rather than the individual. At best such contributors are given credit for communicating these ideas but not in inventing them. To admit that one is the originator of an idea held as dogma by an ideology is to admit that the ideology itself was lacking and thus false prior. The ideology itself can never been seen as incomplete and thus untrue in any fashion. Instead the introduction of new dogma is treated as long forgotten and thus the modern-day ideologues in error as wayward; guilty only of ignorance and not of intention. So rather than admit to the evolution of an ideology they instead maintain the axiom with regard to it. They maintain their self-righteousness and so their own identity as an ideologue. They rationalize this new dogma has having always been present, even elementary, and attributing its loss to personal error. No one can truly take credit or be treated as some prophet. Hell, even prophets of old were said to have God speaking through them and hence not the true originators. Yet I said this was proof of narcissism did I not? Shouldn’t this inability, or rather unwillingness, to take credit for one’s contributions be seen as humble? Well no. Remember that this isn’t true humility. The ‘truth’ of the ideology cannot be undermined as it exists as a proxy to the ‘truth’ of one’s identity as an ideologue; though as ever based in one’s unwavering sense of self-righteousness. Ergo they appear humble only insofar as such humility preserves their own narcissism, preserves the ‘I am right’ axiom. In this way ideologues treat their ideology as truth. They treat it as an immutable, ever-existent phenomenon that can only be discovered and communicated, not created.

It’s also worth noting that those influenced by the axiom never truly admit error. One is correct right up until the point where one is wrong when the axiom instantaneously applies itself to the corollary: being

right about having *been* wrong. The axiom never admits to error in the present. One is first right and then one is right about what they *were* wrong about. One is never wrong. One only *was* wrong. Seems like a trivial word game but as you'll come to see, language is key to understanding this phenomenon and, in fact, understanding itself. It's more important than you yet realize.

So it is from this phenomenon that collectivized behavioral standards are born. A challenge to one's identity is made by virtue of conversation with or observation of the behaviors of other adherents to the ideology and it is from such doubt that an opportunity for personal reconstitution arises. Though recall that any admission of personal error is attributed to ignorance not intention. This is very important. An error of intention is by definition a chosen action. A choice to act against an ideology describes an enemy or opponent of an ideology rather than a misguided believer. The intentions of one are not immediately challenged otherwise it leads to schism as discussed. So as long as the intentions of the collective can remain pure, or rather in support of the externalized identity that is the ideology, the collective can hold together for a time. I did say that this period was a lull did I not? Eventually such standardization of behavior results in an impasse. If one behavior cannot be reconciled with another the ideology falls to nebulization having realized that no one knows the true standard for the behavior of a true believer. Either that or a certain behavior cannot be reconciled with the ideology. Therefore those who apply it cannot be seen to possess pure intentions and in their refusal to abandon this behavior create a schism within the ideology. A good example are Western Christians and their stance on homosexuality and homosexual marriage which has split churches internationally. Now let us discuss the destiny of every ideology. Let's explore schism and nebulization in more depth.

#### Schism: Collapse by Attempts at Standardization

Schism is the simpler one to understand. Naturally with people agitating for different definitions or rules regarding what makes a true believer, all of which are essentially their own rules regarding their identity, schism is inevitable. This happens between generations especially when the younger generation brings in a different perspective than their elders and agitates for that to be incorporated into the definition of a true believer. That this generational schism happens at all is a testament to the subjectivity of the ideology. If the ideology is so prone to change by virtue of the introduction of new opinions, by subjectivity rather than objective fact, it necessarily demonstrates that it is not bound by

objectivity and so governed by subjectivity at its core. I mean really, the idea that youth can transform the central dogma of an ideology is demonstration enough that the ideology is false. You don't see the hard sciences changing according to the new perspectives of younger generations. What change you see is the result of rational argumentation and evidence according to the best standard for objectivity we have. With new generations come new thinkers and new ideas certainly, but they submit themselves to age-old objective standards. Maths and sciences don't change by virtue of popular opinion. Contrast that with Western Christian views on abortion and homosexuality which are becoming more and more lenient, even accepting, with each subsequent generation. It tells me that there is no true Christian though I evoke the No True Scotsman fallacy. Yet in this instance it is not a fallacy. There is no true Christian because there is no truth in Christianity. There is no objective standard for judging what is and is not a Christian. All we are left with is one's own pronouncement of the identity itself. But that no more makes me a green monkey should I claim to be. So that said in any instance of schism there are two distinct groups. There are those who alter the ideology which can be comprised of multiple disparate groups. Then there are those who stick to the established dogma. What you have are essentially reformers and traditionalists. But they nevertheless share in common their distinction from the other group that may come about: the nebulizers.

#### Nebulization: Unity through Ambiguity

Nebulization, the stranger phenomenon, is more difficult to understand but is nevertheless eerily relatable. Here the agitation for different definitions of what constitutes a true believer doesn't create schism or as much schism but instead dilutes the definition in a sea of differing opinions. Thus the definition becomes entirely nebulous with proponents of the ideology, regardless of their stance, asking in earnest, "What makes a good/true/real [X]?" Instead of nailing down some sort of definition they continue to submit differing opinions in vain. Without any objective standard by which to discern the answer they are left arguing more or less in circles about what they *should* define as [X] rather than what [X] actually is. The strangest thing though is that they remain bound by [X] even though it has no clear definition. At least it would be strange were it not for our knowledge of the axiom. Indeed their odd behavior demonstrates that it is this axiom that binds them and little more. That 'little more' being friendships, community, relationship, and some vestiges of objective principles still operating between

them. They have all bound together in the belief that they are right and termed this belief [X], some ideology, rather than identifying what [X] could be or if it could even exist. Furthermore by adopting behaviors that assume they are right and so never seek to challenge that assumption, denial essentially, they not only coexist with each other but prosper as a collective. Wonder of wonders people get along very well together when they *assume* everyone is an ally who accepts the same belief; though in truth they only accept the same label, the same [X], the same ideological identity. Again, in truth what does that ideological identity actually represent? Their shared belief in the 'I am right' axiom.

This behavior can also come about in a similar way though for a different reason. If the members of the ideology are afraid to invoke the dreaded accusation of having offended someone especially fellow ideologues, this behavior manifests in response to that fear and so dilutes itself as to not be offensive. It becomes its own 'safe space' and the fear of offending someone within it forms much of its behavioral methodology. Unable to countenance this behavior as fear, ideologues present it as caution and even compassion for the sensibilities of others and so mutate it into a virtue of all things. Not unlike the religious do with faith. Remember that fear is the root of claims of offensiveness which dovetails nicely with this behavior. Yet is it not odd that while these ideologues cannot agree on what their ideology truly is they *can* agree on what it is *not*? That they can in unison recoil in horror or raise a fist of righteous indignation regarding any representation of their ideology that they deem unworthy? This is telling, at least to me. It tells me that rather than holding to an ideal they are instead seeking one but damned by no objective standard for truth, this search for an ideal is without end. Yet it persists, ever trending toward though never reaching what it is in reality. That it isn't anything.

As an aside I find this behavior really embarrassing. It is a cringe-worthy display to see such people so adamant in their support of an ideology yet admitting to a total ignorance of it and its content. It demonstrates such a gross fear of both reality and the threat of ostracism from fellow ideologues whom they honestly know nothing about. It is the greatest display of personal insecurity I know of. That such people fear being asked to submit their opinion on the ideology, it's like a classroom full of students afraid to be called on to answer a question that deep-down they all know the answer to. It's literally pathetic: miserably inadequate yet at the same time evoking pity. Feminists are notorious for this with their, 'What makes a good feminist?' query that it seems will be pondered in perpetuity or until feminism suffers a new schism. One can only hope such schism brings about a more rational feminist camp and a less rational camp that is nevertheless willing to broaden its appeal by diluting its message thereby diluting the zealotry of its own ranks. I genuinely hope for this.

## The Eventual Failure of Denial: Collapsing Fantasy into Reality

So be the ultimate fate of the ideology nebulization or schism or some combination of the two, the result should it run its entire course with an individual is the same. It is the elimination of the ideology as an externalized identity. With nebulization the ideology slowly loses all meaning and the ideologue eventually recants their faith in the ideology or reforms it as something entirely personal. Of course it was entirely personal before but in this situation they now *admit* to it. They have gained some self-awareness. With schism the ideologue continues to shatter his ever shrinking collective of ideologues he supposedly agrees with until he is left with only himself or a small cadre of friends that are in reality just his friends; no more an ideologue than a drop of water is an ocean. Friends who are, by my definition of friendship, those who merely validate your identity irrespective of and without reference to any externalization. They socially substantiate the identity of Gary, not Gary the Christian or Gary the Buddhist. So at this point the ideology has really become an ideology of one. So this ideologue, this 'Gary' understands that he judges his ideology, should he not recant it, according to his own interpretation. He'll still hold to the notion that the ideology is true or truth itself, but understands that he is the only believer. Thus his ideological identity and his own identity fuse, recognized as merely his own beliefs. Ultimately through both means the individual reaches the same outcome. Either their faith is recanted or knowingly reformed according to their own interpretation. This tiny amount of self-awareness, long fought for not through contemplation but bitter experience, demonstrates both the futility of fighting introspection through denial and projection but also how self-awareness is the bane of denial and projection.

No matter the effort and devotion one puts into their denial, it's still denial. There is forever a pull toward the truth, or rather to the truthful identification of one's actions and motivations. Operating in denial means that such a pull will always exist and with that the resistance to it that is denial. In essence, denial reacts to truth and as a means to refute it. With this an impossible task, truth will never be undermined and thus 'pull' upon those who deny it through nothing other than reality itself. Were it the result of mere ignorance no such pull would exist. So any collective based on such denial will fall to this form of individualism, the narcissism that secretly fuels it all, and eventually splinter and shatter in

the direction of a greater consistency with each individual ideologue's true beliefs. Thus bringing the externalization full circle back into the individual where the only 'truth' of the ideology lay.

This cycle is beautiful in its way. Call it the trial and error of the species. A science of sorts birthed from irrational tribalism. One simply cannot escape reality as even denial admits to knowing the truth, even just the truth of one's error, in order to deny it.

Don't believe it? Consider how many ideologies, how many ideologues, how many reformers, and how many former ideologues fit with this description of behavior. Observe the schisming of Christendom. The nebulization of feminism. The claims and declarations of intent of every reformer from Martin Luther to Lenin to Gandhi. The testimony of those who recant and abandon their faith. Yes each one of these categories is a bit different as each person and ideology is different but the themes are similar, the parallels uncanny, and most important of all they repeat and repeat and repeat. Throughout history this cycle repeats itself with new people, new cultures, and new ideologies. If repeatable results are important to science look no further than human history. It's a single experiment run innumerable times with sample sizes as small as the individual to literal billions each time producing the same result. Indeed as an experiment it is truly a methodology, a behavior designed to maintain the 'I am right' axiom. It is a principle in and of itself though not a universal one. Thus it self-detonates as does the phenomenon of denial and projection that fuels it. It is a behavior that will exist in perpetuity until we finally come to understand it. An understanding that will come through the answer that we all seek. The question of, "Who am I?"

Us vs Them: Ascribing Evil to the Apathetic and the Ignorant

At last we introduce the dichotomy: the catalyst that transforms this benign mind-virus into the malignancy that affects us all. Well one of them anyway. Recall that the axiom can and does apply itself to one's belief regarding their own morality. They believe themselves to be moral, the hero of their own story, yet this belief doesn't create any corollary beliefs with regard to others merely on its own. That is to say, others are not immoral as a matter of our being moral. Their ignorance or apathy regarding our identity has no bearing whatsoever on how we judge them morally. Typically we see ourselves as heroes with such folk as mere bystanders to our heroism and reserve the label of 'immoral' for those who consciously choose to stand against us. Such unwarranted personal belief in one's morality, while

certainly subjective, is limited in its ascription of immorality to others. Only those that directly resist us or counter our moral beliefs earn such identification. So with each individual believing they are moral and their version of morality as true, what happens when the term is evoked by another? Well if they believe morality, when evoked by another, to be the same or largely the same as their own, we have yet another instance of Allied Projection. An Allied Projection with morality itself becoming its own ideology rather than any objective standard or tangible purpose. From here morality operates exactly like an ideology prone to schism and nebulization and for the same reasons. This phenomenon is part and parcel to moral relativism. Yet even with our knowledge of the existence of moral relativism, the default position of assuming others are moral or at least not immoral remains. We even have words used to denigrate the opposite and more rational position that people are immoral by default. That they are inherently divergent and thus opposed to our definition of morality: cynic, pessimist, skeptic, even misanthrope. Why denigrate this position then if it speaks to a truth largely understood? Perhaps if I replace these terms with something more apt like disbeliever, unfaithful, heretic, even witch, you'll understand the true nature of it? Indeed, a suspicion of immorality by default conflicts with this ideological morality which thus creates schism. In effect, such skeptics are rejecting the projected morality, the Allied Projection of those who seek to label them as moral, as their ideological identity of choice. In other words, by claiming that some person is not or shouldn't be assumed as moral, they are implicitly rejecting both the judgment of 'morality ideologues' and also their individual versions of morality too. Even in agitating for objective, realistic standards for judging morality or at least not assuming it in others such skeptics challenge the ideology and thus the axiom; since standards for knowledge and for truth always threaten this axiom. Remember that this axiom is what fuels belief in untruth, in truth based in and substantiated through the self i.e. self-righteousness, and so operates to silence or avoid truth however it can. Denial, as we've explored. So fundamentally morality has become its own ideology that we've projected onto others. By assuming that most people are 'basically good' we're engaging in Allied Projection no different than were we to assume that most people are basically Christian.

So far I have discussed morality without defining it and yet did it matter? This was intentional as a specific definition of morality is fairly unimportant in understanding the ascription of immorality to the apathetic and ignorant. With morality acting as an ideology rather than an objective standard for behavior, as some methodology for achieving a tangible purpose, it's not morality anymore anyway and to speak on what constitutes objective morality is a book in and of itself. For now impose your own version of morality as you will nevertheless see its corruption through this phenomenon. Take note dear

reader that we may hold differing definitions of words and their associated concepts without conflict if first we merely recognize it and understand such definitions as subjective, rather than as self-righteously based.

The ascription of immorality, of 'evil' to the apathetic and even ignorant occurs with the externalization of one's moral identity into the ideology. So instead of being moral as an individual and for whatever subjective personal standard, one projects the source of this morality onto the ideology. Indeed the ideology becomes indistinguishable from morality itself in the mind of the ideologue. This breaks the Allied Projection of morality as an ideology and ironically creates the cynicism such ideological morality denigrates, albeit masked by new ideological standards. So to use feminism as an example, instead of one being moral and thus one identifying as a feminist, one identifying as a feminist is now a requirement for one being moral. A declaration of adherence to feminism becomes a declaration of adherence to morality. Feminism is no longer seen as a mere moral position, as a subset of the greater whole that is morality, but as entirely necessary for morality. Now normally one could reject a specific moral position and still be viewed as moral. For example, I may not care for the plight of 'marginalized women in the workplace' or helping to fund your grandmother's breast cancer treatments yet still donate my time and energy to other ventures such as 'Doctors Without Borders' or feeding the homeless in my local neighbourhood. My choice to direct my moral concerns naturally excludes others from such charity, but such exclusion isn't out of malice. Moral actions are by definition a form of triage, directed where we feel they will do the most good to the exclusion of all others. Yet in this case the fusion of morality with feminism transforms apathy into immorality. Instead of just rejecting a certain venture or indeed the entire moral position itself as informed by feminism, one is seen as rejecting morality itself. Such apathy is transmogrified into a conscious decision to resist morality as now it is by definition a choice not to concern oneself with morality. This earns the apathetic or even just differently concerned individual an accusation of immorality and an appropriate label respective of the moral position they are supposedly in conflict with. In the case of feminism, and immortalized by one Gloria Allred,

"If you're not a feminist, then you're a bigot."

Now for the ascription of evil to the ignorant. Understand that this phenomenon is far worse than Collectivized Hostile Projection in that it creates enemies, or rather practitioners of evil – perpetrators, out of thin air. Recall that each and every one of these ideologies, these ideologues, is a victim in search of a perpetrator; of a person they can project their own responsibility for their psychological state and

even experiences onto. Such searching, targeting really, is common to Hostile Projection but with the addition of the dichotomy supplied by ideological morality *everyone* becomes guilty of perpetration who does not subscribe to the ideology. Before we consider the ideological manifestation of this phenomenon let us first consider how this operates at the level of a single individual. At an individual level this ascription of guilt or immorality is typically reserved for those whom the individual has some knowledge of or has had personal interactions with. Since an individual is the source for their own understanding of morality, to see others as immoral they must be perceived as having rejected said individual thereby rejecting morality or just simply harming this individual. In other words, to be labeled as immoral others must be held accountable for some negative experience of the individual. Naturally this keeps the population of such immoral people restricted to the individual's own experience. You can't make a bully of people you don't know, obviously. Now, the expansion of one's moral identity into an ideology certainly increases the population of immoral transgressors. Simply by virtue of the greater social influence and presence of an ideology versus that of an individual and with that the greater population that rejects the ideology and thus said individual. But the way an ideology attributes guilt even to the ignorant is what causes the exponential increase in the population of the so-called immoral. See, by making the ideology an integral part of morality itself one can make the claim that ignorance of the ideology is ignorance of morality itself. At an individual level it would be absurd to claim that all those ignorant of your existence, of your identity, are immoral. Yet when morality is attributed to an ideology such ideologues can and do claim an ignorance of the *ideology*, rather than an ignorance of the individual ideologue, is an ignorance of morality and thus immoral. Here we see the cynicism that such ideologues had previously denigrated. Rather than assuming through Allied Projection that everyone else subscribes to one's own version of morality, one now assumes but more often than not actually recognizes that others do not subscribe to their version of morality which has now been supplanted by the ideology. So 'moral' is no longer a default position. This assumption of immorality is also bolstered through personal experience by the very fact that such ideologues admit to having been ignorant of the ideology and thus morality itself prior to their 'enlightenment'. Hence others who are ignorant are similarly judged. Now there is some room for ascribing amorality and so leniency to such people, usually by offering opportunities for repentance and corrective measures, but the black-and-white thinking of projection all but eliminates such charitable interpretation. Once the victim and perpetrator dynamic takes hold, ignorance is no excuse. The other is a perpetrator regardless of their ignorance of the result of their actions. They are to blame and thus guilty – even 'evil'. Though frankly to consider others amoral

by default makes said others nearly indistinguishable from psychopaths. Differing only in their ability to develop empathy and to understand what is and is not moral, by any definition. Hardly any better really.

Effectively, while one's own morality is expanded into an ideology, morality itself shrinks into what is at best a subset of morality such as a specific moral cause. This results in, for example, claiming that aiding in the plight of the homeless is *necessary* to morality rather than just another aspect of it. It's bad enough that this removes choice from the concept of morality. Choice being integral to the entire concept. But in claiming it as a *necessity* it implies that all those who do not participate aren't moral. Worse, those who actively reject it become immoral. So in essence the expansion of their morality into an ideology has such ideologues falsely labeling others are immoral, corrupting their understanding and with that morality itself. So truly, by narrowing the definition of morality it becomes something that is almost entirely exclusive from morality altogether. Granted it is similar with regard to achieving one behavior regarding one issue, but that's it. In theory they're opposed. It's like accepting color theory as it is, but only if every color that exists must have some trace of red in it, which they cannot. So through this one makes nearly everyone ignorant of this new necessity for morality and so creates immorality, and perpetrators, out of thin air. This behavior of attempting to define one's ideology as a subset and even requirement of something else, typically some principle, is a theme we've barely begun to explore.

Compounding this with regard to feminism is the concept of Patriarchy Theory which ascribes guilt to all parties regardless of their knowledge of it or intention. This necessary element, the ex post facto justification for this ascription of immorality to all but the faithful, should be familiar to you. It's sin in the religious world. Marginalization to progressives. Privilege to social justice warriors. Myriad rationalizations for the hatred of Jews. It's some concept that ascribes guilt to an entire demographic, typically those not of the faith, whom can only find redemption in the ideology that created it in the first place. Notice however that this ascription of immorality is hidden or blunted in some ideologies for the sake of cohesion through ideologues admitting to their own prior or continued compliance with this created immorality. So the Christian is 'a sinner too', the progressive continues to prostrate themselves toward the marginalized, the social justice warrior forever checks their privilege, and so on. It's meant to convince skeptics that the ideologues accusation and offer of inclusion into the ideology isn't so much a submission as it is a recognition of equality. Also a recognition of both their mutual moral failures according to a single 'true' standard. Indeed, it's believed whole-heartedly. This is, of course, a smokescreen. Whole-heartedly believed or not it's nevertheless based in and so an expression of narcissistic self-righteousness. Hence this offer of inclusion is in truth a submission to the beliefs and

sensibilities of the ideologue, which is made all too obvious in any skeptics' refusal of this offer. The skeptic becomes an enemy, one who chooses to be immoral, and so a target for all manner of coercive and violent actions on behalf of the ideologue. Hardly some olive branch, it's a whip. One whose lash the ideologue revels under as much as they delight in snapping against unbelievers. A penchant for sadomasochism we'll come to understand.

### Doubling Down: Conviction's Clarion Call

What is doubling down? It is the strengthening of one's commitment to a particular strategy or course of action. Not an ill character trait or behavior by any means but in recent times it has become, or at least has come to be used, in specific situations and for a particular reason. To me this warrants perhaps not a new definition of the term but a new term altogether. Sadly the conflation of the behavior of doubling down with this particular instance and intention for its use has made these behaviors inseparable. Indeed in my use of it you no doubt had instances of this particular behavior come to mind. So instead of a new term altogether I suggest adding to the definition itself. So what has doubling down also come to mean?

Doubling down:

- 1) An act of affirmation, typically public, in an effort to psychologically reinforce one's commitment and display their intentions in an attempt to subvert or deny objective examination by elevating personal conviction to a higher standard.

Did that resonate with your own experience of this behavior? Perhaps watching a religious woman double down on her belief in lieu of the evidence? A politician towing the party line despite its failure and even disaster? The action of any person who when backed into a corner by reason and evidence explodes from that corner with renewed righteous fervency is a clarion call, a rallying cry for others to join them in their belief, in their crusade. It is a demonstration of conviction, a conviction *beyond* reason of course but interpreted as a conviction *above* reason. It's held to a higher standard than reason and evidence. It is a call to the faithful yet it resonates with most everyone. Even to the extent that such behavior can be seen as admirable by their opposition with endearments like, "I admire her conviction." This begs the question, "Who are the faithful really and what is the faith?"

Do I have to say what it is? It's faith itself. It's the insatiable need to justify the axiom. The act of doubling down demonstrates an adherence to the 'faith of believing that one is right' and with its demonstration of conviction it spawns allies from those apathetic and even admiration from those opposed. Fundamentally it appeals to the subconscious axiom we all share. So whether or not we support the superficial ideology in which it has manifested, we admire and so support its affirmation of the core ideology from which it originated. Doubling down is thus an act of affirmation of the ideology we all share in common. Remember, we're all bound by this one ideology. By this one fated irrationality.

Doubling down also introduces a scale by which to grade the strength of our adherence to this one ideology. This scale is conviction itself. Truly given our knowledge of how powerful the axiom is, is it any wonder how powerful conviction is: a system that is able to scale and organize it? The inspiration and subsequent great actions of history, for good or ill, crafted purely through the witnessing of great conviction are myriad. The conquering of the ancient Persian Empire as the impetus to the Hellenistic Age. The British Abolitionist movement resulting in the crippling of the international slave trade. The annihilation of Asia by the Mongols. The destruction of Europe through WWII. The eradication of small pox. The end of racial segregation in America. Note that with each and every one of these examples there is a great leader, a grand designer, a paragon of the cause itself. Why? Well conviction, through its ability to scale our adherence to the faith so to speak, propels one person's adherence and so representative status above all others. He is the most convicted and so regardless the subject matter of his conviction, he stands as the greatest believer, in thought and action, of the 'I am right' axiom we all share. So with all of us operating according to self-righteous ideology in one form or another, acts of great conviction ingratiate themselves to us. Yet such acts are not without intention. So more importantly, acts of great conviction ingratiate the *superficial ideology* to all of us whether we recognize it or not; often loathed to. So the superficial ideology of this representative, be it Christianity, Islam, social justice, etc., is now bolstered in some degree in our eyes. To believers of the superficial ideology its effects are most pronounced. They come to share in his identity, seeing him as a hero both moral and righteous in his beliefs and actions. In his crusade. Of course, this is exactly how this leader sees himself. Indeed it is how everyone sees themselves by virtue of the axiom: as self-righteous. Just consider morality and the notion of being the hero of one's own story. To non-believers in his superficial ideology they still come to see him as a paragon and admire him for it. They see him as the quintessential Christian or Muslim or what have you. Either way the result of his representative status is the same. In essence, they come to view him as *the* representative of the superficial ideology. The difference is that they don't subscribe to it and thus don't form their identity through him. Nevertheless he still becomes

the living embodiment of the superficial ideology and even the concepts and principles therein. In essence, his beliefs and actions come to define these things in our own minds. So consider the following great men of history and how they've each become representatives of something greater than themselves. Of some concept or principle:

Alexander the Great. Mahatma Gandhi. Jesus of Nazareth. Thomas Jefferson. Genghis Khan. Karl Marx. Martin Luther King Jr. Adolf Hitler. Aristotle. Julius Caesar. Winston Churchill. Joan of Arc. Gautama Buddha.

So with the addition of great conviction, what was once a personal ideological delusion coalesces around a single individual, becoming a shared one. Through this shared delusion this leader is not merely an exemplar of the cause, the ultimate representative of the self and the axiom, rather *he is the cause*. He is the paragon. 'I am right' is as ever what is being projected by all ideologues, but in allowing a single individual to shape their beliefs by virtue of his greater conviction, what is believed and so projected essentially becomes 'he is right'. Basically it's, 'I am right that he is right'. So he, the paragon, effectively becomes the source of their ideological identity. He becomes *the* Christian or *the* socialist by virtue of his will and thus he epitomizes the ideological identity. Sure he may make appeals to things 'greater' than himself like god or the greater good, but even those become defined according to his own interpretation, effectively making them just another extension of his own identity and self-righteousness. So as he sees them so too will his followers. Again, such things are superficial. As well his followers, faithful to him, can and often will reject those greater things in service to him. In other words, whatever allegiance the paragon has isn't shared by his followers. They honor such allegiance only insofar as the paragon continues to. They owe fealty to the paragon alone. Really it's the unspoken, unrecognized behaviors shared by all ideologues at work here. Since through the 'I am right' axiom there exists a shared belief for all ideologues and with that subsequent behaviors, there exists a metric by which belief can be demonstrated. As I said, this is conviction. Furthermore since this belief is by definition entirely egocentric, literally *self-righteous*, it's really no wonder that those who demonstrate the greatest conviction are themselves followed rather than the superficial ideology they may make appeals to. When it gets to this point the mask, the beard that is the superficial ideology is least apparent and we can see the foundation of egomania at the root of all ideological belief. This is why paragons, cult leaders, whatever you want to call them, can and often do manifest greater schism than were they absent the ideology. Yet paragons' greater conviction forever pulls at the foundation of all

ideology, bringing in new believers for every traditionalist or reformer lost due to the paragons' interpretation of their superficial ideology.

With ideology as an externalized individual identity, externalizing this individuality into a single individual is honestly quite simple; simpler than superficial ideologies can afford. See, with ideology you have some nebulous label, really just a term people project individual meaning into and form a collective through Allied Projection. This then allows the ideology in the form of the collective to alter their perspectives on *what* is right but not that *they* are right. Without ideology you merely have a person who best represents true ideology, that of self-righteousness and its axiom, and so may become a paragon of the one thing everyone believes: 'I am right'. From there he can alter their perspectives on *what* is right but again, not that *they* are right. Furthermore as a paragon, as 'truth incarnate', he can never be wrong in the eyes of his followers. This is a result of everyone's inability to question the axiom, just with the paragon having become the embodiment of that axiom. In essence he is transformed into an externalization of the method by which we all process information, how we determine truth at an individual level, that of self-righteousness itself. So as he reasons so too do they. As he intends so too do they. As he acts so too do they. His followers are like sheep and have formed what we understand as a cult of personality. Before that however, a brief interlude regarding the distinction between conviction and confidence.

#### Conviction vs Confidence: Belief vs Knowledge

Confidence doesn't so much appeal to faith regarding knowledge claims and the axiom the way conviction does. Rather confidence is an expression of one's evaluation of outcome; typically risk. Confidence demonstrates that one is unconcerned or less concerned with possible negative outcomes whether they be physical or psychological harm or even humiliation, and all by virtue of one's *estimation* rather than *faith*. It is a form of optimism surely but not blind since as an estimation it submits itself to some standard be it talent, reason, etc. By operating according to some standard the demonstration of greater confidence translates to, though assumed, having met or exceeded such a standard. Of course right? One assumes that another so confident in their ability to tame lions wouldn't be awful or inexperienced at it; especially if they proceed to walk into a lion's cage or den. In such situations there are only two options for this behavior and we have a sentiment for that: 'either brave or foolish.' Simply

put, confidence operates with reference to reality. Confidence and conviction remain separate as confidence implies some standard by which it can be substantiated and indeed confidence can be seen as having failed to live up to the expectations created through its display. Not true with conviction however. Conviction exists by not submitting itself to any standards for knowledge and indeed the more it asserts itself in spite of evidence the greater the conviction is seen as succeeding for the individual. The moment conviction submits itself to a standard is the moment that conviction is seen to have failed or been folly. Conviction is faith and faith is the desire for something unknown to be known or for untruth to be truth. It is an appeal to the self-righteousness in all of us and thus a call to rally according to it. To replace reason and evidence with it. To subscribe to the ideology of 'I am right'. Simply put, conviction operates irrespective and often in spite of reality. Since the individual with the greatest conviction is essentially demonstrating the greatest behavioral expression, the greatest affirmation of self-righteousness, and we are subconsciously bound through this shared ideology of self-righteousness based on the axiom 'I am right', we therefore admire and even follow this individual as they are seen as the greatest purveyor, the greatest paragon not necessarily of *what* we believe, but *how we believe*.

#### Cult of Personality: Through You, Me

A cult of personality is merely the projection of one's identity onto another rather than an ideology. The axiom and the identity it creates is forever bound to the individual, but the projection becomes so strong that the personality, the charismatic leader, seemingly becomes an extension of the self. In reality they become a paragon of the axiom itself. They become a living physical embodiment of 'I am right'. They are faith itself made tangible. With such lofty attribution comes what should be by now obvious corollaries. The paragon's actions, in keeping with the axiom, are now above reproach and even define what is and is not acceptable. Why? They are right, of course. To doubt the paragon is to doubt the self. This goes so far as to not simply excuse but champion contradictory and hypocritical behaviors on behalf of said paragon. So long as the paragon maintains their conviction, cognitive dissonance will be forever stayed since no standards to judge truth and behavior exist other than the conviction of the paragon. In other words, everything they say and do is right so long as they themselves believe it. Their conclusion, their position of self-righteousness is axiomatic. Ergo it never submits itself to reason nor to any challenge whatsoever. In the same way the paragon never submits to reason nor any challenge.

Consider the Christian god and how Christians follow 'His word' which is nothing more than rank subjective opinion on behalf of their god. Hypocrisy doesn't matter when their only standard for belief is what the paragon says. No standard for reason or logic need apply.

A paragon is the closest anyone can ever get to fully externalizing themselves into another person. This incorporation of the paragon into the self creates sacrifice, even of their own lives, for the sake of preserving the paragon's desires. As he has become the paragon of their beliefs, everything they hold as good and true, he has become worthy of preservation above all other concerns. In the same way you may need to make a choice between one thing you value and another, his followers will make the choice between their lives and his. Worse is that he now represents the ultimate concern everyone has, that of preserving their identity and so their axiom. This is his great and terrible power. The choice of how to use this power, this power to fundamentally choose for others, can be used to accomplish great feats wonderful or terrible. So long as this phenomenon itself cannot be controlled outsiders typically seek to segregate it. That is if these cults do not do so themselves. As you've no doubt seen or heard, these cults can and do segregate themselves into their own communities in what are usually called compounds by the media. When this cult of personality escapes this self-imposed or outsider-imposed quarantine of sorts the hope is that such leaders are moral people or at least orient their faithful according to ethical principles or a worthy cause. For every Martin Luther King Jr. or Jesus of Nazareth, if he was real mind you, you get an Adolf Hitler. Though am I really comparing Martin Luther King Jr. and Jesus to Hitler? Yup.

So far I've spoken of paragons who are, for an intents and purposes, not self-aware. They are true believers themselves either in the faith, some higher calling of sorts, or in themselves as egomaniacs. But what if this paragon is aware of this entire phenomenon and not a true believer even in himself? That is to say he doesn't share in the faith of his faithful nor does he accept the version of himself that his faithful have created. Think an atheist Pope. What is he then? Further still, what if the paragon doesn't even exist? What if the paragon is a god? What then? You'll have quite a while to ponder that query and I invite you to keep it in the back of your mind.

Horseshoe Theory: Observation of Ideological Congruity

There are myriad examples of the phenomenon of collectivized projection as you've no doubt considered throughout this chapter. I've focused on religion as I believe it is the most prevalent and simplest to understand as an atheist or even as a member of a different religion, but any time a group of people project their identity onto something external to themselves you can observe this phenomenon. Politics for one; especially the left vs right, liberal vs conservative, democrat vs republican divide that plagues just about every Western country. Really what they all boil down to is good vs evil – at least that is how they are characterized by those within them. Both sides largely hate each other, are victims of each other, are blamed for each other's failures, etc. Black and white thinking in other words. Then there's Horseshoe Theory:

- 1) In political science, asserts that rather than the far left and the far right being at opposite and opposing ends of a linear political continuum, they in fact closely resemble one another, much like the ends of a horseshoe.

This dovetails with my hypothesis that all ideologies, by virtue of operating according to the same erroneous psychological mechanics and fundamentally on the same foundational axiom, are similar in behavior and methodology regardless of motivation, intention, or goals. The only thing I would disagree with are the terms 'far left' and 'far right'. I contend that rather than being construed as radical or extreme with reference to the average position of those of either a left or right political persuasion, they are actually far more *consistent* in the application of their ideology and the behaviors it ought to inform. Take the Westboro Baptist Church for example. They are demonized as radicals and extremists yet they have applied the teachings of the bible much more consistently than those of their peers in other Christian sects. Indeed, the extent to which Christians are not radical but rather moderate, which is telling terminology, is the extent to which they aren't Christians. It's almost as if our judgment of their behavior accords to some universal standard like reason or something. Go figure. This can and is applied to ideologues of all sorts: radical vs moderate feminists, Muslims, libertarians, etc.

I say the term moderate is telling because of the metric it evokes. I mean, are these ideologues only *moderately* Muslims or feminists or whatever? Do they only believe it *moderately*? Frankly yes, and thus this term moderate is in praise of, again, the extent to which they are not ideologues but more rational. There is a cowardice in being such a moderate though. In not possessing the strength of one's convictions or one's confidence in their reason and evidence to commit fully to either the irrational ideology or a rational standard for truth. Instead they choose a middle ground reserved for those who typically advocate for tolerance yet without any standard. They are the physical embodiment of the

appeal, "Can't we all just get along?" More often than not, such moderates are prone to nebulization rather than schism and are typically considered more liberal. Since left-right politics is a quagmire of varying opinions and motivations by virtue of its need to incorporate millions of individuals under one of two fealties, for now I'll not expound anymore on these umbrella ideologies but focus instead on something much simpler: race relations. In particular instances of spontaneous moral outrage and racial solidarity in the United States. Now before you object, I know full well the extent to which these events are catalyzed and exacerbated by race baiting on the part of the American media and its political wings. But such is the power of those that understand and can therefore control collectivized projection and they warrant their own chapter of discussion.

Michael Brown and Trayvon Martin. Darren Wilson and George Zimmerman. Names that, should you have involved yourself in their respective fiascos, will elicit feelings of defensiveness in preparation for yet another contentious, or rather opposing, opinion.

The deaths of both Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown were legal and warranted uses of deadly force against them. More importantly they were ethically justified. Stop right now. You know better. I want no feelings of resentment, disappointment, or even solidarity with me. At this point you must know better than to externalize your identity into these men and these events. Surely your newfound awareness grants you an exemption from such externalization? You can be free from it now. Don't slide back. Don't base your identity in lies. Dear reader these men, their situations, indeed their lives have and had nothing to do with you. Indeed they had nothing to do with most everyone involved in the rioting that followed. What these rioters did, people on either side, was to externalize their own identities into these men and the situation itself as an effect of some greater whole like racism, poverty, police brutality, etc. It was no longer about the men involved but rather about each individuals' own identity and thus narcissism. Such people selfishly involve themselves in these situations by making it about them, about their own identity, rather than what actually transpired. To such ideologues the extension of the core of their identity to encompass the guiltlessness or not of Trayvon Martin and Michael Brown brings with it their identity as morally righteous individuals. So because these ideologues are morally righteous Brown and Martin are surely innocent and anyone who claims otherwise is immoral and a justifier of, hell even an accomplice to, the very 'evil' that killed Brown and Martin.

So either side set out against each other, rioting and fighting in the streets the same way any person who felt their own identity threatened would. Hostile Projection put them at each other's throats. Allied Projection kept both sides unified in defense of each other. All the while it ceased having anything to do

with Trayvon and Brown but rather to do with the identities of the rioters themselves. The battle over their self-perception was what was spilling over into the streets. It was pure ideological tribalism fueled by intense narcissism at its core. It was never about Martin or Brown. It was the culmination of a shared narcissism that, when provoked, spills over into the streets in violence over and over again.

#### Acting in Ignorance: Fear of Guilt as an Investment in Denial

No matter what the facts were in the end of either situation, the reality was that people were acting violently in ignorance of the truth. It didn't matter what conclusions people wished to come to or even came to as the result of good research. What mattered was that people felt justified in acting in ignorance and, as a result of the guilt they now feel for having done so, have denied the truth once it came to light or rallied around some corrupted sense of vindication depending on what they believed and what they did accordingly. Indeed, no matter the truth of the situation acting in ignorance of that truth is a regrettable action. No vindication can be found in the truth after such actions are undertaken in ignorance. Such personal investment is not a game of chance but rather of identifying and assessing one's motivations according to one's principles and ideals. In other words, just because Trayvon and Brown were found guilty doesn't make anything you did while irrationally operating under that conclusion justifiable. In fact it reveals you as having poorly represented the truth. In having falsely elevated yourself to a representative of the truth all you were really doing was representing your own sense of identity and your own sense of self-righteousness.

Through externalization people on either side held their position with regards to Trayvon or Brown or whomever as the basis of their principles instead of those principles informing their position on them. When the truth finally came out people felt their own character threatened because instead of erecting a totem to the true principles they proclaimed throughout either fiasco, they erected false totems to Trayvon or Brown or whomever in their place. They had the whole thing backwards which we've no doubt come to expect from ideologues. In their minds defending Brown or Trayvon or Wilson or Zimmerman made them principled, instead of being principled first and therefore acting in accordance with those principles; to the benefit of whichever side said principles determined to be worthy of action. Their flawed system operates on a conclusion rather than a principle, a methodology, and all irrespective of reality. Of course it is the axiom at work attempting to justify and eventually vindicate

itself. So after having acted rashly and irrationally not to mention violently, they have since shaped their own reality as a means to deny their own evil doings and their own false totem. To defend this totem they have made paragons of either involved parties, though especially of Trayvon and Brown, glorifying them as saints, good 'kids', peaceful, virtuous, and a host of other unsubstantiated nonsense the truth of which they have not been made privy to and believe with all evidence to the contrary. In becoming paragons even after death, their actions are above reproach in keeping with the characteristics of a paragon. This attribution of paragon status to the dead brings with it immediate vindication and so status as a martyr, again of some greater cause of the ideologue's choosing. When such attempts are made in the black community to vindicate violent criminals as saintly martyrs, these criminals have come to be known by the pejorative term 'dindu' as in 'they didn't (dindu) nothing.'

Consider all the actions taken in ignorance. The riots, assaults, vandalism, and theft. Such investment in their conclusions, having manifested as violence and the victimization of innocent parties, has left these people unable to countenance their behavior and so they've doubled down on their position; bolstering their convictions for the sake of denying their responsibility for their own actions. So now to even consider the falsity of their position is to consider that they are immoral by their own standards, severely dampening any incentive to do so. Now their denial, strengthened by their fear of guilt, protects itself through an ex post facto justification that involves projection of their guilt onto other parties. Such projection of guilt necessarily renders such parties as opposing, 'evil' wrongdoers. They become what the projectors are in truth. So after all is said and done what has transpired? Now instead of a single person or small group blaming each other regarding a single event, we now have thousands involved in a single, long, protracted event. With all having acted in ignorance of the truth all are also guilty to one degree or another. So this externalization of one's identity has become a self-fulfilling prophecy wherein the Trayvon/Brown side has become victims of the Zimmerman/Wilson side and vice versa. They created the very victimization they claimed to be victims of by first identifying, erroneously, as victims themselves. I repeat:

'A belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.'

Now we have two groups numbering in the thousands all victims of each other. This only generates another means of illusory divide between two opposing sides who are more alike than either you or I who watched this freak show from the sidelines with our heads in our hands. Here we see Horseshoe

Theory in full display and would marvel, were it not so abhorrent, at the stark similarity and I argue equality of these supposedly opposing groups.

### The Zealotry Toolkit: Turning Denial into a Weapon

I believe this behavior of acting in ignorance is the result of a subconscious motivation designed to facilitate denial. It isn't merely acting rashly. It is acting in such a way that will strengthen one's conviction through a fear of guilt thereby strengthening their overall resolve. This behavior is designed to facilitate denial, not create it as a byproduct. In other words, rather than denial being the unfortunate result of this behavior it is the *goal* of this behavior to produce it and a stronger form of denial at that. The harder it is to come to terms with your unreality, the easier it is to maintain it and the greater the passion in its maintenance.

The moment the mind realizes the potential in acting in ignorance it does so making an investment in a future, more powerful denial by which the individual can operate under the influence of. Such behavior foments great conviction because while one's identity had been previously erroneously tied to some external subject matter, it is now tied intimately as a result of the individual's immoral actions. Each and every situation to act in this way is yet another opportunity to grow one's conviction and their overall sense of self which is probably why you see the same people involved in these sorts of situations over and over. In essence it creates a greater need to maintain denial which itself develops a greater conviction which in turn charms others to validate you by virtue of your greater displays of affirmation of the axiom. This also applies to those who recognize this phenomenon and so use it to their advantage like the media with their race baiting. This behavior is the number one conviction creation process for ideologues, operating at an individual level on a positive feedback loop ever growing one's overall conviction with regard to just about everything. It is also the creation toolkit for zealotry.

That said, would you like to engender zealotry in an individual? Just make him guilty of something. Dirty his hands. Make the ideology, the faith, his only reprieve from the guilt slowly beginning to gnaw away at him and he'll turn to ideological fanaticism before he dares consider the alternative. That he has acted against his principles, his conscience, that he is guilty of 'evil' and thus immoral. In other words, tie his very identity as a moral individual and especially as not *immoral* to his belief in the ideology. Corrupt

his axiom into, 'I am [X Ideologue] therefore I am right,' but with the worse corollary, 'Thus without [X Ideology] I am evil.' This will subjugate him forever lest he face the reality that he has done great 'evil'. It's altogether interesting really. Interesting in that hideously though efficient sort of way typically reserved, and rightly so, for the parasite. Calculated monstrosity. The first part of the corrupted axiom, 'I am [X Ideologue] therefore I am right,' is an excuse of course but acts as salvation from the second part which is a rational understanding of the circumstance, 'Thus without [X Ideology] I am evil'. Indeed, those who use this toolkit to generate zealotry are twisting reason to their own evil purpose.

It is a marvel of human psychological engineering to turn reason into a weapon. To use it to cage the mind rather than to free it. In essence, such zealots now have every reason to fear reason and with that their identity exists as far removed from reality as they can maintain. Now I imagine you've not lost yourself to zealotry and unreality to this extent, but you've certainly created a situation wherein the maintenance of your identity as a good person required a rejection of reality, no? Should this be the case you've no doubt felt how uncomfortable reality, a dose of truth or the questioning or criticism of what you believe, can make you feel. Consider the extent to which zealots are invested in their denial and with regard to some truly atrocious behaviors on their part and so recognize just how agitated they are by reason. Zealots, regardless of their ideological allegiance, are your enemy.

#### Corruption through False Equivalency: Co-opting Standards and Principles

This behavior has already been mentioned in this chapter but it bears closer examination and explanation. Recall how the axiom coupled with the externalization of one's identity allows one to equivocate or even usurp an objective principle or concept with their ideology. This is the ability for one to define themselves as an ideologue first and moral due to that rather than to define one's self as moral first and thus identifying as an ideologue which supposedly adheres to moral standards. It's putting the cart before the horse. This behavior itself speaks to the power in these principles and concepts as they remain the ultimate standard by which ideologues judge themselves and their ideology and communicate the righteousness of their ideology to others. Except that's not entirely true. These remain the ultimate standard in word only. Essentially they lose their power as concepts and are instead transformed into raw appeals to the objective authority they represent. The power of association is what ideologues are attempting to harness by co-opting these concepts and principles which themselves

define a consistent application of objective reasoning. Concepts just as fairness, justice, equality, morality, and principles such as charity, honesty, kindness, etc. Naturally this drive in ideologues isn't at all self-aware but rather their earnest attempt to associate like with like. Whether that be feminism with equality, religious tenets with an objective morality, social justice with justice, and so on. Though this raises the obvious contention of why such ideologues continue to hold to their respective ideological distinctions. See, if the ideology they espouse is a necessary component of the objective concept they claim it embodies, they no longer require the ideology. They can instead espouse what had informed their ideology and so become champions of the objective concept itself. This contention is embodied in the common query, "If you're for equality between the sexes why not call yourself an egalitarian?" The answer to that question should come simply to you by now. It would mean the death of their identity to do so. What's more that act of progress towards their goals also results in the eventual futility of their ideology. The goal of every revolution is to end right? This was well demonstrated when Suffragettes achieved their goals and effectively ended their campaign. What remained however, or rather *who remained*, were those personally invested in the cause and the motivations for it as a source of externalized identity. Thus they sought to maintain the need for it in perpetuity lest they lose their false sense of identity supplied through it. These were feminists who eventually took credit for Women's Suffrage ex post facto as a means to grant legitimacy to their cause through a presumed virtuousness of intention that comes with having secured women's suffrage.

The overall issue with attempting to define one's ideology as a necessary component or subset of an objective, or at least standardized concept, is that as such it does not allow for redefinition. Justice is justice. Theft is theft. Murder is murder. It can be added to, expanded upon, but cannot be deviated from without such deviation divorcing itself from the concept. Thus any distinction one attempts to make and keep from such concepts yet still claiming to embody them is a distinction from objectivity itself. In other words, you cannot embody an objective concept while maintaining anything that distinguishes you from the concept itself. Objectivity itself is black and white at its core. It's true or false, or rather it is the ability to distinguish the two. Objective is itself a term used to describe the truth of reality. It is essentially the concept of rightness, correctness, truth itself. As such it operates very much like the 'I am right' axiom, or rather ideology is believed to be true and so operates much like objectivity – at least in part. Consider the ideologue who believes that their ideology is the objective truth. How then do they countenance new additions to their ideology? How do they explain how their objective truth could be lacking in any way? Well, such new additions to the ideology are not seen as additions but forgotten, neglected, or always having been elementary. The error is never with the ideology but rather

in the ideologue. New discoveries and subsequent additions were always true and it was merely the error of the ideologue for not having known them. See how the ideology has become analogous to truth itself? Consider that the physical sciences are constantly evolving and adapting to the truth of reality. Yet what is true, what is truth remains unchanged. Only our perception of it changes. *Our truth* changes, not *the truth*. It is in this same way that ideologies change though forever with the assumption that the ideology *is truth* itself. Their ideology *is physics* to them. Ideologues are merely learning more about it or rather becoming more consistent with their 'reality' and thus objective in their own minds. This is the righteousness axiom at work. First the assumption of rightness is made and then that assumption seeks substantiation. This substantiation forms the superficial ideology. The host of ex post facto justifications required for such self-righteousness.

#### Objectivity Creep: Reason from Unreason

Historically there have ever been attempts to introduce reason into an ideological zeitgeist. To judge reality based on objective standards for truth. To form beliefs based on a methodology rather than an ideology. Science has been successful in introducing such standards with regard to what is, but with regard to what ought to be, in the realm of philosophy, such objective standardization has failed. The problem is of course the axiom and how it interferes more so with personal beliefs and identity than with other matters of reality. Matters of reality that science, while no different in its objective standards for truth and in its methodology, simply has not or cannot break into. Yet there has been, or rather was given its rate of deterioration, a successful attempt at harnessing the axiom and the tribalism it engenders for the sake of pursuing objectivity and reason. Can you guess what it is? This attempt was religion and the concept of god itself. In particular the Christian religion and the god Yahweh.

In seeking ways to substantiate their ideology ideologues become more susceptible to collapse by attempts at standardization through the mechanisms of schism and nebulization. However with these mechanisms, particularly nebulization, lies the *potential* for a corrupted but nevertheless operable form of objective reasoning to take root. Given that the ideology is first considered an objective truth, as wrote, as elementary, any such substantiation of this 'truth' can yield to the very objectivity the ideology claims to embody. In essence the answer to, "What is objective truth?" is provided in the form of the ideology, let's say Christianity in this case. Yet this then begs the question, "What is Christianity?" and it

is with such investigative and ultimately introspective questioning that ideologues can apply the necessary tools of reason and evidence in determining just what truth, or rather what Christianity, is. No longer is the meaning of Christianity and what it means to be a Christian left as an unspoken shared assumption effectively ending Allied Projection amongst the faithful. Instead the community of the faithful rallies around their shared interest in and pursuit of the truth itself or rather the 'truth' of Christianity. This effectively transforms their ideology into a methodology. Certainly at their core is an unwavering faith in God and Christianity, but with neither God nor Christianity benefitting from their assumed interpretations provided through Allied Projection, they become merely analogs for truth and the application of truth respectively. In other words, God becomes just another word for truth and Christianity another word for an objective application of truth. See where I'm going with this? Once the ideology transforms itself into a methodology its pursuit of substantiation creates the need for objective reason and evidence as the ultimate arbiters of belief. To determine *how* one is a Christian and *how* God exists both in reality and in character. Is it any wonder then that the Enlightenment began in Christian Europe and around the same time Christian thinkers and philosophers had broiled themselves in steely debate regarding the true nature of God and Christianity? Hardly. It is deeply ironic that the very methodology so scorned by ideologues would then be used to attempt to substantiate their ideology, only to refute and slowly destroy it. I love a good irony.

Now recall the creation of a Cult of Personality and the leader, the paragon, who heads it. His personal actions are above reproach and excused or praised even if hypocritical and contradictory. The paragon becomes analogous with the follower's own identity who incorporates the leader as a part of themselves. This phenomenon is no different whether the paragon is a man or a non-existent god. Consider that Christians hold the actions of God above reproach, excuse and praise His contradictory behavior, and view God as a part of themselves. They even go so far as to, 'ask Him into their heart in order to be saved,' whose rhetoric is so on the nose it's more than likely due to the greater self-awareness centuries of Christian philosophy was able to develop. Yet whereas the paragon as a man can represent himself and his own intentions how can a non-existent god? Well through his priests of course. The priests claim holy representation and so abuse this power, either consciously or subconsciously, to choose for others. However, recall the spontaneous manifestation of objectivity within an ideology and how it removes Allied Projection. What then? Who then can claim to know God and thus represent Him? Again, this is how a god can become synonymous with truth itself. 'God' merely becomes another word for truth. Why does this bear repeating you ask? Well for the not

insignificant fact that this form of nebulization of the ideology by the slow creep of objectivity *harnesses tribalism and creates rationalism through it.*

As discussed human beings, through the narcissistic tribalism created by Allied Projection, are prone to follow and admire conviction and the cults of personality created by it. As a social species people require the validation and guidance of others and so often put social considerations, matters of rank tribalism, above reason and evidence. People follow people more powerfully, more readily, and more often than mere ideas alone. Conviction trumps reason in most situations. So what the creation of a god does is to create an ultimate person or rather personage to admire, to follow, to swear fealty to, to fight for, to live for, and even to die for, all the while that person is wholly non-existent and instead a anthropomorphized version of objective truth. This abstraction harnesses the irrational motivations informed by tribalism and turns them toward the pursuit of an anthropomorphized rationality in the form of a god. So instead of following the leader and doing what he says, they try to envision the leader and discern what he'd say. Given that they believe what he'd say is truth, they inadvertently come to seek truth albeit through a tribalistic motivation.

So without anyone to speak for and represent this god all anyone is left with is the eventual application of reason and evidence in order to determine His true nature, which in reality is just true nature in spite of any god. So those wishing to discern the true nature of God's morality pursue objective morality. Those wishing to discern the true nature of God's world pursue the physical sciences. In whatever field one decides to explore they become bound by the methodology informed through reason and evidence, eventually science, and so become the opposite of an ideologue without ever realizing it. Fundamentally the only thing they now assume is that, 'God exists and He is truth,' but in practice this manifests in an investigative behavior, a rational methodology that operates on the assumption that truth exists along with the motivation to pursue it. Certainly time is wasted attempting to prove the existence of the embodiment of truth that is God but such pursuits are innocuous and hardly detrimental. They manifest as non-answers such as God occupying another dimension of existence and debates on how to countenance opposing aspects of religious texts. Time wasters to be sure but as exercises in reasonable argumentation through fiction they keep one's skills sharp; though confined by the limitations of fantasy. Seems like an oxymoron doesn't it: confined by fantasy? Anyway I see such discussion no differently than Star Wars fans discussing the merits of the Jedi vs the Sith; which I am not ashamed to say I can weigh in on.

So fundamentally this co-opting of objectivity in an attempt to harness its inherent authority ends up backfiring with objectivity itself eventually co-opting tribalism for rationalism and nullifying the ideology altogether. This is fitting as any *willing* introduction of objectivity into an ideology should nullify the ideology. When the survival of an ideology is predicated on the resistance of reason, denial, and the assumed camaraderie developed through Allied Projection, the introduction of reason and shattering of Allied Projection it brings about acts as a silver bullet. It acts as a perfect cure-all for ideological thinking and as stated previously, such submission to objective standards is the means by which conviction is seen to fail. The moment an ideologue suggests that they define their ideology as a necessary addition to or subset of an objective concept they are inviting skepticism, doubt, and most importantly an objective method for discerning truth, into their ideology. Knowing this, how is it that ideologies can avoid it? How can they avoid centuries of growth without ever allowing reason to eventually shatter their collective delusion?

#### Circular Reasoning: The Roundabout of Denial

Rather than merely a failure to reason, circular reasoning is a subconscious attempt to avoid reason by seemingly applying it or applying it to a degree that the ideologue feels is satisfactory. See, the proper application of reason acts as a pathway; branching to be sure but one that will eventually lead to objective conclusions that will conflict with the ideology or whatever other false belief one has and is reasoning out. Circular reasoning is an attempt to take this branching path but to walk in circles as the name suggests. So for example:

The bible is the word of god.

I know this because the bible tells me so.

I know the bible is infallible because...

The bible is the word of god.

I know this because the bible tells me so.

I know the bible is infallible because...

Another example:

Feminism is needed to liberate women because women are oppressed because people reject feminism, feminism is needed to liberate women because women are oppressed because people reject feminism.

The best circular reasoning has no beginning nor end nor periods of any sort. As an avoidant behavior this is yet another form of denial and as a form of denial it seeks to maintain itself in perpetuity, not unlike a circle. It transforms the branching out of reason toward different conclusions into something which merely encircles a single conclusion; never to reach it but never to move away from it either. Like a limit in calculus, it only ever trends toward it. That's why it exists in perpetuity.

Double Standards: The Hypocrisy that Wasn't

In your interaction with ideologues, especially feminists, you've no doubt observed their double standards. That is to say, they claim to hold a universal concept such as equality, but then demonstrate exceptions in practice. Exceptions that they will often refuse to recognize though if they do, vociferously justify ex post facto. Yet such hypocrisy is often of our making, not theirs. By projecting our understanding and so interpretation of the universal concept in question, we therefore also determine what constitutes a deviation from it. Yet such a standard is entirely of our own making. Another person may have, in fact is almost guaranteed to have, a different understanding and so standard for this universal concept. Thus what we may interpret as a deviation and thus a hypocritical action, they may view as entirely in keeping with it. So really, it's more often than not our fault whenever we observe a double standard because we're assuming others operate according to our definition of something. Where have we seen this before? Of course this is Allied Projection; of assuming a shared self-righteousness, in this case in the form of a definition of a term. As we can assume the same interpretation of our identity and so form an ideology so too can we assume the same definition of terms and so form an ideology. Really the assumption of an equal and shared understanding of language is what's key to this. So when a feminist evokes equality between the sexes yet appears to act hypocritically we need to ask how she defines equality and furthermore what constitutes legitimate exemptions from it. See, 'man' and 'woman' are to be treated as equals according to sexual equality but

there are of course other factors at play. According to feminists there is systemic oppression, matters of privilege, and a host of other things to consider. As ever, men and women are agents, able to choose and to act and as such these factors must absolutely be considered as well. Honestly it's all rather complicated.

Now why does it matter? That is, why must we understand how ideologues, in this case feminists, define terms? Well it matters because in order to interact with them efficiently we need to know exactly whom we're dealing with. Be your aspirations to help or hinder or harm them, you must know them first.

"Know thyself, know thy enemy." – Sun Tzu

Though we will return to this matter of hypocrisy in time, consider how deep this matter of definition can go. It's not simply a case of holding to different definitions for some words but *all words*. Consider just what would happen if the very fundamentals of language weren't shared between yourself and another. That they would have a different understanding of 'I' or 'as'. That they would interpret individuality entirely differently thus affecting their understanding of literally every *thing*. In contrast consider that their language may be almost entirely consistent with ours save for a tiny though integral distinction. One that allows for a consistency of logic nearly identical to ours whose distinction is revealed only when operating through complicated belief systems like ideology. So like looking for a needle in a haystack, trying to determine the impetus to their ideological belief appears impossible since we only ever find the psychological equivalent of yet more hay. In other words, we can't locate the source of the problem because their ability to reason appears consistent with our own. They just come to different conclusions by the end of it. So we chalk it up to all sorts of external forces such as mental disorders, but such is *our* own attempt at ex post facto justification. While we can certainly prove these people incorrect in their conclusions, we can't prove why they've arrived at them. Until we can do so we can't cure, fix, or otherwise alter their conclusions given they're bound by their own rationale. They will believe it regardless our input. In other words, to change their conclusions you have to change the process by which they conclude. To fix their conclusions, their output, you must instead fix their programming, their rationale. Input is irrelevant to flawed programming.

So all that said, accusations of hypocrisy a la double standards may often be of our own making and when not, offer no means of rehabilitation for those who adhere to them. These accusations certainly expose such hypocrites to observers and preach to our respective choirs, but they do nothing to remedy the underlying cause. As such this cause can be allowed to persist and when operating amongst a great

enough majority, no amount of accusation of hypocrisy is going to matter. The hope is that such hypocrites will always remain a minority but this is sadly a false hope. A hope I ironically wish to rid you of. Remember that many of you are already hypocrites by my own demonstration.

## CHAPTER 4 - Ex Post Facto Justification:

### An Exploration of Narratives

## Introduction:

The term 'narrative' and the action of crafting one is perhaps best demonstrated, and first introduced to us, through the medium of politics and its punditry. The term is often used with reference to what opposing political ideologues are communicating to their constituency. By labeling this communiqué a narrative as opposed to fact it is simply a more *sophisticated* way of calling others liars. Essentially a narrative is a story one uses to explain one's actions and beliefs. A great example is the absurd narrative crafted by the American Left wherein they accused the American Right of a 'War on Women' with reference to the most petty personal matters and matters of strict economics such as birth control requiring purchase i.e. not being covered through health insurance. With the success of the Left this shifted the burden of the purchasing of women's birth control onto men en masse, effectively creating a women's only subsidy through the inclusion of a male tax. An affront to any semblance of fairness surely.

Accompanying the narrative in the realm of politics is the 'Talking Point' which describes a brief argument or slogan oft repeated by pundits and politicians alike with the goal of instilling it into the minds of listeners as fact through repetition. It is a sort of truth through oversaturation but truly another example of the power of the tribal appeal. That is, 'If everyone is saying it then surely it must be true or warrant some discussion?' Naturally this isn't the case, especially given that such saturation was artificially crafted for the very purpose of mimicking a natural phenomenon created through word of mouth. Notice how it relies on social substantiation. Truth through social recognition, though not necessarily an acceptance of what is being recognized. The explosion in popularity of 'Gangnam Style' is the best example of this phenomenon to date garnering billions of views from demographics not normally interested in it. Compounding the talking point is that it is provided with little to no evidence in support of it. Rather whom is saying it, be it a respected politician, pundit, or otherwise famous individual, is what is used to engender belief. This belief in the message based on the messenger comes as a bit of a gambit as it is based on whom this individual appeals to and whether that appeal is strong enough to subvert reason. If you don't particularly care for the messenger the message they parrot could just as easily be dismissed based on personal appeal. In both cases however the acceptance or dismissal of the message based on the messenger is irrational. On that point, why does the American Left in particular use actors and actresses to parrot their talking points? A few reasons:

- 1) Physical and charismatic appeal; infatuation and sexual interest overriding reason.

- 2) Attribution of the merits of their film characters to actors and actresses who portray them granting them false characteristics that in turn grant them false merit and trustworthiness (such as integrity, honor, stalwartness).
- 3) Urge *not to hate them* for fear of ruining them as actors and actresses in one's eyes.

Recall that acting in ignorance is itself a regrettable action that cannot be vindicated through truth after such actions are undertaken. In other words operating on a guess, especially when no operation need take place nor such guess be made given the accessibility of the facts, demonstrates a willingness to act against reason and in particular a fear of the truth. Otherwise why avoid investigation? As we know now, this is yet another manifestation of denial. Having said that it is apparent what the true goal of talking points are, given that they are provided with little to no evidence. They are designed to elicit beliefs and so actions in ignorance of the truth. They aren't merely poor and unreasoned positions. They are designed lies. Talking points are themselves lies. They may be true in substance, but in their iteration by those who do not know the truth of reality they become lies. Even the act of not providing evidence, given a rudimentary understanding of the rank tribalism of the human species, is encouraging faith over reason, conviction over confidence. Reporting anything you do not know as true as the truth is an act of lying, whether it is true or not. It's fundamentally dishonest. Thus the use of talking points are very much akin to the appeal of conviction through doubling down and how it is used to supplant reason with the fervency of personal belief. In other words, it is a rank appeal to the subconscious ideology of the axiom operating in each and every one of us.

So in summary, narratives are themselves stories used to explain one's beliefs and actions. They propagate through lies, typically those told from ignorance rather than an awareness of the truth, which overall manifests as an appeal to faith-based belief that is itself an appeal to our axiom. Simply put, a narrative is the communication of one's ex post facto justification.

### Narrative Crafting: Storytelling for Adults

That a narrative is merely ex post facto justification is easily demonstrated through its constant evolution to fit with the singular conclusion, the assumption, that it must ensure remains unmolested by reason. This assumption is typically the righteousness or necessity of the one's political position or party

or some specific issue supposedly championed by said political party. Now as discussed with regard to large-scale ideologies such as religions, this evolution of the narrative occurs much faster than at the scale of the individual. Given that ex post facto justifications operating at a social level attract far more criticism, ideologues require consistent evolution of their narrative to maintain the perceived veracity of their central assumption. A veracity remember that is maintained only by virtue of such criticism never targeting the axiom directly. No direct challenge to the axiom leads to no recognition of the axiom and thus no opportunity to self-criticize it. As with circular reasoning the goal is to never address but rather avoid challenge to the axiom and so consistent deflections via the evolution of one's narrative are required to facilitate this avoidance. This denial.

Such an individual may meet a dissenter once every few months and even then without manifesting the behavior of Intellectual Conflict Therapy (ICT) or Emotional Conflict Therapy (ECT), they may never meet one at all. They may never recognize the dissenter as just that. On the other hand, a narrative espoused by a political party meets with criticism the moment after it is presented. Consider again the American Left and Right who will forever maintain their respective assumptions: that of the other political wing being wrong. This phenomenon of self-righteousness producing the falsity of the 'other'. Their respective narratives throughout several decades are provably false though with some degree of truth, yet despite this their central assumptions remain unchanged. The democrat continues to battle the republican even though the last say, 5 decades worth of narrative crafted against the republican has been false. This is a demonstration of the axiom going unchallenged and the subsequent evolution of the ex post facto justification required to effectively shield it from any criticism and ultimately of doubt. So long as it goes unchallenged the narrative never ends and the ideologue doesn't recognize its past falsehood and ultimately failure. Remember that their enemy, the Right in this case, is an enemy by virtue of the Left's self-righteousness. Not because of what the Right stands for nor the ex post facto justifications provided by the Left. The Left will always fight the Right and vice versa because that is their respective and mutual roles with regard to each other: self vs other. You can forget the principles they purport to stand for, both parties have neglected them anyway, because at their very core they exist solely to fight each other not as opposite ends of a political spectrum or opposing principles and values but as symbiotic adversaries. In essence right now the identity of a republican is one who fights a democrat and a democrat is one who fights a republican. This would seem unbelievable were it not for the observable overlap between both parties' policies and positions. Does this hint at an encroaching political fusion as a move toward fascism? In truth yes, but at the level of the average citizen it's hardly a conscious plan of action but instead a demonstration of the ideological congruity of well, the ideologue;

despite political allegiances. Though for now just recognize that both parties are incredibly similar; choosing some of the most arbitrary and petty things with which to oppose each other on. The purchasing of birth control for example and whom is to blame for small, unimportant social events such as the death of Trayvon Martin or another school shooting. Yet despite the differences in approach of either political party, it should be noted that no matter what the issue is both parties advocate for policies that constrict the rights and freedoms supposedly granted through the United States constitution and Bill of Rights. So no matter whom you side with ultimately the effect is the same, just in a slightly different way. Horseshoe Theory in demonstrable effect.

There are many forms narratives can take but with regards to matters of responsibility, especially its denial and subsequent projection onto others, they always take one of two forms though both can work in tandem. These two take form according to the different roles played out between individuals or demographics with regard to the ascription of responsibility. When the narrative deals solely with the individual or demographic who, as described by the narrative, has been *acted upon* it is called a Victim Narrative. So naturally when the narrative deals solely with the individual or demographic who, as described by the narrative, has *acted* it is called a Threat Narrative. In essence it is the ascription of guilt and of blame to one and the ascription of innocence and exoneration to the other. These are purposefully loaded terms of course, Victim and Threat, phrased so as to appeal to our instincts both for morality and self-preservation i.e. the protection of victims and elimination of threats.

As discussed the addition of a dichotomy, morality in this case, transforms denial based, desire-seeking behavior into a self-fulfilling prophecy. For example, treating others as a threat will make them a threat, though with the important distinction that they have responded in self-defense. Thus in such situations it is wise to consider the Victim Narrative itself as a threat and the target of the corresponding Threat Narrative as their victims. Indeed, this is the reality of the narrative. As a means of ex post facto justification it is by definition an act of excusing false beliefs and corresponding behaviors. With the addition of morality it is an act of excusing immoral beliefs and corresponding immoral behaviors. So through the addition of a dichotomy such narratives effectively invert. In reality victims are threats and threats are victims. Violence is the ultimate danger of the Victim and Threat Narrative as these narratives working in tandem implicitly advocate for action taken against the target of the Threat Narrative on behalf of those of the Victim Narrative all with the justification that such action taken against them is in self-defense or as a response to previous aggression from the target of the Threat Narrative. But let's address each individually before we discuss how they work in tandem:

## The Victim Narrative: An Enemy Creation Kit

As stated the Victim Narrative deals with the individual or demographic that feels acted upon.

Essentially it is no different than denial of one's personal responsibility. As with denial, indeed because it is denial, first one feels irresponsible for some emotional state be it fear, anger, anxiety, stress, etc., or some circumstance that they have brought about. This prompts them to ascribe this responsibility to another. Yet without any other all one can do is describe themselves as a victim of some unknown being or force. Thus they are victims by virtue of their own denial of personal responsibility. Since the source of their victimization remains unknown all they can do is to guess at their 'victimizer's' motivations. This then prompts a probing of personal characteristics by which they could be so victimized. In reality what they are doing is designing the motivations of this fantasy victimizer from whole cloth. By doing so they are selecting not only the personal characteristic for their supposed victimization but also the logical perpetrator of that victimization. As is the case in myriad examples of the Victim Narrative, the personal characteristic chosen as the source of one's victimization is typically a core part of their own identity and something that is also usually flattering. Thus not only does it raise one's self-esteem i.e. being victimized for being attractive, talented, etc., but it also validates their identity. Odd to consider a victimization of one's self by others a validation but look no further than the example of the Muslim man admitting to his error to Allah in order to bolster his sense of self-righteousness through Islam. Both examples bolster the faith of the individual as each belief admits to the individual's projected identity as genuine. For the Muslim to admit sin is to promote his identity even more as a Muslim and of Allah's chosen. For say, a transsexual to believe they are hated for being the other sex or hated as a transsexual regardless of their personal identification as the other sex promotes their respective identity. In other words, to be known as [X] validates your identity as [X] through its recognition by others. Hatred as [X] still admits to that same knowledge, just accompanied by a negative response. See, to be loved or hated for being beautiful still admits to your being beautiful. There is parallels between this and the sentiment, 'all publicity is good publicity.'

While unbeknownst to the 'victim', whatever characteristic they choose as the reason for their victimization also chooses the would-be victimizers/perpetrators that could realistically be victimizing them. Naturally you would suspect someone who claims to be victimized according to race would point to another race rather than their own. This may be rooted in irrational projection but it does lend itself to reason oddly enough. Or better put, it lends itself to logic. Anyway, this is where black and white

thinking is utilized to narrow down the list of possible victimizers. Essentially these 'victims' determine what is the opposite of their characteristic and who embodies that or even whom is opposite of them altogether. What is telling in these considerations is that there are opposites of determinable, standardized characteristics such as faithful, reliable, kind, humble, peaceful and so on. Yet the characteristics by which one is victimized rarely lend themselves to such dichotomies or if they do are not moral or ethical in nature or in any way behavioral, such as race or sex. Thus whomever they choose as the perpetrator of their victimization is the result not of any rational progression, say ascribing one's victimization for being peaceful to the violent, but of inherent discrimination without any basis in reason. Furthermore there is a subtle self-flattery in claiming to be victimized or hated without cause that is brought about through the use of the dichotomy that exists between opposing standardized characteristics. For example, if a woman claims a man hates her because he is a misogynist the acceptance of this narrative implicitly admits to her being a good, or at least not an immoral, person. How so? Well to believe that said man hates said woman by virtue of misogyny and not any other reason, say because she is ill-tempered, rude, etc., she is thus perceived as an innocent party and therefore good or at least not immoral. If said woman continues to play the victim and not to act in kind to the supposed misogynistic actions of the man targeted by her narrative, she is thus seen as a good person by virtue of holding herself to a higher ethical standard for the treatment of others, even her enemies.

But what happens if the manufactured victimizer is not an individual but an entire demographic? Using sex once again, if a man victimizes you because you are a woman but fundamentally *because* he is a man, does that not mean that all men victimize you or that such discrimination is inherent to maleness? This is where we see the not-so-subtle bigotry inherent in an accusation of perpetration based on such characteristics. In this example yes, to claim that one hates your sex by virtue of their own sex and for no other reason admits that all of that sex must similarly hate you or at least fight this instinctual hatred that is inextricably linked to their sex. With no other reasons to consider other than your sex and his sex, sex itself is the only factor. This is absurd of course but such a claim was absurd to begin with and similarly creates an absurd conclusion. However, such narratives are never based on standardized characteristics themselves but rather their interpretation as an identity. This is why we don't have pervasive social narratives based on the plight of the victimized humble or honest or charitable. Instead we have narratives based on the plight of the victimized woman or black or disabled. Such narratives always deal in matters of identity and so validate those identities as genuine by virtue of their acknowledgement; even if said acknowledgement is negative or falsely perceived as negative. It is only

after this acknowledgement as a victim that such identities are attributed standardized characteristics such as charitable, innocent, good, etc., in order to grant them greater sympathy and greater status as victims. Also to denigrate the would-be victimizer as opposing these characteristics as they manifest in the would-be victim.

The Victim Narrative is essentially an Enemy Creation Kit that begins as a broad claim of victimization that slowly narrows on a specific reason for it and simultaneously a demographic, the threat, who provides this victimization. Its power comes from the fact that matters of personal identity are mostly subjective and can thus be interpreted charitably according to our own biases. Also with the extra addition of the narrative reinforcing them rather than facts and reason countering the entire process. In essence the Enemy Creation Kit is the power of subjective interpretation itself which in turn is the power of Allied Projection. Take the example of the current American narrative of whites oppressing blacks. This begs the question, "Why is it whites and no other races that oppress blacks?" The ex post facto justification used, especially in America, is a 'Sins of the Father' argument wherein the enslavement of some blacks by some whites in America is proof not only for the continued racism in America but also the obligation of whites to blacks for reparations. From there the narrative, in its necessary evolution to protect its central assumption, has evolved to include more forms of oppression more 'systemic' than the last. Though the fact remains that slavery was and still is a worldwide phenomenon and during its time in America, less than 10% of whites owned them. Furthermore it was the actions of the British that crippled and nearly destroyed the international slave trade. For those reasons and many more, not to mention the immorality of this 'Sins of the Father' argument, this narrative is obviously false. Rather than focusing on the 'Sins of the Father' we'd be wise to focus instead on the 'Virtues of the Son' if only to operate in truth and thus reality, but I digress.

So what many people believe to be true is actually a well-known Victim Narrative. Seemingly the reason why whites continue to be targeted by this narrative is that it has been so effective. This is true but doesn't tell the whole story, not nearly. So as with the black oppression narrative, why does the narrative evolve to include more and more systemic forms? When both the Victim and Threat Narrative work in tandem the only way to perpetuate this new tandem narrative is by sacrificing specificity for plausibility. More on that shortly.

So what we have by the end of the crafting of the Victim Narrative is the eventual and necessary creation of the Threat Narrative whose target is based on little more than rank discrimination. Save of course for those that form a dichotomy. See, while white is not the opposite of black with regard to

race, sex and sexuality do lend themselves to an appreciable dichotomy of man and woman and subsequently heterosexual and homosexual. Thus the narratives of men oppressing women and homosexual oppression by heterosexuals. Though that's not entirely true anymore is it? Growing from those has spawned another bizarre dichotomy that while based in biological science has been corrupted by a black and white, us and them false dichotomy. This is the concept of cissexual and transsexual which insists that if sex is itself a dichotomy, then identification as one's sex or not is itself a dichotomy. In other words, how you perceive yourself within a dichotomy creates its own dichotomy. So on one hand we have all the people who identify as their biological sex and on the other hand all those who do not. How this topic is approached, in one of two ways, demonstrates well the dilution of standards, objectivity, concepts, and terms and will be discussed in the chapter dealing exclusively with social justice.

#### The Threat Narrative: Enemy Removal Kit

Upon a successful application of the Victim Narrative, the Enemy Creation Kit, one transitions inevitably into the Threat Narrative which at its core is the ex post facto justification one must create not simply to paint the target of the Victim Narrative as a threat, but to justify the aggressive actions taken against them in a an act of erroneously morally sanctioned self-defense. Basically with a threat having been established by the Victim Narrative, one must now construct the means by which this threat is made and the justification for one's response to it. Suffice it to say it's not enough to cry and point and accuse one of evil. You must explain how one has harmed you and that explanation *is* the Threat Narrative. Of course since this entire process is projection as an exercise in denial, all manner of explanations are offered to lambaste the target ranging from the seemingly reasonable to the downright fantastical. Yet each maintaining plausibility and more importantly moral accountability on behalf of those to whom these explanations are offered. Feeling accountable creates an obligation to assist rather than just a choice to. Given that we understand the true nature of the Victim Narrative, that it is in effect an aggressive action, a targeting of others, the Threat Narrative is itself the culmination of that targeting; though requiring its own narrative to justify its actions. These actions include anything that facilitates the removal of the threat. Now while the group targeted by the Victim Narrative is entirely the result of the motivation and intention of the 'victim' and not any aggression on their part, the ex post facto

justification of the Threat Narrative does in fact lend itself to objective reality. Though by obscuring it rather than outright denying it. See, the Threat Narrative requires some demonstrable effect on behalf of the targeted group that can be framed as detrimental to the 'victim' group or directly causal to the 'victim' group's victimization. The narrative has to be able to demonstrate some real effect that it can then frame as threatening rather than just a result circumstance, merit, choice, etc. Take black poverty for example. This must not be framed as a result of blacks' choices and merit, as a circumstance they created, but one foisted onto them by some other. This effectively transforms matters of merit, circumstance, choice, etc., into effects of one's identity rather than their exercise of agency i.e. their chosen actions. Basically if one believes they are poor because they are victimized and victimized because they are black, they will believe their poverty is an effect of their being black. Sure they use victimization to deny their responsibility, but the link exists regardless. It's a form of self-bigotry, one of low personal expectations, and without recognizing the link between one's poverty as the result of their own actions, a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Worse yet, if they are poor because they are black and so implicitly victimized because they are black, then whites victimize blacks because they are white. It masks or outright ignores any actions on behalf of whites and blacks that could determine the 'threatening' effect. It removes any investigation as to the cause of this effect, in this case black poverty, and transforms it entirely into a matter of racial identity; one replete with an attribution of innate characteristics to both white and black that we should understand as bigotry. This removes merit, circumstance, choice, etc., from the narrative altogether. This is why no amount of reasoned argumentation and evidence can sway belief in the narrative. The narrative doesn't reference reality and never did. With that any objective standard for determining the cause of the effect is nullified and attributed only to matters of identity. Though understand that this form of bigotry, while no less prejudicial, is far worse than what we commonly understand as bigotry. With what I suppose I'd call normal bigotry a group is granted false, innate characteristics either negative or positive that in turn create an effect that isn't tolerable. The version created through the Threat Narrative never references any such characteristics. We only have a group that creates an effect through no virtue other than their racial identity and that effect is itself at threat. There is no characteristic or behavior to point to, only race. In the case of black poverty, whites aren't all labeled as thieves, slavers, hucksters or some other form of extortionist; at least not primarily. Instead they are blamed by virtue only of their whiteness, really their non-blackness. If anything an accusation is made to 'supporting the system' that oppresses blacks. A system that doesn't exist mind you but acts as an externalization of blacks' own self-bigotry. Any objective determinates for the 'threatening' effect are at

best implied but never addressed as doing so would invite a rational standard – reason – for determining the ‘threat’. As such it would reveal both the irrationality and bigotry inherent to the Threat Narrative. It would engender a schism, one based around black identity and the characteristic of poverty, which reveals the ideological nature of the narrative to begin with. Remember the narrative is just *ex post facto* justification for some assumption based in the axiom. Any application of reason will engender schism. So too do acts of affirmation within the ideology. In this case an act of attributing black poverty to something other than their victimization but nevertheless their racial identity. Such acts of affirmation are met with swift ostracism. Economist Thomas Sowell as an example.

While the narrative is designed to mask the true force, the true cause behind the perceived ‘threatening’ effect, the effect is nevertheless real. So there is some system of cause and effect that determines it. Yet recall that in the presence of a dichotomy, denial comes to represent not just unreality but the inverse. So when the Threat Narrative does act to rectify the ‘threat’ it is, in reality, acting against the objective determinates that created the effect. So be that determinate merit, the Threat Narrative acts against merit. Be it circumstance, it acts against circumstance. Be it choice, it *acts against choice*. Though worse than mere opposition and impediment, it often takes the form of an inversion wherein it punishes one for the innate characteristics that would grant advantages in certain endeavors. Be it athleticism in sport, intelligence in sciences, ambition and vision in business, etc. Take the current feminist Victim Narrative that women are disadvantaged in STEM fields. Mind you this is true insofar as it is an effect of the female brain, of circumstance rather than oppression. Consider also the accompanying Threat Narrative that it is the fault of men. So while male success in science is indeed attributed to their maleness, instead of any recognition of the difference in male brain structure versus that of females, such success is attributed to male oppression; first overt then systemic as it becomes more apparent that no individual men, or any of sufficient clout or power, are oppressing any women. This moves in lockstep with how blacks blame whites for their poverty without reference to any actions on behalf of whites other than, once again, their ‘systemic’ involvement. With such ‘oppression’ in STEM fields being countered by gender quotas, the likelihood of an intelligent man entering the course of his choosing or being hired for the position he was trained for decreases. His maleness, by being punished through the Threat Narrative, has effectively reversed the advantage wrought by the true characteristic advantaging him. His intelligence or rather his male brain structure. We also see this with Jewish success in business. While it is attributed to their Jewishness it is again under the auspices of something nefarious. In this case a worldwide Jewish conspiracy or uniquely Jewish greed. In reality, such success is likely due to the extra emphasis placed on the understanding of finance, human incentive, social power,

and a striving for success that is often championed by Jewish families. The anti-Semitic Threat Narrative is relatively weak in America however and so hasn't developed in any particularly powerful way. Ah, but in countries where this narrative dominates? Jews are indeed an oppressed group and as such characteristics that would benefit them in business are disadvantaged.

Now while such characteristics can be disadvantaged through quotas and other coercive laws, the more the 'threat' is a characteristic that is causal to the 'threatening' effect it creates, the less possible it is to effectively disadvantage it because such characteristics operate in reality, not in the unreality formed in such narratives. In other words, they will always be effective and successful because they define effective and successful in the particular field they apply themselves to. No amount of denial can change that reality. Intelligence will always benefit the sciences. Athleticism, sport. Ambition, business. So regardless of this adversity, the merit of the individual will, though to a lesser overall extent, outcompete the less meritorious though at an overall loss. This creates a system wherein the meritorious still succeed but to a much lesser extent and the less meritorious succeed but only slightly more. The disparity between the two cannot ever be made equal but can approach equilibrium at the cost of the greater overall success were both groups to operate according to merit rather than in opposition to it.

With the inability of the Threat Narrative to effectively counter merit, or to counter reality in cases that don't necessarily reference merit, the severity of the actions taken to achieve the goals of the Threat Narrative increase. Essentially the ineffectiveness of the actions excused through the Threat Narrative result in a doubling down; a reinvigoration of the campaign. As we learned regarding doubling down, as with all matters of faith, the goal is to transform the matter into one of personal conviction rather than fact or confidence. The fact is that the actions excused through the Threat Narrative have proven ineffective and detrimental. To avoid this fact and the self-examination it ought to engender, more drastic matters are taken to preserve one's primary assumption, facilitate denial, and given the severity of these measures employ the Zealotry Toolkit to their advantage. Yet ultimately such drastic actions will be forever fruitless. It is here that the true nature, the true driving force behind the Victim Narrative and thus the Threat Narrative is made apparent. See, it is at this time that the subconscious motivations for the entire narrative can be made manifest as one of two possibilities.

As a means of continuous self-validation the Victim Narrative and Threat Narrative must remain in perpetuity. So with a cause that cannot be won but forever fought, the Victim Narrative and Threat Narrative coalesce into an Submission Narrative designed to validate its' espousers in perpetuity. More

on this shortly but to put it simply, if the target is chosen merely as a consequence of the process of validating one's own sense of victimization, then the existence of the target is required in order to continue providing that validation. But what if the narrative is goal-oriented? That is to say, what if the narrative is designed to end?

If instead of validation the target of the Victim Narrative is chosen due to rank bigotry, then genocide is the end goal. Simple as that. I'd call it an Eradication Narrative though only to be consistent with the naming convention. It's really just whatever justifications one uses for murder. That said if the 'threat' is an effect of some characteristic that creates a disparity, like intelligence, then the elimination of intelligence becomes the goal. Since the target is powerless to change whatever innate characteristic is 'threatening' the 'victim' group, this results in a steady increase in the severity of measures in opposition of that characteristic until elimination becomes the only solution. The final solution if you will.

Suffice it to say the Nazis can't be victims of the Jews if they're all dead and neither can women be the victims of all men if they're all dead or at least feminized. So while the former, Nazism, is goal-oriented and seeks the elimination of the 'threat' the latter, feminism, is validation-oriented and so requires the continued existence of the 'threat' and especially their submission; acceptance of the narrative as valid. The former seeks destruction while the latter seeks control. A control of reality or rather an attempt to make manifest one's unreality, as informed by their denial, through a widespread social substantiation of it as truth. The former would kill the 'other' to eliminate any resistance to their unreality and the latter would warp the perception of the 'other' to eliminate any resistance to their unreality. Am I comparing Nazism to feminism? Yes and by now I'm sure you understand why. See, this behavior informs everything from quota systems and affirmative action to displacement and genocide. The difference is not in the motivation or intention but the means; the methodology by which such intentions are achieved. A difference in methodology that accords with, and is representative of, their respective political ideological affiliations. Keep that in mind.

So the more one's characteristics for which they are being targeted as 'threats' are objective and especially innate, the more likely they are to be killed for them. This demonstrates once again that the true conflict at the core of this phenomenon is subjectivity versus objectivity, unreality versus reality, which puts their respective forms of substantiation in conflict; that of tribalism and reason. Though this is not nearly the core of why it is so, this conflict against objective and innate characteristics is partially to blame for the baffling antagonism of merit and meritocracy by social justice warriors as an appreciable means to judge worth. Their resistance to the notion that one's worth as an actor in a

particular field should be judged according to their actions as an actor in that field. For those of you unawares, this is in fact being resisted heavily. Indeed, it is an affront to very thing that informs our understanding of identity itself.

Narrative Transition: Witch Narrative is Which?

Let us recap the cycle of transition from Victim Narrative to Threat Narrative:

- 1) Someone claims to be the victim of an unidentified source. (The source is usually themselves.)
- 2) Their narrative creates a threat. (A victimizer is created without tangible form or motivation.)
- 3) The threat is searched for. (By searching one's self for characteristics in need of validation.)
- 4) The threat is found. (A target is chosen according to the characteristic for victimization.)
- 5) The threat is tried. (The methodology of the threat is manufactured and the target is judged.)
- 6) The threat is removed. (Ostracism, enslavement, or death.)

Seem familiar? There are many examples of this behavior but perhaps the mere mentioning of Salem Massachusetts will drive it home? Yes, behold the true origin of the Witch Hunt. So fitting that with it being based in denial, the search for a witch to burn is so much a search for a strawman. A Threat Narrative is a Witch Hunt so let's rephrase this recap with that in mind:

- 1) Someone claims to be the victim of an unidentified source. (As of yet unexplained, it's 'magical'.)
- 2) Their narrative creates a witch. (A witch is created to explain the seemingly unexplainable.)
- 3) The witch is searched for. (Validating one's moral uprightness by virtue of routing evil.)
- 4) The witch is found. (A target is chosen according to well, any reasons really: spite, jealousy, etc.)
- 5) The witch is tried. (The targeting and eventual punishment is justified morally 'before god'.)
- 6) The witch is removed. (Imprisoned, executed.)

As you can see the first three steps comprise the Victim Narrative while the last three comprise the Threat Narrative. Becoming an Eradication Narrative should it result in murder. Now as stated the Threat Narrative requires its own justification so with regard to Witch Hunts the justification of the Threat Narrative takes the form of the Witch Trials which are, in truth, attempts to justify their own egregious actions and motivations. This practice is no different in modern Threat Narratives today. The

construction of the narrative is, as stated, an attempt to justify one's own assumption, that of 'I'm a victim', rather than to demonstrate the validity of one's beliefs and subsequent accusations. The witch hunts and subsequent accusations and trials such 'threats' are subjected to are nothing more than masturbatory self-validation on behalf of those making such accusations. In effect, these 'victims' manifest the entire narrative into their reality without any involvement required from the target of that narrative and indeed, this is why such targets are helpless to stop it. Those who would craft these narratives create their own victimization, their own victimizers, the means by which they are victimized, and the means by which they will deal with their victimizers, all without any input from the supposed threat identified through the narrative. Indeed, this entire process can take place over years if not decades if not generations before the 'threat' has any idea of what's going on. Of course this is entirely in keeping with how egocentric this whole process is and, as a matter of subjectivity, the unnecessary of others and indeed objective reality to factor into its machinations. Greater still is the downright *impotence* of others and of objective reality, of facts, to counter it. Once again:

'A belief about oneself is the root of all projection, not a belief about others.'

The victimizer doesn't actually exist by virtue of no victimization ever taking place and thus *never had to exist* for this process to manifest. This psychological process, save for any interjection by reason, is as likely to manifest in a woman living among millions as it is a man sequestered in the woods. Remember, it does not come about through the targeting of others for blame but first and foremost as the denial of personal responsibility. Such targeting of others comes by virtue of the exclusion of the self as the source of victimization and thus the logical conclusion that something or someone else must be causing this feeling of victimization. When that 'something' is itself possessed of intention and agency, which it must have in order to victimize at all, that something is sometimes a demon or devil or spirit or indeed, a *social construct*. If the death of religion has brought about any change to this process at all it is merely the replacement of the intangible spiritual with the similarly intangible social. Both of whom share a lack of agency and thus no capacity for malicious intention i.e. victimization of others. The rub is that by blaming a social construct such secular narratives invariably target people where they could once target spirits and devils. In effect the death of religion brought about the loss of a safer outlet for this madness. Wouldn't it be curious reader, if such spirits were constructed for that very reason? That religions developed these spiritual agents as an outlet for aggressive narratives? Though regardless of their intention, is it any wonder that the most powerful and long-lasting religions share this very outlet in common, that of an evil spiritual force? Such shared characteristics are, in my estimation, the result of

religion adapting to appease and to pacify, in other words to placate, more powerful and more fundamental aspects of human nature. Once again we observe the ability of religion to harmonize with the human condition. To tranquilize and control or simply redirect the behaviors informed by denial for the sake of greater social cohesion. And once again I must pay my compliments to religion for its ability to maintain this means of civility all the while operating in near-complete ignorance of the true enemy it fought. Religion operating as a tool for tranquilizing and redirecting the mind-virus of ideology, whilst also *being* and ideology, is something of an enigma. Now for those of you wondering and before you ask, has the slow death of religion in the West destroyed the greatest defense we had against this mind-virus? Yes. All the more reason to spread this information to create a new vanguard. Better yet an *offense* against this madness. One that understands and so can target this enemy rather than just to adapt to or redirect it.

#### Doubting the Narrative: When a Lack of Faith is found Disturbing

Back on the topic of the Victim Narrative, while the 'threat' group can be based on the self-validation of the 'victim' group i.e. 'heterosexuals oppress me because I am homosexual', 'men oppress me because I am a woman', etc., there is yet another enemy that can and often is created by the Victim Narrative. This enemy is anyone who resists the narrative rather than being the target of it. Such resistance takes the form of anything from outright violence, though this is atypical, to reasonable skepticism which is the most common incarnation. Using Salem as an example, those who would question the existence of a witch, question the validity of the victim's claims, or question the authority of those who act at the victim's behest, would be tried under the auspices of assumed guilt, of suspicious activity. Consider, "Methinks thou dost protest too much," or "If you're innocent, what have you to hide?" Indeed a rational response to the Victim Narrative is itself seen as an opposition to the innocence of the victim, as an opposition to the innocent party, as an opposition to justice i.e. serving the interests of the innocent victim. As such skepticism is seen as an ally to evil and a threat in and of itself. When the innocence of a victim is assumed the mere questioning of that innocence is seen as an affront to morality itself. This demonstrates again the reality of the opposing methodologies in such confrontations: reason vs tribalism, objectivity vs subjectivity. As stated there is no real threat – there never was. Though in this circumstance there is a group erroneously claiming to be victims and merely those skeptical of their

claims. Yet by virtue of their skepticism they become the source of the others' victimization. A different sort of victimization, but a victimization nonetheless.

In this circumstance the Victim Narrative exists in search of a threat, but not so much a legitimate threat to them or one that merely validates some personal belief, but rather a threat to the narrative. No really, when it manifests in this way this entire exercise is just rooting out anyone who would resist the *lie*. It no longer has anything to do with physical threat or oppression or anything of the sort. It's all about whether or not you will accept a story. In other words, were you to reject the validity of the tale of the Big Bad Wolf you in effect become that Big Bad Wolf. Better yet should you have rejected the validity of the American narrative that Saddam Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction, you become 'just as bad as the terrorists' or 'not a true American'. I know that seems mad. It is. But remember what matters is only the self-righteousness of the ideologue. The narrative is merely *ex post facto* justification. The identity of the ideologue apart from their own self, their identity as a Muslim or woman or victim, is just a logical placeholder of that self and ultimately of the 'I am right' axiom it's founded upon. Resisting their self-righteousness, no matter the form of that resistance, is all that is required to be perceived as an enemy and thus a victimizer.

Now while both skeptics and the intended target of the Victim Narrative resist this narrative, skeptics distinguish themselves through a matter of approach. See, the intended target typically remains passive, unawares of their impending troubles, and is targeted through no fault of their own. Skeptics on the other hand target those espousing the Victim Narrative and thus take an active role. Invariably, either those who espouse the Victim Narrative find a target or a target finds them. Granted, those skeptical of the Victim Narrative are typically the target of that narrative, like whites resisting the narrative of black oppression by whites. But even if not, all those skeptical of the narrative are grouped together with the intended target of the Victim Narrative as a single 'threat'. A threat comprised of 'victimizers' (the intended target) and apologists/victim blamers (skeptics).

With the narrative ever reliant on the existence of opposition, real or not, if the intended target of the Victim Narrative capitulates and submits to the demands of the 'victim' group either through fear or genuine desire, the Threat Narrative cannot take root. The 'threat', the intended target of the Victim Narrative, has become at best an ally and at worst a slave to the 'victim' group. However, this now leaves those skeptical of the narrative as the sole opposition to said narrative. Again it's mad, but should skeptics alone resist the narrative while the intended target of that narrative does not, their resistance earns them the label of 'threat' that was originally meant for the intended target. This can and does

result in all sorts of rationalizations by the 'victim' group to excuse the prior agency of the intended target thus alleviating them of their responsibility as 'victimizers' and transferring that responsibility to the skeptics. This is often rationalized through the 'evil influence' of skeptics and how it guided the behavior of the intended target who are not necessarily innocent of their 'crimes' but rather ignorant of their perpetration. For example:

"It was people like you that made them think this was okay! You fostered this culture of oppression!"

Consider how one's ignorance of perpetration is much easier to countenance than outright malicious intention and is thus much easier to accept as true – even when it's not. The intended target is essentially given an ultimatum of:

- 1) Accept having done evil without the intent to do so (remember they truly did nothing wrong and so *are* truthfully ignorant of any wrongdoing) and simultaneously blaming the skeptics for having maliciously influenced such behavior or...
- 2) Standing alongside the skeptics, accused as malicious offenders.

The first option is often chosen as the path of least resistance and harm and so they turn on their once-allies the skeptics. Furthermore the bolstering of conviction wrought through the admission of guilt of the intended target necessarily increases the overall population of those espousing the Victim Narrative, now turned into a Threat Narrative. This serves to embolden the 'victim' group against the skeptics which typically results in greater shows and uses of force. Compounding all this is that skeptics cannot claim any ignorance of the 'evil' they are accused of since they argue for it or at least the falsity of the narrative. Though worse still, since such skeptics rightly refuse to acknowledge their skepticism as evil or to admit to the supposed maliciousness of their actions but to the contrary, to argue that both are morally right, they demonstrate to the 'victim' group that they are not merely doing evil, but *incapable of understanding their actions as such*. Thus in the minds of the 'victim' group, skeptics become far worse than the intended target could have ever been. Indeed in the skeptics' inability to recognize evil but instead argue for it as moral, they become wholly anti-moral. They become immoral.

See, there is a stark difference between the belief that one is harming another and the belief that one's harm isn't harming but rather healing. So in the minds of the 'victim' group these skeptics, these people whose minds are so corrupted that what is moral and immoral has reversed, well they ought to be removed from society or eliminated altogether. Of course it must be said that the reverse is true. That the immoral actors in these situations are the 'victim' group and it is they who cannot see their actions

as immoral but worse, wholly righteous. This is one of a few ways that morality is not merely warped but entirely inversed through this process. Naturally given that the Threat Narrative is itself an ex post facto justification for immoral actions under the banner of self-defense, it is no surprise that morality isn't merely ignored for the sake of some loftier goal but rather inverted. As a means of denial, that is its intention and so purpose. Of course since there is also a dichotomy present, that of moral and immoral granted through victim and victimizer, acted upon and actor, this inversion is sadly predictable.

In the end, wherever the narrative meets *resistance* is where the threat is found be that resistance rational or not – though typically it is, even if the individuals providing this resistance aren't rational themselves. No better demonstration of this than of how well a learned person of one religion can criticize another religion even with arguments that are entirely applicable to their own religious belief.

So where can we see examples of the Victim Narrative transitioning into the Threat Narrative? Well for one the transition from the traditional model of gender relations to the modern-day feminist one. Where once women were essentially victims of their own selves and of others, needing the protection of men, now they are never victims of themselves yet still most certainly victims of others, namely men. Though I won't offer detailed explanation here, every genocide will demonstrate such a transition. The removal of the enemy, of the target of the Threat Narrative, is ever the end goal. Indeed by doing so one is able to seemingly manifest the false reality created through their denial. Since they've placed the blame for their victimization on a target, the elimination of that target, not to mention the social approval in doing so, validates their victimization to the point of convincing them that their narrative was true. Furthermore with the target removed their sense of victimization can, though not always, be alleviated if not completely removed. Naturally this is all a sick and twisted psychological response to the final, culminating act of facilitating their denial rather than any demonstration of the truth of their victimization. It's just another exercise of bolstering one's denial through zealotry. This investment one has made in such egregious actions makes it all the harder to countenance that it was not justified and in fact, entirely immoral. They've burned the witch, gassed the Jew, behead the Tootsie. They've reached satiation, they've fulfilled their prophecy, by achieving the ultimate goal of manifesting their denial of reality, and all it took was the death of another. No, I am not mincing words. I do contend that anyone espousing a Threat Narrative and indeed the Victim Narrative before it is calling for the death of another to validate their own identity. Well at the very least violence, given any resistance to it. The Victim Narrative and its transition into a Threat Narrative is the modern-day cult of human sacrifice.

So, have you participated in it dear reader? Have you fallen prey to the race riots fomented by the American media? How about the 'War on Terror' or 'War on Drugs'? Did you get what you wanted out of it? Did you feel a sense of self-validating moral righteousness when the first riots broke out? When the first bombs dropped? When the first young man was sent to prison for possession of marijuana to be beaten, humiliated, even raped? To be turned into the very monster you made him out to be? I admit that I cannot as of yet fully countenance it myself. I can't come to terms with how I have participated in this horror. But that's the Zealotry Toolkit for you. Stealing your innocence by stealing your innocence.

### The Submission Narrative: Enemy Control Kit

The Submission Narrative occurs when both the Victim Narrative and Threat Narrative operate in tandem with each other with the goal to exist in perpetuity rather than achieving any elimination of the 'threat'. See, when these narratives evolve in order to deflect direct criticism of their central assumptions they trend toward a simultaneous expansion of the scope of victimization while nebulizing the target of the Threat Narrative. It sometimes even changes that target altogether and through this process leapfrogs from one target to another as each targets' usefulness expires. Remember that so long as the axiom is preserved, that of 'I am right' though in this instance 'I am victimized', the target of the Threat Narrative doesn't particularly matter. They are used merely to justify the Victim Narrative which in turn is used to validate the identity of the 'victim'. So what do I mean by this? Well much like, indeed exactly the same, as when one must tell a lie to cover another, the narrative must add upon itself each time a point in the narrative is countered or proven false. Typically the evolution of the narrative operates on a 'one step backward, two steps forward' model. First though let's explore this behavior at an individual level.

With regard to lying, it is like claiming to have received a gift from your grandfather yet not having a grandfather nor receiving a gift. When pressured on this by others the grandfather becomes merely a grandparent. When further inquired the grandparent becomes an elderly family friend. Then she may become an elderly stranger and so on. In this scenario the central assumption is that one has received a gift yet it is not questioned directly by virtue of the effort spent in addressing the existence of this imaginary grandfather. So the claim of having received said gift never comes into question and the lie evolves to protect the central assumption in a particular way I'm certain you noticed: by sacrificing

specificity. So while the liar admits to being wrong (one step back) they admit to it only with regard to the specificity of what was said and by nebulizing their narrative they expand the *possibility* of it being true (two steps forward). Indeed there is a greater chance, by virtue of the population of each demographic, that one has a grandparent rather than a grandfather, an elderly family friend than a grandparent, an elderly stranger rather than an elderly family friend, and so on. The lie necessarily becomes vaguer until it may not even resemble what it had begun as. In this example the grandfather could become a dog whom you merely call 'Grandpa'. Then the liar justifies their deception with claims of personal embarrassment regarding this odd quirk. Yet even that is just another step in the grand lie that is crafted. Next he may be asked why he does this or why he is embarrassed by this and so on. This process is well demonstrated in the perpetual evolution of the narratives between the Left and Right sides of politics, again especially in America. Their dislike and even hatred for each other is never truly questioned. Rather such introspection is delayed by yet another lie that, in time, will prove false yet never degrade or detract from the central assumption it sought to preserve. This keeps going until someone, especially an outsider not aware of the entire string of lies, demonstrates the growing absurdity of it all and challenges the claim. In the example of the gifting grandfather, perhaps by asking in earnest what sort of gift a dog could present one with and how? Yet while a single curious person can shatter an individual narrative a social one is far more difficult because they cement themselves in some subjective social appeal to consequences, the greater good, etc. Some even use a manufactured appeal to authority by 'legitimizing' their narrative under the banner of academia and 'social sciences'.

As with lying the narrative sacrifices specificity for the sake of increasing plausibility, like an infinite regress of sorts. However, since the nature of the Submission Narrative necessarily deals in the attribution of responsibility culpability is broadened, sacrificing specificity. This expands the demographic of whom this responsibility is attributed to with less direct responsibility per individual, thereby increasing plausibility. Yet no matter how much overall responsibility for the supposed malice against the supposed victim is removed from an individual, that some remains allows for moral appeals to remain effective and often more immediately actionable. For no matter how small one's perceived involvement, so long as one believes that they have any involvement in evil one will seek to rectify it in order to preserve their own identity as moral: to preserve their axiom of 'I am right' i.e. 'I am *morally* right', 'I am righteous'. Often such people need very little convincing as in truth they care less about the 'victims' and more about themselves. Indeed, their preservation of themselves as the heroes of their own stories is far more important than the 'victims'. In essence such actions, while seemingly motivated by moral considerations, are little more than narcissistic self-preservation similar to what is called

'Virtue Signaling'. Also with the ever shrinking overall responsibility an individual possesses regarding their 'victimization' of others, what is asked of them typically shrinks with that responsibility. So given that what is asked is something seemingly simple, almost trivial to undertake it is done with little overall push-back. Further still, some will go above and beyond what is asked of them given that really, it is so simple to go beyond such seemingly trite desires so why not for the sake of winning favor? Thing is it's not that simple. It never is. While the infinite regress is certainly real, what is asked of the ever increasing population of 'victimizers' increases the overall power and effect of the Submission Narrative in two ways:

- 1) Sheer numbers increases the overall effect of the narrative even if each individual is asked to do less.
- 2) The scaling back of demands is an illusion that appears as a scaling back because it retreats into matters of perspective and interpretation rather than demands strictly on behavior.

Let's use feminism as an example. See, while women and others used to demand the very lives of men and even older boys to protect their own, they now demand changes in perspective. This seems rather trite and fair in comparison to the aforementioned chivalry of yore but has enormous implications that far surpass the gynocentrism inherent to chivalry. No really. Consider just the evolution of the public perception of the catcall. Before it was understood as an uncouth behavior unfitting of a gentleman. It was something simply not done even if one so possessed the desire. Now the thought isn't even countenanced as it 'sexually objectifies' women. The thought itself is considered an indication of one's inherent misogyny. Indeed, it is now a moral thought crime. This small change in perspective, that a man's chosen expression of attraction is not merely unacceptable but opposed to the very thing it is designed to express i.e. an expression of attraction now demonstrating disgust, or rather a communication of desire demonstrating distaste, manifests cognitive dissonance in the poor man. This forces him to come to the conclusion that his own inherent sexuality is, in effect, evil. From there the only reprieve is to seek guidance from the very women who have labeled his sexuality defunct thus putting the power over his own sexuality in the hands of these women. In effect they made him a sinner who must seek forgiveness from them. I should note that this is yet another example of the inversion of the victim/oppressor dynamic wherein the target of the Threat Narrative, the man, has become the victim of the demographic comprising the Victim Narrative, the women, and in the very same fashion these women accused him of. These women now have power over this man's sexuality and are thus guilty of the very thing they accused the man of: sexual objectification, sexual enslavement, whatever

term you wish to use to describe another's power over your sexuality. Of course what makes this far worse, and indeed is the reason why a change in perspective is so far reaching and more powerful than mere demands on behavior, is that it makes the entire process of 'reforming' (really controlling) others entirely voluntary. Truly, in this example the poor bastard has willingly relinquished control over his own sexuality and identity to these harpies.

The Submission Narrative is much more effective when it can attribute its victimization to a construct without an easily identifiable demographic. This is due to yet another form of Allied Projection but not with regard to an ideology but rather to a concept. As stated the concept is typically a construct; one in which we project our own interpretation of said construct onto others and so take their meaning of it as our own. These constructs can and do vary but culture and society are employed most often. What makes these concepts so effective is that they describe often subconscious, aggregate behaviors forming what can be seen as a cohesive whole. Thus we, as forming a part of that whole, are in some way responsible for it. Recall that one cannot apply a trend to an individual thus in order to apply a trend, or an outright falsehood, to an individual you must include them in some larger demographic. What better demographic than a subjective and nebulous one that is itself a term used to describe the result of everyone's aggregate behavior? When used by those crafting a narrative terms like society and culture essentially mean 'you all' as in everyone else; a manifestation of the 'self vs other' dichotomy informed by black and white thinking. Though sometimes along with this criticism the claimant/accuser includes themselves; attempting to ingratiate themselves to us by virtue of including themselves in their own criticism. Again this is the ploy of the Christian with their 'I'm a sinner too,' and the feminist, 'patriarchy hurts men too,' appeals.

The goal to attribute responsibility to a construct rather than a single individual or group is done primarily to remove the opposition to any claims of perpetration that an individual or demographic would normally provide. In other words, a construct can't defend itself. The secondary reason is that it is also easier, though foolishly countenanced, to consider one's self responsible for another's perpetration in one's ignorance. This way accepting any reparations asked by them, while admitting to having done wrong, is seen as a good act rather than as an appreciable punishment or extortion. Again, typically what is asked of people is something relatively small and seemingly reasonable, usually in the form of a perspective change and especially of self-policing and censorship. You aren't demanded to give your time or money but asked in typically soft, dulcet tones. The same way a charity approaches possible patrons. In reality of course this first admission of guilt and subsequent perceptual alterations plant a

familiar seed, an unfounded *assumption* that grows until it begins to alter your behavior in order to preserve itself. The beauty and horror of this model is that instead of targeting a specific demographic it allows everyone within a community, local and even international, to freely accept guilt and so take responsibility voluntarily. Such voluntary acceptance forms a core of their identity thus challenging it becomes as difficult as previously discussed. This is very well demonstrated in the character of the sycophantic male feminist and social justice warrior. Hence why those who submit to the Submission Narrative have come to be disparagingly known as ‘cucks’.

So now that we know why ideologues attempt to blame social constructs, what are these constructs objectively speaking? Well given that culture is merely the end result, that end being some arbitrary point of observation, of the aggregate behaviors of a particular demographic of people and applying responsibility to the construct itself, culture as ideologues use it is nothing more than mere circumstance and attempting to apply agency to it. Indeed, by blaming culture or society or any other social construct ideologues are attempting to give agency to a concept, to a non-agent – hell to a non-entity. It is absurd, but again absurd claims are fraught with absurd logical conclusions. So what does the ideologue gain from this personification of circumstance? This strange attribution of intention? Well besides the power gained through Allied Projection which is substantial, the ideologue gains a never-depreciating, self-evolving target that cannot defend itself. See, rather than ideologues needing to evolve the narrative in order to avoid criticism of their axiom, of their self-righteousness, social constructs evolve naturally since the subjective interpretations of them change over time. This allows the ideologue to continue to blame social constructs in perpetuity. Essentially the evolution of the construct directs the evolution of the narrative. New generation of music? It’s misogynistic! New popular television program? It’s anti-liberal! New social behavior or greeting? It’s appropriating someone’s culture! This relieves the ideologue of most of their work and makes them rather lazy, which is good because with their lack of effort comes a lack of creativity and so they come to attribute ‘evil’ to nearly every new thing. This ability to see the ‘evil’ in everything becomes clichéd, predictable, and ultimately unconvincing. It’s like Christians seeing Jesus in everything from burnt toast to their dog’s asshole. The best example in modern times is feminism whose ascriptions of misogyny would make the most paranoid and superstitious people on the planet look at them funny.

As stated, the inability of a social construct to defend itself doesn’t so much strengthen the Submission Narrative but rather weakens the opposition to it. This happens in a few ways. Firstly by targeting a social construct, a non-agent, it by definition cannot defend itself. By targeting a construct rather than

individuals it shrinks the voice of opposition since while those targeted by the Submission Narrative have grown in size, they feel less targeted as individuals. Indeed, they don't feel targeted at all really. Secondly anyone who wishes to counter the Submission Narrative must name themselves de facto representatives of the social construct targeted by the Submission Narrative. This fails for many reasons. First there is the absurdity of claiming to represent this construct; let's use culture as it is most popular. Never mind the absurdity of blaming it which is absurd for the exact same reason. Since culture is subject to Allied Projection to claim to represent it is to claim to represent others' interpretation of it and by extension themselves i.e. their respective identities within it. This is met with all sorts of accusations of pompousness and speaking far beyond one's station and capacity. Furthermore it is by my definition an act of personal affirmation and should this not be in keeping with others' interpretation of one's culture, and it most certainly will not, it results in schism. So should you voice your interpretation of what your culture is you are doomed to be removed from it by virtue of ostracism or hopefully realizing that you were 'wrong' about it all along. This leads to the second reason: the inherent truth of the first point. Indeed, social constructs like culture and society are non-entities existing in the mind of the observer predicated on Allied Projection. Those who rightly criticize others who claim to represent a culture do so with the support of reason itself; once again turning the truth into a weapon against the rational or in this case directing its use to that which benefits irrationality.

Speaking objectively, which is difficult to do regarding such constructs, they are merely the result of aggregate behaviors and observable shared preferences. So attributing one's circumstance to anything other than one's own choices, such as the pseudo-agent that is culture, is an attempt to relinquish one's responsibility for their choices and subsequent actions to someone else. In this case a 'someone' that is, in truth, a subjective *something*. It is certainly true however that choice can and is influenced by incentive but it is an influence, not an imposition. In a free society, or rather a freer one as none exist yet, there is nothing forcing one to act according to popular social preferences, to cultural incentives, and where there is such force there is an individual behind it. In lieu of such force and the subsequent irresponsibility for one's choices (more accurately non-choices) that it would engender, if people are more prone to choose to do something by virtue of others' doing so it is an effect of socialization. Yet it remains a decision to act according to others' interests for you or according to the customs and behaviors that define the cross-cultural rules of social engagement. Therefore it is forever a choice and it is your choice, not anyone else's. So to claim that you are a representative of culture is to claim to be a representative not only of the manifestation of the aggregate behavior of everyone, but of their own individual choices and even intentions. It is thus impossible to represent one's culture as it is comprised

of individuals whose choices and intentions can run entirely counter to each other; as we've learned is often the case with Allied Projection. Hence the opportunity to court schism in claiming to represent one's culture, to affirm your cultural identity. So not only is it impossible to represent a culture due to the schism invariably created through whomever attempts such an affirmation, it is objectively impossible as well given that one cannot represent what defies representation by definition. With culture as a manifestation of various and often antithetical beliefs, actions, and intentions all operating in aggregate, it is impossible for one individual to claim representative status. You cannot apply a trend to an individual. Consider so-called Muslim culture. You cannot represent something that is simultaneously peaceful and warring or both passive and aggressive. In other words, you can't draw a square circle. You can't communicate to me that language is meaningless. To claim that you could isn't simply a subjective claim, such as your being happy or that there is an undetectable rainbow unicorn in your closet, rather it is an anti-objective one. It is the difference between that which *does not* exist and that which *cannot* exist.

Furthermore there are cross-cultural rules to consider. Now culture shock is certainly real, I'm not discounting the feeling of unease and even bewilderment when experiencing another culture, but with every question regarding social custom and behavior there comes easy answers. Not in the history or evolution of the practice but in its purpose. Within the explanation of the purpose lies the means by which every culture operates and we, no matter the culture, understand these because they are shared, likely universal. These are concepts such as politeness, kindness, hospitality, insult, respect, generosity, rudeness, friendliness, reproach, ostracism, etc. The behaviors of many cultures make little sense without these points of reference and that we all understand these points of reference demonstrates that at the core of human interaction lies a system we each understand to one degree or another. That claim is a book in and of itself but for now I suppose you could take that for granted. I mean, we'd never be able to get along with or communicate with other cultures, hell even other individuals, were that not the case. So to declare one's self as a representative of culture, which is the aggregate behaviors of individuals culminating in behaviors designed to exercise the universal concepts they represent, one declares themselves a representative of a representative further distancing themselves from any ability to actually represent the core of that which they wish to. It's like reflecting a reflection or recording a bootleg of a bootleg. It simply doesn't compare to the original.

So if you can't represent culture because doing so is anti-objective, what makes you think culture, the concept, the social construct itself, can? It cannot. Thus culture, without any meaning other than what is

projected into it, is itself the greatest form of Allied Projection we have. It is a subjective conceptualization of course, but any attempt to transition it into something objective is entirely impossible. Simply put, you cannot communicate what a particular culture is nor describe it with any particulars. Should a single Scottish man disagree with his peers regarding Scottish culture, is he no longer a representative of that culture? Is he no longer a part of it? Is he no longer a 'true Scotsman'? Should he forgo certain traditions or adopts different behaviors, is he no longer adhering to Scottish culture? Does that imply Scottish culture and by extension all cultures can never change? See dear reader, culture must always remain nebulous and individually interpretable so as remain a vessel for Allied Projection. Now does this mean all representation is, by definition, anti-objective? Well consider this: what is the proper representation of American culture? How about black culture? Gamer culture? If cultural representation is real it must have some standard by which to judge it. So what represents it? Hell, what doesn't represent it? It's far easier to consider that which does not represent it rather than what does, correct? Where have we seen that before?

"Yet is it not odd that while these ideologues cannot agree on what their ideology truly is they *can* agree on what it is *not*? That they can in unison recoil in horror or raise a fist of righteous indignation regarding any representation of their ideology that they deem unworthy? This is telling, at least to me. It tells me that rather than holding to an ideal they are instead seeking one but damned by no objective standard for truth, this search for an ideal is without end."

Culture is a result Allied Projection reader. Of *your* projection and mine.

### Anti-Objectivity: Breaking the Rules of Reality

Anti-objectivity is a term I use to distinguish the unreality it describes from subjective unreality given its unique distinctions. While subjectivity is necessarily a matter of individual perception, ultimately of prediction though more on that later, anti-objectivity is a matter of demonstrable impossibility. In essence, anti-objectivity is that which isn't merely untrue, isn't merely false, but cannot even exist. Anti-objectivity is a sphere with corners, a future past. Now it is certainly true that one may nevertheless believe in such nonsense and this belief can and is described as subjective. Yet this is because what is

being described as subjective is the belief itself, not its content. The existence of the content of the anti-objective full-stop.

Anti-objectivity can manifest wherever one's denial of reality manifests as a belief in the demonstrably impossible. Though it can also exist within any manmade system of rules. Consider that it is entirely impossible to score points by missing your opponents' goal in soccer and just as impossible for Harry Potter to be a woman. Even within a system of rules that is entirely manmade what is possible and impossible is still objectively determinable. Sure Harry Potter isn't real, but within the Harry Potter universe he is a man. Sure soccer rules aren't real, the sport itself isn't some immutable fact of the physical universe, but the subject of scoring in soccer submits itself to the rules of the sport. If this seems confusing just consider our manmade system of mathematics. There is no 1 nor 2 yet '1+1=2' is absolutely true. There are plenty of examples of anti-objectivity to explore but for now let us consider race and with that the National Socialist a.k.a. the Nazi.

Nazis replaced the objective reality that race is by no means an entirely realistic and determinable measure of human value, principles, and character with the falsehood that there is a hierarchy of races with Aryans at the top of said hierarchy. Nazis justified their racism through a standard. A false one but a standard nonetheless. Standards themselves are of course necessary to the evaluation of anything and everything, but in this case they were irrational insofar as they didn't accord with reality and so the conclusions wrought through them. So given the matter of race, what would its anti-objective counterpart be? An example of anti-objectivity supplanting objectivity with regard to race? It would be to make racism, the beliefs and behaviors informed by it, entirely rational and moral yet without any standard by which to determine which race is superior or inferior; to determine their value. To instate the belief that value, principles, and character can be determined by race but without any additional criteria. See, while both are racist the former tries to apply a standard while the latter eliminates such a standard. The former justifies racism as an extension of reason to the evaluation of genetic differences. The latter merely assumes the existence of race as a determiner of value, principles, and character but without any system of determining value, principles, and character. It makes claims of *what* race is, but offers and indeed resists any attempt at determining *how* it is. So it exists as a 'what' without any 'how', without any means through which it exists. Indeed, this 'assuming into existence' of labels, terms, and affiliations, whatever you want to call them, that lack any cogent definition or means of evaluation is the core of anti-objectivity. Defined not merely by its existence as subjective, as wholly dependent on the

individual mind, but entirely unable to exist in reality and to describe any reality. Suffice it to say it isn't just something that doesn't exist. It is something that cannot exist.

This would take the form of claims such as 'black is valuable' all the while resisting any attempt to attribute to 'black' characteristics that could be used to determine its value to something, to some purpose. Certainly 'black' may be valuable to you but such is a subjective claim. *How it is valuable to you*, for what reason it is valuable, for what outcome it facilitates, for what result it generates, is left entirely unexplored and entirely unacknowledged as a necessary criterion for it to be valuable. The value of 'black' just is. It merely exists without reference to the necessary criteria used to determine its value by definition. Call it a square circle, a future past. Moreover recognize the axiomatic nature of such a claim. The value of 'black' is axiomatic in the same way 'I am right' is. It just exists. So ask yourself, what *do* 'Black Lives Matter' to? Subjectively perhaps they matter to you but again for what reason? With reference to what purpose? Indeed, what is the 'Black Lives Matter' movement other than an act of affirming their own axiomatic sense of self as 'black' and so too of their own self-righteousness? As with every act of affirmation we have explored, it operates within an ideology, an axiomatic belief system, and so is maintained through Allied Projection. So what would engender a schism in this example? Simple, claiming any criteria as necessary to the value, or rather your valuing of, 'black'. Call it an attribution of particular characteristics to race through which you determine its value. Make such an affirmation and face ostracism as, you guessed it, a racist. Forget the prejudicial definition of the term. Dear reader could you have ever guessed that an accusation of *discrimination* could ever have been so literal?

### Turning Agency into a Weapon: The True Target of Narratives

Since the narrative be it Victim, Threat, or Submission is based on one's denial of personal responsibility and the projection of that responsibility onto another, it is necessarily a matter of personal agency. In particular to whom one's agency can be foisted onto or to whom one's agency can be perceived as being controlled or restricted by. This takes the form of blaming certain individuals or demographics of course, but it especially places blame onto social constructs like culture and other 'systemic' social forces. While we've explored why such an ascription of responsibility and so blame is erroneous and how it is used to perpetuate the 'victim' group's validation through nebulizing the target of their Threat Narrative, we've

yet to discuss in full how this perpetuation occurs and how targets, old and new, are chosen in spite of this nebulization. Recall how skeptics are targeted not only for their perceived allegiance to the intended target of the Threat Narrative but also for their opposition to the narrative itself, rather than the 'victim' group itself. Also recall how skeptics' knowledge and moral sanction of their actions has them appear as immoral to the 'victim' group due to the 'victim' group's inversion of reality. Furthermore recall that should the intended target capitulate to the demands of the 'victim' group and in turn accept responsibility, to submit, they can and often are more or less excused of their responsibility which is transferred to the skeptics with the justification that the skeptics had orchestrated or otherwise maliciously influenced the behavior of the intended target. So what am I hinting at here? Well the skeptics became targets by virtue of exercising personal agency. Not only that but defending their ability to do so and their knowledge of it. Indeed, in this situation the more one exercises their personal agency the more one is seen as responsible for the victimization of the 'victim' group and thus a threat. Suffice it to say, to an ideologue agency is a threat. Let's explore why.

By attributing agency to circumstance, which is what the 'victim' group must do in order to place responsibility onto social constructs such as culture, they are in effect separating themselves from that culture by virtue of their lack of responsibility for their own 'victimization' and thus lack of personal agency. In other words, the less agency one can perceive themselves as having the less at fault they are for their circumstance and thus a victim of those who manufactured this circumstance. Furthermore the more agency that one perceives themselves as having or purports to have, the more they are responsible for the circumstance affecting the 'victim' group. Ergo the more you claim personal responsibility for yourself and your actions the more you will be perceived as having contributed to the circumstance that victimizes the 'victim' group. So as long as you can be seen to contribute in any way to the circumstance that the 'victim' group erroneously attributes their feeling of victimization, you will be blamed for victimizing the 'victim' group. Worse and just like the skeptics, the more conscious you are of your own actions and the outcomes they have and furthermore your defense of such actions as moral at best and innocuous at worst, the more evil you become in the eyes of the 'victim' group. It is as if all human interaction or the aggregate known as culture or any other appreciable social construct is negative, antagonizing, and victimizing. Thus the less you exercise your ability to act, the less you act as an agent, the less you apply your agency, the less to blame you are for others' victimization and the more guiltless, and so more virtuous, you become. Seem familiar? Yet again we see the concept of sin manifest. As ever, religion had borrowed a concept from humankind and adapted it to its own purpose. In this social model agency becomes sin. Agency becomes evil. Most importantly though, *personal*

*responsibility is seen as evil.* Now if there was ever an ex post facto justification for one's denial of personal responsibility that would be it. Yet consider that such people, bound by their axiom of 'I am right' and subsequently 'I am moral', would of course believe that their lack of agency made them moral. This is yet another example of circular reasoning:

'I am moral because I am not responsible for culture (sin) because culture victimizes me because I am moral because I am not responsible for culture (sin) because culture victimizes me because...'

With this ascription of intention to circumstance and said circumstance perceived as victimizing, it takes what is the cause and effect domino chain of reality and transforms it into a hierarchy of ascribable guilt; with guilt increasing up the hierarchy or in reality, guilt increasing the further back into the past of this cause and effect chain. Ergo each cause that preceded an effect, or rather each effect previous to the latest one which it caused, is more responsible than the subsequent effect it caused. So whomever is attributed the responsibility for this effect is made the ultimate guilty party. This hierarchy even overrules one's own admission of personal agency, of both choice and intention, as such an admission can be seen as lacking in perspective or acting in ignorance of this greater mechanism of control. So they may blame a man for his crimes, then blame his poverty for his motivation, then blame his poverty on systemic oppression of minorities, then blame whites for this system and so on. Essentially once such a hierarchy is established it can be blamed for practically everything as it is, in effect, an attribution of intention to everything; to circumstance. You could be the most devout racist in the world yet through this hierarchy your position as a racist can be attributed to some other casual factor. Your exercise of agency, even while acknowledged as intentional, becomes irrelevant to your ultimate guilt.

Given that culture is a social construct, emphasis on social, the more societal power one can be seen as possessing the more responsible for others' victimization they will be perceived as having but also the more power to rectify it. Such people are often celebrities, politicians, or otherwise famous people you often hear about and can likely identify with. They themselves often have a sense of responsibility towards others, an obligation for setting a 'good example' or giving voice to important social issues now that they have the soapbox with which to do so.

So with this hierarchy a mere ascription of intention to circumstance, it ensures that one can always blame others for one's outcomes; ironically so long as one can respond to said circumstance and whatever stimuli or incentive it provides. Suffice it to say, their ability to choose demonstrates to them their inability to choose or at least the constraint of that choice. What we have is one attributing all their

actions, indeed all their choices, not simply *to effects* but *as effects* of prior causes rather than causes in and of themselves. They perceive their exercise of agency as entirely reactionary. Though not described as such, it is an ideological adherence to determinism. It is a reverse Butterfly Effect of sorts.

Butterfly Effect:

1. A cumulatively large effect that a very small natural force may produce over a period of time.
2. The idea, used in chaos theory, that a very small difference in the initial state of a physical system can make a significant difference to the state at some later time.

The common analogies used to describe this effect are the use of a time machine to change the very distant past and the effects such change could have hundreds if not millions of years in the future. Also the eponymous example of a butterfly beating its wings and that such change in the air, given enough time and distance, could cause or at least contribute in a much larger fashion to a hurricane on the other side of the world.

This reverse Butterfly Effect begins with the assumption that one's circumstance is a result of their victimization and that such victimization must in turn have a progenitor, a butterfly. So the current circumstance by which one feels victimized is attributed, rightly or wrongly, a cause which created it. This new cause is seen as being more responsible for one's victimization than the circumstance subsequent to it, yet even this cause was effected by a prior one. So we continue in this fashion, rightly or wrongly, reverse engineering the domino chain of cause and effect in the hopes of discovering a 'butterfly' to whom all responsibility can be laid. Of course this is nothing more than an examination of cause and effect and even then only if one attributes each cause to each effect correctly. Such an exploration of cause and effect, whether logical or fantastical, ensures that such examination will last in perpetuity. There will always, *always* be a new cause for every effect and thus the perpetual cycle of what is, as its main purpose, an exercise in masturbatory self-validation through denial is assured. One will never run out of causes to blame for their supposed victimization.

Still this process, should it be goal-oriented, will stop at any point where one's bigotry deems it to. If it reaches a particular demographic or person the 'victim' wishes to target as the means of validating their identity, it stops and focuses all effort in eliminating this target. As has been demonstrated, even within a single ideology behaviors informed by either validation or goal-orientation can manifest. Should it be goal-oriented, this search for an oppressor stops at some appreciable oppressor or 'innate' oppressive

behavior or characteristic. This is the witch hunt and subsequent trial. Should it be based in validation this process, this hierarchy of intention attributed to cause and effect, can actually be characterized as innately oppressive. Therefore the process of examining the Butterfly Effect continues under the auspices not of determining whom is the victimizer but rather the scope and breadth of their victimization by better understanding this innately oppressive model of well, existence itself. This is where most reference to an oppressive individual is removed with social constructs and 'systemic' forces put in its place. Considering this victimization is all a matter of personal perception it's fitting that one's quest to validate their victimization eventually dispenses with individual oppressors and nebulizes to encompass not everyone, but all of one's own experiences. In essence, experience itself becomes victimizing regardless of any particular oppressor or the intentions of others. In feminism this represents the duality that is patriarchy theory. As a validation-oriented theory, this hierarchy of ascribable intention is called patriarchy. As a goal-oriented theory, each and every person or demographic to whom the responsibility for the 'victim' group's victimization is attributed becomes patriarchal themselves or a part of the patriarchy. The former is some nebulous oppressive force. The latter is an oppressive characteristic with a linked demographic. In practice the former allows for others to relinquish their personal responsibility, their agency, to the patriarchy and so blame it instead. The latter does not. Through this process the former forever allows those whom it targets, while not exactly vindication, a retribution through blaming patriarchy. Though this is better understood as accepting the validity of the narrative and thus the self-righteousness of the ideologue. The latter does not allow for this and so makes permanent enemies of so-called patriarchs. Both however share in their retroactive attribution of malice to their targets.

#### The Retroactive Attribution of Malice: All's Well that Orwells

The flawed examination of the cause and effect chain along with the ascription of greater personal responsibility to each actor further along this chain, hitherto known as the Reverse Butterfly Effect (RBE), necessarily creates an ever growing effect for which one is to be blamed. This increase in the scope of the overall effect of one's actions inflates their responsibility to a preposterously high degree. So high in fact that to attribute such responsibility to them is akin to granting them powers of prediction and influence so beyond the scope of human capacity that it is more akin to clairvoyance or godlike

omniscience. Again, to prevent such godlike attributions a similarly godlike social construct is blamed instead. Yet in the interim, in the time before such retroactive attributions of malicious intent can grow beyond a reasonable scope of human control, that is to say when such attributions aren't absolutely unreasonable, there exists a bizarre period of near-schizophrenic relations and ever-growing hostility between ideologues and the targets of the RBE.

What could be an ally or innocuous bystander in the ideologue's mind can transform in a near instant into a long-time enemy. Yes, *long-time*. Despite their position as an ally or bystander just a day or two ago, they have now become long-time enemies. How so? Well, the retroactive attribution of malice comes with it every transgression purported to afflict the ideologue. Thus anything from yesterday to over a century ago and beyond is the fault of whomever this attribution falls to. To the ideologue your alliance, or innocuousness, wasn't real but either a cover for your true nefarious purpose or a product of their own lack of perception. That is, they will admit to their fault of not having seen you as an enemy by virtue of their ignorance. This behavior accords with their treatment of their ideology as truth. That all new facts and reasons and arguments to that effect are treated not as new but as elementary; only unknown due to their ignorance of the ideologue. Those familiar with Orwell's '1984' may be similarly familiar with this behavior. It has become a bit of a cliché to quote '1984', though I believe that is because we have yet to fully understand and apply its message. In fact, I know that to be the case. I wouldn't need to write this were it not the case:

"The past was alterable. The past never had been altered. Oceania was at war with Eastasia. Oceania had always been at war with Eastasia." - George Orwell

Similarly ideologues are now at war with an ally. To translate:

"The perceived reality had changed, but not the truth. The truth had never been altered but rather better understood. Ideologues were now at war with allies. Ideologues were always at war with these allies but had not yet realized it."

As ever such ideologues exist in search of a target, rather than in response to one. Thus they themselves are, in fact, targeting others. Ideologies, or rather the beliefs that inform them, are the impetus of associated aggressive actions. They are not innocuous. While this certainly explains their hostility toward allies, such hostility could hardly be described as schizophrenic or bipolar. Indeed, which is why such allies return to their initial ally status in time and then perhaps back to enemies again and to allies once

more. How? Simple, the ever-shifting responsibility of the RBE ensures that responsibility can only ever linger on you for so long before it moves to another target. After it finds a new target you can attempt to ingratiate yourself back into the ideological fold but even then such an active role in your own retribution isn't always necessary. You've merely become yet another 'victim' of the next target and so have relinquished most, though not all, of your responsibility for the victimization of the ideologue. Of course this targeting could eventually find its way back to you or target you through some other demographic or affiliation you are perceived as possessing. Hence the schizophrenic/bipolar nature of it all.

Now while similar as a misattribution of responsibility to an innocent party, the RBE as I've presented it thus far is an exercise in self-validation rather than the goal-oriented approach. That is, the targets of the RBE were unintentional and chosen only to further the purpose of validation. The RBE, when used for validation, has only a single or small cadre of targets at any given moment. While it certainly gathers an ever-growing perceived opposition by forever inflating the list of those who oppress them, it eventually ceases any actions against such perceived opposition. So what will begin as the newest frontline in the battle for an ideology will eventually return to whatever status quo it began as with maybe some small changes here and there. This is logical as this need for validation as a victim requires constant oppression rather than rectification or remedy. When one capitulates to the demands of these self-described victims it is validating for a time but eliminates a potential venue for perceived victimization which is, in reality, what they actually want. Basically they don't want their stores of potential oppressors to ever depreciate. They don't want reparations of an act of ultimate expiation, of atonement. Similarly their need to avoid objective criticism of their position has them move to new targets as well much like people move to new ideologies in order to delay introspection. However, should the use of the RBE be goal-oriented it accumulates successive consistent targets and demands reformation therein; maintaining a vigilant presence to enforce its agenda. So for feminism and in the case of patriarchy, the validation model of the RBE is ever *searching*, though never finding, the true source of the patriarchy and its scope of influence. The goal model of the RBE is ever *accumulating* so-called members of the patriarchy or rather those in possession of some innate characteristic that is responsible for the patriarchy. A characteristic which in reality is, by virtue of the inherent bigotry of patriarchy theory, masculinity itself. So essentially the validation model is ever seeking a 'what' and the goal model is constantly accumulating a 'whom'. This makes sense given their respective motivations.

So with this pervasive denial of not only personal agency but the agency of others through its attribution to some hierarchical social construct, we essentially have the culmination of 'none possess agency' and so 'agency doesn't exist' as a core assumption. Suffice it to say, no one is an agent anymore. There is no such thing as responsibility and thus the denial sought by the 'victim' group has wholly manifested in this false reality. As stated:

'A belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.'

In this case the belief that one is not the cause, the agent effecting their own sense of victimization has culminated in the belief that no agency exists; not only on their behalf but everyone's. Now one is the ultimate perpetual victim forever bound to a fatalist existence, a life of total unchoice, yet somehow possessing the ability to recognize this. As though such people are living their lives trapped in their own bodies, hell in their own minds. How fitting.

It's certainly counter-intuitive that the projection of one's responsibility onto others would culminate in not only the complete denial of one's agency but also the agency of those whom they had targeted; given such pervasive and complete denial belies the state of victimization itself as it effectively removes intention from the human psyche. Suffice it to say, no agency means no perpetration which in turn means no victimization. How then is this countenanced? Well often it isn't. This culmination of one's denial and the subsequent self-detonating logic that it has created is an effect of objectivity creep. Having attempted to reason out one's initial assumption, in this case that they are a victim, they have observed the depreciation of others' responsibility for said victimization due to nebulization. This depreciating trend is pointing invariably to the objective truth that no such victimization exists. From this some ideologues can finally extrapolate the truth. They can reach the logical conclusion that theirs' is a self-imposed victimization. That it is a denial of one's personal responsibility and agency for the sake of preserving and validating one's own identity. Alas as shown, and indeed as demonstrated by ideologues in reality, such introspection is rare. First, any circular reasoning provided can shield an ideologue from ever recognizing the logical conclusion of their beliefs. Secondly, the attribution of all intention and thus control to circumstance, the creation of an agent out of nothing yet in control of everything, is merely the creation of yet another god. Naturally it isn't named or understood as such, but in practice it is the same thing. Social hierarchy, patriarchy, culture, social force, whatever you want to call it, it is nothing more than a false being manufactured for the sole purpose of having intention ascribed to it. It is the creation of an answer that itself requires more explanation than that which it is

used to explain. It is the 'other' in some non-corporeal but nevertheless 'real' form. So this 'god' becomes a never ending vessel for an ideologue's denied responsibility. Thirdly, the examination of the Reverse Butterfly Effect allows one to forever shift the goalpost of responsibility further down the chain of cause and effect. Each and every time you can prove that the current 'butterfly' is not to blame, they move down to the next and they won't necessarily observe the trend this creates. Note dear reader that these logical fallacies aren't merely operating in the mind but have manifested in another venue altogether. In this case that of human experience and the ascription of responsibility, of human agency. Consider that logic and its subsequent fallacies are matters of reason but more importantly of truth. Each fallacy is an erroneous attempt at discerning or claiming the truth. Replace 'truth' with 'agency' and the exact same fallacies apply to the behaviors committed by the ideologue. There is the fallacy of circular agency ascription. The fallacy of creating a false agent. Lastly the fallacy of shifting responsibility.

Do you suppose dear reader that there might exist a link between this belief in personal non-agency and self-righteousness? Ask yourself, where does 'I am right' reference personal agency? Where is it stated that 'I' is a result of one's chosen actions? Is it not true that, should one operate on this axiom, one exists irrespective of one's exercise of agency? Though with that said shouldn't we all view ourselves in this fashion? We share this axiom in common with ideologues. We all operate according to it yet there exists an observable distinction between ourselves and ideologues. In truth there is a crucial factor that manufactures this distinction. A truth that is harder to countenance than anything I've yet written and likely anything I may ever.

## CHAPTER 5 - Ideology in Practice Part 1:

### Feminism

Introduction:

The definition of feminism according to Merriam Webster:

- 1) The theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes.
- 2) Organized activity in support of women's rights and interests.

Modern-day feminism has as much to do with those definitions as Nazi Eugenicians had to do with Darwinism. That is to say they are predicated on some truth, but have twisted it to an irrational and harmful purpose. Many, if not most feminists recognize such behavior as extremism or a twisted radicalization of their core beliefs, but such criticism is little more than slander. I recognize it as such and instead attribute to these 'extremists' their deserved label of 'true believer' as they are more consistent with their ideology. It should also be noted that the achievements of the Suffragettes ought not to be attributed to feminists such as lobbying the government for the right to vote. A distinction between both groups has always existed. Think of feminists as validation-oriented and Suffragettes as goal-oriented. This is why Suffragettes no longer exist while feminists do.

Inherent in this definition, while not technically discriminatory, is an exclusionary caveat. That is, why focus solely on inequality between the sexes and not inequality as a whole? Naturally there is nothing wrong with a focused approach, but it does beg the question why one would choose a particular demographic with which to apply their efforts rather than to apply their efforts consistently according to the overall principle of equality which is, at its core, the principle of fairness itself. A greater need comes to mind. If the effort to rid the world of inequality is a form of triage, then surely whomever requires it most should be most deserving. Though were that the case, then every feminist is by definition an egalitarian with a focus on inequality between the sexes.

Egalitarian:

- 1) A belief in human equality especially with respect to social, political, and economic affairs.
- 2) A social philosophy advocating the removal of inequalities among people.

If such is the case then feminism is merely a subset of equality which in turn is a manifestation of the principle we understand as fairness. Now where have we seen such attempts at defining one's ideology

as a subset of a principle before? Regardless, there is yet another problem. What of the other sex? That is, what of the men? Alas, feminists' contributions to men are shall we say, substandard and more importantly undesired. That is, whatever 'benefits' men receive from feminists are ancillary to their core goal of pursuing women's interests; all the while such scraps are lauded as some great, selfless contribution to the well-being of men. Moreover such benefits aren't asked for and indeed only beneficial through a feminist interpretation. Say for example the ability of a man to order a prissy drink or to engage in some 'gendered' activity. What benefits, or rather rights, men do advocate for are at best ignored and at worst attributed to some malicious intent on their part. Hence the denigration of the Men's Rights Activist (MRA).

Similarly MRAs claim to comprise a subset of egalitarianism but one that focuses on the rights of men. That is, if their claims are to be believed. Or rather not believed but understood. Indeed, while feminists claim to be a subset of egalitarianism Men's Rights Activists demonstrate it through behavior which has yet to be widely recognized. The MRA has also wisely chosen not a label but an objective definition of their purpose. That is, rather than a 'Masculinist' or some other ideology, they have described themselves by the very actions one must take to be described as such; even without any knowledge of or affiliation with the wider community of MRAs. That is, to be a MRA you must act to preserve and acquire male rights. The name and the definition are the same leaving little if no room for ambiguity. This is in stark contrast to feminism which, like many ideologies, uses language to hide its purpose through the phenomenon of Allied Projection. Truly, to deny the observation that your efforts to act to acquire or to preserve male rights has you acting as a MRA is to deny the meaning of language itself. To deny any affiliation with or as a MRA demonstrates only that you've falsely attributed some characteristic to the term which exempts you from sharing the same categorization. In other words, it's demonstrative only of your own projection and so irrationality. This unambiguous descriptor also allows for effective criticism of anyone who claims the title for themselves. If they do not act to acquire or preserve rights for men then they are not, by definition, a MRA. This is something that simply cannot be said of feminism and feminists. I admire the MRA's use of objective terminology greatly and as one who understands the covert and insidious relationship ideologies have to language, this was my first indication that 'Men's Rights' is not an ideology but rather a coalition of actors acting on principle toward a tangible goal. In other words, MRAs represent a goal-oriented approach rather than engineering a cycle of perpetual validation of some ideological identity. With regard to sex-based activism, they constitute our modern-day Suffragettes. Yet will this goal prove virtuous or will it succumb to the mind-virus of ideology and manifest in the behaviors of the Victim and subsequent

Threat Narrative becoming an ideology itself? Well now that we understand these narratives we can wait and see. Or we can shepherd them and keep them on a rational path.

### Men's Rights Activists vs Feminists: Goal vs Validation

As you've no doubt noticed if you've spent much time on this topic, both camps largely hate each other. By now you are no doubt certain on which side of this divide I fall. Feminists, feminism itself, is in the wrong. Luckily with examples of debunking feminists becoming plentiful I can refer you to such minds and save myself the hassle. This chapter, indeed this book is not for the sake of debunking feminist claims. That is a gross waste of time as attacking any such hydra is. Instead, I seek to debunk feminism itself which requires a much deeper look into what and how they believe rather than what they claim to believe. Claims are merely the tip of the iceberg. Claims are the conscious communication chosen to represent feminism and a particular feminist's beliefs. A claim is the culmination of their entire thought process, of their reasoning. It is just a conclusion whose foundation is entirely unexplored by any criticism of said claim. Most importantly a claim is a conscious communication, so what if the feminist is entirely unaware of their own thought process? If it is a product of their unconscious or subconscious mind, how do you expect them to communicate it to you? Unless presented by the most intellectually rigorous and self-aware, claims won't represent at all the impetus to the belief in the claim itself. So whether they are aware of it or not, anything a feminist communicates is propaganda. Their communicate are the falsehoods they tell themselves and others to justify their beliefs. Their claims are their ex post facto justifications for their axiom and all corollary assumptions borne from it. It is their hydra of excuses. We don't want to investigate what amounts to a sneeze borne from their mind-virus. We want to scrutinize the virus itself, not its effects and certainly not its vector for spreading the infection. To do so is to meet the mind-virus on its own terms. To reuse the analogy, dealing with feminist claims and indeed the sneezes from all mind-viruses is merely confronting the claim that one has a grandparent rather than that one has received a gift. It is playing your role in the cycle of the evolving lie, of the narrative, by preying on your own presumptions. Such claims are meant to forever replicate themselves and to preoccupy us with, when compared to the core of their beliefs, complete triviality. We needn't waste a second of our time demonstrating how [X] isn't misogynistic or how [Y] isn't objectifying. We needn't waste our time on such distractions when much deeper and profound is

our investigation and criticism. To continue with the analogy, we're going to prove that they received no such gift and in turn why they chose to lie about it in the first place. By the end of this chapter we're going to do what no feminist has ever done before. We're going to understand feminism.

### Ideology: Hiding in Plain Language

Everything before this point, while certainly contentious, remained in a realm that I cannot myself define but was nevertheless familiar. It contained concepts that were new, but nonetheless referenced material I understood. Not so with this argument. Here I will be exploring not necessarily a different form of reason but a different venue in which it operates – I think. It's hard to know really. Though I believe that speaks in its favor for would this be a common realm of human understanding and even recognition I very much doubt ideology could have manifested from it. Suffice it to say, this is where the root of ideology has been hiding all this time. It is our very lack of understanding in this area and the resulting unawareness of its machinations that allows ideology to flourish despite our efforts; even within those of us who pride ourselves on fighting it.

Given this widespread ignorance of the underlying mechanism that creates and maintains ideological belief, there is a shadow battle of sorts that occurs with every exchange between the ideologue and the skeptic that the ideologue wins every time. That is, there are certain premises unique to ideological belief that, even in arguing against the ideology, skeptics implicitly accept through their choice of argumentation thereby rendering the interaction not just fruitless but a boon to the ideology itself. The premise is namely that the conceptual framework within one argues is at all real. That is, the skeptic argues that something *does not* exist rather than the truth that said something *cannot exist*. It is through this implicit admission of the truth of the ideologue's premise that the ideologue prevails with said ideologue failing only – if at all – in their *assessment* of their observation of the premise rather than the existence of the premise itself. Indeed, all the skeptic can prove in such situations is that the ideologue has evaluated the premise incorrectly and in so doing admits to the truth and so existence of the premise itself. In other words, the skeptic implicitly claims that what the ideologue is speaking about is true while explicitly claiming that the ideologue is most certainly mistaken in their observation or application of this truth. To complicate matters, if the ideologue defines themselves as in any way fighting for or against said premise, the skeptic validates their identity by, again implicitly and certainly

accidentally, admitting to the truth of the premise itself rather than denying it outright. Confusing? Yes a bit, so an example is needed:

A feminist argues that [X] sexually objectifies women.

A skeptic argues that it does not.

It's really that simple.

What the skeptic fails to do however is to debunk sexual objectification as a concept altogether. Naturally I am not without self-awareness and recognize that I have yet to do so myself. But we are in the chapter on feminism dear reader and I shall. Regarding the example, essentially all the skeptic can claim of the feminist is that she is overzealous or simply mistaken; hardly a scathing rebuttal. Rather the skeptic of feminism ought to approach the topic of sexual objectification not unlike the atheist skeptic does of Christian claims of miracles. The atheist skeptic of Christianity argues that miracles are nonsense by virtue of there being no god, rather than to argue that this particular instance was not a miracle. Were atheists to do this it would imply that miracles can occur and by the definition of a miracle in this context, that there does indeed exist some god who creates them. This is where such skeptics of feminism are lacking however, as they have no cogent and popular argument to use against the concept of sexual objectification amongst others. Worse, most skeptics accept sexual objectification as a viable concept without any evidence. They accept the premise and thus validate not necessarily the observations of the feminist but certainly their beliefs. And yet, such acceptance is not without merit.

No really.

How can I make such a claim? I can make this claim because not unlike the lack of perspective and knowledge of the underlying mechanism that is demonstrated in claims of so-called double standards, what skeptics are accepting with this notion of sexual objectification is actually quite true. Not true in how feminists argue for it, but rather in its effects. That is sexual objectification, not as described but what it actually is, is by definition dehumanizing and both feminists and their skeptics recognize it as such even if that don't recognize what it is they are actually talking about. This shadow battle goes both ways you see. It can also foster subconscious agreement. That is the nature of not understanding fully the communication between two parties. They can in ignorance agree to another unknown premise that they reference but never recognize. Allied Projection once again. But what is this unknown premise with regard to sexual objectification that is actually responsible for the dehumanizing effect? Well first we

need to explain this other realm, this venue that we subconsciously apply our reason to. Care to give a guess before the reveal?

It's language itself.

Our use of words and their relationship to each other is where ideology is allowed to manifest though as ever first fueled by the 'I am right' axiom. Consider such self-righteousness as applied to every word in your lexicon and with that the concepts behind them. This is the realm often not considered or even explored. Consider how much you take for granted in the acceptance of a single word: what it defines, what it implies, its relationship to yourself and its relationship to those who use it. Can you even engage in such evaluation without my help? I doubt many of you can and this is because we don't often explore this realm – if at all. We take almost all of it for granted similar to how ideologues take the meaning of their ideology for granted through Allied Projection. Though unlike ideology, language has a logical framework on which it operates. So even if we don't recognize it, this framework is nevertheless affecting and shaping our understanding of words and their relationship to each other. These relationships between words translates to their respective agents, events, actions, etc., in reality forming a framework for our perception and understanding of this reality.

Just the single utterance of a word, even a word for which there is no real definition, can bring with it a shared and nearly uniform understanding not of the word itself necessarily, but in how that word must exist and operate within language itself. That is, to 'know' what a word means is to know how it fits into your understanding of language.

Imagine if you will the introduction of a new word and a provided definition and all the connections your mind makes of that word and its definition to other words and their definitions in your mind. It is expansive, overwhelming, and near-endless. I imagine an infinitely branching crack radiating from the center of a sphere of ice until it changes from clear to solid white. Such is the power of a single word and this power affects all of us. Though really, this is the power of our own perception and so model of reality as communicated through language. While we may have different meanings for words, this mechanism by which we relate words to others is shared by us all and such a mechanism, this rooting of a word in our minds is what creates ideology, creates the fantastical, creates an unreality that we can nevertheless operate within. It is what creates the real from the unreal; what creates the known from the unknown. Yet there is hope because language, though again the concepts language is designed to communicate, operates on a logical framework. A framework that is consistent, demonstrable and so

provable. Though most importantly, a framework we all share in common. The universality of this framework coupled with its logical consistency allows for an irrefutable appeal to be made to every single person who employs and understands language itself. It allows for an entirely inadvertent comprehension upon whomever is exposed to it. As though you were merely reminding them of something forgotten; because you are.

“The Matrix is language.” – Stefan Molyneux.

### I Am: The Origin of Victimhood

As you are well aware, much of the theory presented in this book is predicated on the self-proclaimed victimhood experienced by ideologues. Without it and without denying the self-inflicted origin of it, my theory crumbles. Yet these core components have been largely taken for granted. I have not provided an explanation for this feeling of victimhood. I have of course provided the reason why the source ought to be denied: to preserve the axiom and in turn the self. But, and as I'm sure some of you must have protested, recognizing one instance of self-victimization isn't nearly enough to challenge one's entire identity. You are correct, which is why there is a particular source for this feeling of victimization shared uniformly by all ideologues.

Now I recognize the advantages of having revealed this from the very beginning but doubtless any of you would have countenanced the true origin without all the prior knowledge you've accrued thus far. To consider this sense of victimhood a mere emotional dysfunction is far easier, and relatable, than what I will propose. In calling it a mind-virus and other terms of which I provided little to no explanation nor example, I was in fact manipulating the phenomenon of Allied Projection to my own benefit. What it meant, even its source I left to your discretion and interpretation and you filled in those gaps to your own satisfaction – without realizing it – and in so doing it probably reinforced your own assumptions in some way. That is, it made reference to some observation of emotional dysfunction or something else you believe you are right about without sufficient evidence. If that's the case it's why you failed to recognize that gap until I pointed it out.

So what am I proposing as the true and shared source for this sense of victimization? Well what I am proposing has larger implications beyond even my critique of ideology. Indeed, what I am proposing

speaks to the very nature of identity itself or rather how identity is defined. So what is the source of this sense of victimization?

Axiomatic identity itself. 'I am' by virtue of no standard for determining one's identity transforms one into a victim or rather first and foremost denies them their personal agency. That is the source of their perceived victimhood. To hold to an axiomatic identity is the act of making one's self a victim. But how? How on earth does an axiomatic identity translate to victimhood? To answer this we must revisit what it means to be an agent:

Agent:

- 1) A person or thing that acts or has the power to act.
- 2) A person or thing that causes something to happen.
- 3) A person who acts or exerts power.

An agent is thus defined by the ability to act. Indeed, the ability to act is itself the standard by which agency is determined. It is what separates a rolling boulder from the one that pushes it. Yet this standard for agency extends to other matters of identity and I dare say you already understand this. That is, one is defined not by their self-proclaimed, self-assumed characteristics but rather by their actions. One can claim for themselves the identity of 'honest' but in having lied prior, this claim is debunked and further compounded by the very fact that such a claim is itself a lie. One can claim to be non-violent, but is immediately debunked by the aggressive actions they take against others. These determinations of one's identity, better understood here as their character, are certainly well known to us. The identities of honest, liar, violent, etc., are themselves descriptors of behavior. Such behavior-based identification exists for specific behaviors too or rather roles as we've come to understand them. Identities such as worker, healer, reader, leader, even for occupations like plumber, doctor, electrician, and so on. Granted we may not have a full understanding of these terms and they suffer from some Allied Projection, but there nevertheless exists the standard of behavior that must be met in order to satisfy them: a leader must lead, a reader must read, a healer must heal, and so on. What one means by lead or read or heal varies from person to person, but a leader must satisfy one's definition for leading and a healer must satisfy one's definition for healing and so on. One's definition for an exercise of agency, of some action, cannot be separated from those whom they would label as taking said action. In other words, the standard for describing an agent by their action remains regardless of the definition of

the action itself. This uniformity demonstrates that we absolutely understand that identity is defined by actions; save for one aspect. That is, identification as a methodology allows for certain innate, non-behavioral characteristics by which one can be identified. As such these characteristics do apply themselves to human identity distinct from any behavioral standard. These are characteristics such as male, female, age, race, relation, etc. On their own these terms are innocuous and informative and claims regarding them are easily demonstrated one way or the other. For example, a male can claim to be a female but an examination of his genitals and, if further investigation is required, his chromosomes will prove otherwise. As such these terms bring with them no greater meaning than what they singularly describe. That is, they don't describe or imply any behaviors that are then attributable to the agent. So while they describe an agent, they do not describe an exercise of agency. They do not describe the core characteristic that defines them as an agent. So for example, the characteristic of 'Asian' says nothing whatsoever about the agent's honesty or their penchant for violence. As you know, to believe anything to the contrary is the ideology of racism. This attempt to equate these two means for human identification, the innate with the behavioral, creates one's perceived sense of victimhood. Again, how?

First a subjective identity is presented as objective, as standardized yet without any actual standard or means to demonstrate it. I've dubbed this an undentity. This undentity, by virtue of being assumed, is claimed as an innate characteristic rather than a behavioral one. For example, consider the identity of Muslim as something innate, not unlike one's race, rather than a belief system with a corresponding behavioral standard. There is only belief that one is Muslim rather than meeting any criteria that would then lead one to believe they are Muslim. Putting the cart before the horse yet again, in essence it is axiomatic. In reality, it is a label without any attributable behaviors or reference to any innate characteristic. It is 'make believe', fantasy, a word without meaning, unreality by any other name. In order to maintain that this undentity is innate and not the result of behavior, any behavior as a source for this undentity must itself be denied. Such people, ideologues, cannot define this undentity through behavior as such behavior is sure to be shared amongst many. Of those many there are those who will reject the undentity and who will be similarly rejected as sharing the undentity by others who accept it. The quintessential example is the difference between the identity of 'feminist' and the behavioral standard that is falsely attributed to feminism: advocating for women's rights. You see it everywhere with feminists denouncing the efforts of non-feminists to defend and secure more rights for women, even amongst their own ranks of feminists, and with non-feminists similarly denouncing feminists for not adhering to their standard for behavior and thus not being 'true feminists'. See, to introduce a behavioral standard for an undentity near-instantly creates schism. As we know an act of affirmation is

necessarily an act of defining. Without the ambiguity afforded through ideological language, behavioral standards always initiate schism. This is the problem with introducing the subjective as objective, the perceptual as the demonstrable. Varying personal interpretations as well as judgement by an objective standard is quick to destroy an undentity unless, of course, the subjective can mask itself in ambiguity; in language. At best such axiomatic, subjective identities, these undentities, can only be considered an amalgamation of standardized behaviors; as an umbrella term. Though even then they lose their innate and so axiomatic existence given they are based on some standardized behavior. Regardless this does allow for any number of umbrella terms to exist given the infinite number of possible combinations of human behavior. Suffice it to say, if you maintain a specific set of behaviors, you can earn yourself an umbrella term that encompasses them. Of course such umbrella terms are easily and often rejected as unnecessary complications as the purpose for their creation is entirely subjective. Certainly one can accept an umbrella term as a means of simplifying their communication in some respect, but such acceptance is hardly necessary and again not always rational. For example, the umbrella term 'man' refers to a male human. The umbrella term 'fireman' refers to a male, human, firefighter. Yet the supposed umbrella term 'feminist' hardly refers to an egalitarian focused solely on women. The previously Dawkins' endorsed umbrella term 'bright' could refer to a person with a naturalistic and so atheistic worldview, but was mostly rejected; though not as an unnecessary complication but as something quite condescending. As stated the use of a term is entirely subjective; an act of choice and one that accords with one's own model of reality. But whatever their model of reality and whatever their definition of a term, it operates within the logical framework afforded by language. So that said, what is the logical consequence not necessarily of breaking this framework but attempting to alter it? In becoming ideological? The consequence is losing or rather denying one's agency insofar as they maintain an identity that doesn't describe their exercise of agency.

In having to deny behavior as the standard for determining an identity, an undentity necessarily requires a non-agent to which it can be applied to by definition. That is, absolutely no behaviors can be used to determine the undentity. So all behaviors of such an ideologue and the choices prior to them are thus described as reactive rather than active. That they are the result of some other agent forcing their choice or otherwise coercing their chosen behavior. Now you may consider limited agency to allow for the creation of some innate quality to fill the void left from such limitation, but you'd be wrong or at least you'd be wrong eventually. See, a perception of limited agency is typically how the innate undentity begins. But in time objectivity creep, reason essentially, reveals that such non-agency must expand itself in order to continue to deny other behaviors that could form the identity. See, eventually

the objective analysis of just one of their behaviors of which they will claim total responsibility for – total agency – will demonstrate that they have agency with regard to all subsequent behaviors and will thus demonstrate that their agency was total rather than in any way limited.

Example of Innate Identity: An Adult Not Responsible for Their Poverty

Ideologue: “I am not responsible for being poor at 40 years of age.”

Skeptic: “Did you get a job and work?”

Ideologue: “No, because my education was worthless.”

Skeptic: “Why was it worthless?”

Ideologue: “There were no jobs requiring that field of study in my country.”

Skeptic: “Did you research the viability of your education for employment and in other countries?”

Ideologue: “No, I didn’t.”

Skeptic: “Well then it’s your responsibility.”

Ideologue: “I didn’t know I could get an education in something that was useless in my country!”

Skeptic: “So you assumed that all education would be fruitful when as a rule that simply can’t be true?”

Ideologue: “But I trusted that the government wouldn’t teach me something useless!”

Skeptic: “Then that assumption is your responsibility and with that, so too is everything else including your poverty.”

Ideologue: “Shut up!”

This isn’t unreasonable granted the breadth of possibility that is choice and this conversation can continue until, as I said, the ideologue claims responsibility for just one of their actions. Consider that for whatever ‘reason’ one gives as to why they lack agency or choice in one area and especially their understanding of this limitation, another layer of explanation is required as to why one lacks agency,

why one lacks power to effect an action, with regard to that explanation and so on. It is the 'present from the grandfather' scenario all over again. It is the infinite regress of the Reverse Butterfly Effect. A cause and effect chain that, realistic or fantastic, can be used to deny one's responsibility. Layer upon layer of explanation is always required in order to deny one's agency; always trending toward but never reaching total personal agency so long as the ideologue *refuses to admit to it*, to take responsibility. Again we see denial as a matter of conviction. Never admitting that one is wrong and always insisting otherwise. Granted the identity of 'An Adult Not Responsible for Their Poverty', while a prevalent identity, isn't identified as such. That is, it's not nearly as well identified an identity as 'black' or 'Christian'. We'll be visiting more common identities shortly.

So while the denial of the behavioral standard for identity explains the non-agency, what accounts for the victimhood? Well it's easy enough to understand that should you never consider yourself the impetus, the progenitor, indeed the cause of every effect in your life, that everything you do is not an action but a reaction, then even your choices and indeed much if not all of who you are is an effect of another's influence. You're essentially an object at that point though you are paradoxically self-aware of the fact that you lack choice, that you lack agency, and so ascribe even your own choices to some other agent. You have defined yourself as forever reactive rather than active making your choices not a cause for your behaviors, but an effect of another's behaviors who are themselves the cause of yours. You have become the rolling boulder rather than the one who pushed it.

As always, a cause is necessary to explaining an effect and in the case of identity behavioral standards are this requirement. Without the existence of some innate characteristic that could determine their identity, the only way ideologues can define themselves is via the behavioral standard; lest they attempt to attribute behavioral criteria to categorizations like race and sex and so discriminate by their own definition. So in having denied their own agency this leaves only one source to which the behavioral standard for identity can be applied: the 'other'. In essence, the behavior of the 'other' becomes the standard by which the ideologue define themselves. Therefore to claim for one's self a subjective, falsely innate identity, an undentity, an axiomatic identity, necessarily requires one to define themselves by the actions of others all the while denying their own choices as the impetus for their behaviors. Their identity becomes wholly shaped by the 'other'. Now this 'other' can be anything from a particular person to demographic of people to absolute nonsensical attributions of agency to things such as culture and the Devil. Hence the victim is well and truly borne of the first part of the axiom, the 'I am', because in this case 'I am' has with it the corollary of 'because you are' or better understood as 'because

you do as I cannot'. Perhaps the best way to understand this entire phenomenon of projecting one's agency onto another is that the only place to mask one's own agency is within another agent. That is, a rock can't choose for you and neither can a tree or a cold winter. But an agent always can, even if it's a mystical demon or a god. Hence one must attribute their agency to another agent and in so doing can then blame that agent for the circumstance that one has actually created for oneself. And they do. They all do. This necessity to blame another agent for your own exercise of agency and to foist upon them the behavioral criteria for your identity are due to the logical framework behind these terms extending into our language. Consider that even within this realm of unreality created by the ideologue, these rules still apply. Any excuse could be used, indeed any and all excuses are used, but only if they accord with the rules of both identity and agency. So while the ideologue is most certainly irrational and unreasonable, they are not illogical.

So naturally with ideologues defining themselves by the behaviors of whom they consider to be the 'other' they attempt to guide, control, even to force that behavior into something that creates the identity these ideologues desire for themselves. Normally one would shape their own behavior to satisfy the behavioral standard for the identity they wish from themselves, but since ideologues define themselves through the actions of others, they attempt to control *the actions of the 'other'* in order to create their perceived undentity. As with all ideologies objectivity creep continues to challenge their layers of explanation, in this case their claims of non-agency. So their excuses, their ex post facto justifications must grow accordingly which then expands their behavioral commandments on the other. As a means of ex post facto justification in and of itself, this process of controlling the 'other' is an effort to create the perceived innateness of an ideologue's identity; by virtue of it 'existing' through no personal criteria but nevertheless observable in its being acted upon by the 'other'. In other words, it exists because it is targeted, because it is acted upon. Yet this process is also to maintain the undentity as something that pleases ideologues. They want the way the 'other' defines the undentity, or rather the way the ideologue perceives the 'other' as defining the undentity through their actions, to be something the ideologue desires. This is why this process exists in perpetuity with ever growing complaints against, restrictions on, and even encouragement of the behaviors of the 'other'. For every change in our own behavior that we would make in an effort to 'better' ourselves or at least to change according to some purpose we seek to achieve, the ideologue must manifest such changes through the 'other' rather than themselves. So for example, rather than being kind and receiving the desired response from others, the ideologue insists that the 'other' treat them as though they were kind. The greater the extent to which this is done in contrast to how the ideologue actually behaves the more the

ideologue believes 'kindness' to be an innate trait. As something entirely non-behavioral on their part as no such criteria can be used to explain why the 'other' treats them as kind. In essence, the more the ideologue isn't kind but nevertheless treated as though they were cements all the more how they, or rather how their undentity is inherently kind or includes kindness as part of an umbrella term. Interestingly, the more they behave kindly and are treated as such the less validated they become; perceiving such validation by the 'other' as something earned, as something paid for through their behaviors, and thus not inherent to them and their undentity. The dichotomy provided by one's identification as either an agent or non-agent, along with the criteria necessary to determine agency, has allowed for yet another inversion of reality to manifest.

So in summary, with the behavior of the 'other' supplying the necessary observable *effect* for the *cause* that is the undentity, ideologues use this warped perspective to claim that their undentity is entirely innate and so real. The *effect* it has on the 'other' is observable and determinable via the behavioral standard as presented through the actions of this 'other'. Call it tribal proof. A form of social substantiation. It is validation. Yet consider for all this belief in innate identity, in this 'I am', is the undentity itself the impetus for the ideologue's beliefs about it or is the undentity just an ex post facto justification for what is an expression of the axiom? That is to say, are these undentities only used to mask the axiom in matters of personal identity? Well yes. Any proclamation of undentity is a proclamation of self-righteousness. Again, literally *self*-righteousness. The undentity just represents a shifting of the goalpost.

So whence cometh victimhood? Simple really. If your undentity is entirely an effect of the actions of the 'other', to whatever extent you claim this undentity you foist the responsibility for your actions and thus the experiences you have created through these actions onto this 'other'. Given that you've relinquished any responsibility for your having created your experiences to the 'other', should any experiences not be to your liking you adopt a position of victimhood by virtue of your involvement in what is, by this warped perspective, a non-consensual experience. You created it by virtue of your own actions, but you perceive yourself as the victim of it and with that the 'other' the perpetrator. Given this dynamic, is it any wonder feminist ideologues in particular are so obsessed with consent? To them every experience isn't their responsibility but that of the 'other' and therefore subject to matters of personal consent.

Consider the plentiful interest and concern you have for yourself both in your choices and actions, but ignore yourself and project it onto all others. This is what feminists have done. Ergo feminists cannot help but meddle in everyone's affairs down to the smallest details. Details typically preserved for

matters of self-reflection and scrutiny such as how one presents their hair, walks down the street or indeed, sits on public transit. Consider also how such an application of consent to all of what one experiences, to what is essentially reality itself and one crafted by their own hand no less, would have one appear absurdly juvenile. It is juvenile for the exact reason that juvenility is marked by one's underdeveloped understanding of cause and effect, an ignorance of their individual power and scope to affect reality, and so finally of their unmatured sense of personal responsibility. Though it must be said that in the case of feminists their immaturity is borne from denial rather than ignorance.

### Undentity: Masking Assumptions with Non Sequiturs

I presented in Chapter 1 this concept of core personal beliefs forming persons. Add to that my incredulity regarding proclamations of innate identity and my subsequent claims to that effect and it is little wonder that I dismiss claims of personal identity as a mere non sequitur; as little more than a need to rationalize the assumptions they were created to justify. Though first, let us define terms:

Non Sequitur:

- 1)** An inference that does not follow from the premises; *specifically*: a fallacy resulting from a simple conversion of a universal affirmative proposition or from the transposition of a condition and its consequent.
- 2)** A statement (as a response) that does not follow logically from or is not clearly related to anything previously said.

This can be something as obvious as: 'I have red hair, therefore gravity accelerates an object toward the earth at  $9.8 \text{ m/s}^2$  or something less obvious as we'll explore. Given that undentities are merely a communication, really a reiteration, of 'I am right' just expressed as an identity, they are prone to and indeed are always expressed as a non sequitur. For example, 'I am Muslim, therefore I am moral, righteous, good, kind, and justified in my actions as a Muslim.' Naturally the leap in logic is that such characteristics, insofar as we define Muslim, aren't at all necessary to the identity. The typical retort offered by skeptics is, 'Just because you're Muslim doesn't mean you possess those other characteristics.' This was a trap and a failure of the skeptic to understand the nature of the ideologue's

communication. Through his retort the skeptic admits to the 'truth' that the ideologue is Muslim. With 'Muslim' merely a placeholder for the ideologue's self-righteousness, the core premise has been agreed with and validated by the skeptic. That is, the premise that the ideologue is indeed a Muslim and entirely right. From this point onward any argumentation provided by the skeptic is interpreted only as their misunderstanding of Islam and so what it means to be a Muslim. The Ideologue believes the skeptic has rightly identified the ideologue as Muslim, but has failed either through ignorance or arrogance to successfully understand exactly what a Muslim is and thus what exactly the skeptic has observed. Without having the core of their undentity and thus self-righteousness challenged, the ideologue is free to attempt to convince the skeptic as to what a Muslim is rather than to prove that they have met the particular criteria necessary to be a Muslim. So the skeptic directs his effort toward addressing the non sequitur when it was always designed, consciously or not, to mask the core assumption it represents and the true non sequitur. Namely that one is 'Muslim' by virtue of no criteria other than one's proclamation. What the skeptic should do is to attack the core premise first and foremost whilst ignoring the temptation of debunking the non sequitur. The non sequitur itself doesn't provide any universal and so demonstrable standards by which the ideologue can be judged. Moral, righteous, good, kind, and justified are all matters of perception and entirely subjective. The skeptic should instead attempt to coax an affirmation from the ideologue as to what they believe constitutes a Muslim. Ensuring that such affirmation is done in definitive, tangible, or otherwise demonstrable terms courts schism from fellow ideologues and with that threatens the core belief structure of Islam and any ideology: Allied Projection. Remember Islam is a superficial manifestation of the true ideology and addressing it is entirely pointless. The core belief system, that of personal self-righteousness and the projection and so attribution of your beliefs to others within the collective, is what the skeptic must target.

Tautology of Undentity: I'm Right Because I'm Right

Undentity itself is ex post facto justification for belief forming a tautology. It is a restating of your beliefs though really your own self as some other label and one that may be ambiguous enough to court Allied Projection and thus a mutual acceptance of each other's selves. Put simply, 'what you are is what you are'. While true note that this is entirely non-criterial and immediately circular. Instead we recognize

that any such claims of identity require behavioral criteria or some categorical or innate characteristic. So instead you are not what you are but always and forever what you do. Who you are doesn't determine what you do. What you do determines who you are.

### Linking Agency with Identity: Whosits and Whatsits Galore

Speaking of the innate and so categorical aspect of identity, what you are does not translate to any doing, to any exercise of agency while even the use of the word 'who' is necessarily the identification of agency and an agency apart from another i.e. the identification of an agent. Thus 'who' is defined by who it is not, rather than who it is. Establishing a distinction between two exercises of agency is integral to establishing the existence of an agent; one separate from another. That's all 'who' is. The observation of a distinction and with that, another agent. Call it 'him and him' or 'that guy and this guy'. But what is the nature of this agent? How would we identify and so define him? Well this distinction takes the form of what was done by him, ergo every 'who' is not only defined by what they do but established entirely by what they do. We couldn't distinguish one agent from another were this not the case. So 'who' remains forever undefinable on its own since no 'what' can ever be objectively attributed to it. This would be putting the cart before the horse. This would allow us to attribute any and all 'whats' to any 'who', even 'whats' that entirely contradict each other. Consider the impossibility of both the omnipotence and omniscience of god. All powerful yet unable to alter his actions in the future, given any such alterations would contradict his perfect knowledge of the future granted by his omniscience. As such this is a form of Allied Projection wherein whatever a term means, necessarily a 'who', is whatever we want it to mean rather than representing some particular exercise of agency. Consider further a recitation of all the names, all the 'who's' you know, and how that establishes nothing apart from their distinction from one another. Their names say nothing whatsoever of their identity.

In reality, a 'who' can be identified as an individual according to what it does as such actions are themselves objectively demonstrable. Such actions are better understood as effects. Thus 'who' only characterizes the ability to effect, understood as agency, and a particular 'who' is the one who created a particular effect, exercised their agency to create a particular result, understood as their identity. Perhaps this seems convoluted, but this linking of 'who' with 'what', or rather the establishing of a 'who' from a 'what', is how we determine identity. In essence, 'who' merely describes agency which is

something we all possess. The 'what's' that were done are the effect of our respective exercises of our agency. This is better understood as our responsibility. Responsibility represents our understanding of the need to distinguish and so establish an agent by their exercise of agency. From here we label their responsibility, or rather what they are responsible for, as some identity be it healer, leader, killer, soldier, etc. For this reason, as we will explore in the next chapter, matters of responsibility are entirely a black and white issue. They describe only what you effected which is, in truth, any of what you've experienced.

Now, ideologues conflate 'what' with 'who' and attempt to define what they are by who they aren't and who they are by what they aren't. Let's use feminism as an example. Feminists define what they are according to another's agency which is the root of their perceived victimhood. So they define themselves as women through men's actions. They also define their own agency according to what they are not. So they define feminine behaviors as everything that isn't masculine or done by men. Yet in defining their agency according to what they are not, they can only restrict that agency and trend towards complete non-agency. In essence, to adopt only the effects that no other agent creates is an impossibility. What does a feminist do that a man does not do? Nothing. What does a feminist do that an egalitarian does not do? Nothing. This is the impetus of the debate within feminism regarding what constitutes a 'good feminist' or 'proper feminist action'. There isn't one and cannot be one by definition. So feminists continuously restrict their agency, their effects, their behaviors, all as a means of distinguishing themselves from the 'other' in the vain attempt to eliminate any shared behaviors between them and said 'other'. Remember, a 'who' not defined through what it does can only distinguish itself through who it is not. As more and more behaviors are considered unessential and even antithetical to being a feminist, more and more restrictions will be placed on what can be done by a feminist and even what one can attribute to it. This is the root of the seemingly paradoxical puritanical shift in feminism. It is always and forever restrictive rather than liberating. The only 'liberation' they can offer is the 'freeing' of one from their own sense of agency. All in all, it is the attempt to define agency, the criteria for establishing individuality and personhood, not by what one does but by what one is and what is done to one. It is the attempt to define an agent by everything that is not agency. In other words, to be a feminist or an ideologue or to possess an undentity of any sort is to make one an object or an effect of some other agent, not an agent in and of themselves.

Any identity, subjective or not, must adhere to the rules established by the logical framework of the language used to present it. So to put it simply:

You don't do [X] because you are a feminist. Rather in having done [X] you are a feminist.

You don't do [X] because you are a Christian. Rather in having done [X] you are a Christian.

You don't do [X] because you are a progressive. Rather in having done [X] you are a progressive.

What you are does not control what you do. What you do controls what you are. That is the truth regarding agency and the objective identification of identity. As ever choice remains. One may choose to be any identity they wish so long as it isn't something innate, but they must choose to adhere to the behaviors that constitute the identity, not merely proclaim the identity as the only necessary criterion for establishing it.

So now that we know what an undentity is, what is an example of one? Well I had considered presenting 'feminist' as an undentity which it certainly is because it defies objective definition, but as an identified ideology rather than as an innate characteristic such an observation is hardly revelatory. Plus 'feminist' is itself one of the layers of excuse used to explain away and so deny the agency of those comprising another undentity; one you certainly take for granted.

I speak of course of woman.

## Feminism: The Feminine Identity Crisis

Female:

- 1) Of or denoting the sex that can bear offspring or produce eggs, distinguished biologically by the production of gametes (ova) that can be fertilized by male gametes.

Such an identity exists and by virtue of what? Objective *identification*. That is, an objective process by which one determines the nature of something. A *methodology* used to determine truth. Now to address woman. Define it yourself reader. Define woman objectively. What is a woman? No not a female, I mean a woman. 'Female human' is the objective definition and it describes an amalgamation of two innate characteristics to whom no greater meaning can be attributed. It is itself an umbrella term. Therefore 'woman' has no objective meaning outside of these two characteristics. Yet I imagine a host of you, especially the women, aren't at all satisfied with this definition and would protest with appeals

to some unknown quality or standard I am unaware of. That is, you wish to claim that being a woman is 'so much more than that'. Let us entertain such protest. What is this 'so much more'? Does it make a woman a *real woman*? A *true woman*? Even a *good woman*? What is this proper determinant for the 'true woman' and what is the resulting definition of woman that is informed by it? Also, would other women disagree with you? If so, how? Are they all delusional? Misinformed? How have you been bestowed with the knowledge that truly defines womanhood? Perhaps with all matters of tribalism, with all matters of mere affiliation, with all matters of one's self and the 'other' and so with all matters of *ideology*, you can only tell me what it is not, rather than what it is? That you can only tell me *who it is not* rather than *who it is*?

It is as if 'woman' is beyond any definition; as though it is impossible to properly *represent*. That is the truth of the matter dear reader. What this label 'woman' means isn't just prone to subjective interpretation, it is wholly and absolutely ambiguous. It means nothing other than 'female human' and any of what it could mean, to you and to everyone else, is a matter of personal projection. Every time you use this undentity you evoke the very Allied Projection that binds together ideologues of all sorts. The behavior is the same. See, so much of what is at the core of ideology, indeed where ideology is able to flourish is in the ambiguity of our language.

Consider for a moment what would happen if every word and concept described therein became wholly subject to personal interpretation and thus Allied Projection. We'd lose all sense of reality. Nothing would be true. We'd have no standard for reality and objectivity as a methodology would cease to exist. We'd be wholly unable to effectively and earnestly communicate with each other. All knowledge, with no way to substantiate it, could best be said to be delusion. All beliefs would essentially become ideologies and *that* is the root of it all. Ideology is merely a symptom of language: borne from the trait of language as a mere interpretation of reality rather than a direct communication of it. See, feminism doesn't exist without the undentity of woman. Judaism doesn't exist without the undentity of 'god's chosen', the Jew. Nazism doesn't exist without the undentity of several but in particular, Aryan. Furthermore, all that these undentities can do is to demonstrate a group affiliation apart from others. That is to say, they define themselves by what other undentities they are not. Can we really define what an Aryan is? No, but we can certainly tell you that they aren't Jewish. Can we really define what a man or better a 'real man' is? No, but we can certainly tell you that they're not women. This practice of using a undentity to describe itself as separate from another undentity is the dabbling ducks all over again but extending into identity. Such is the reason why 'proper' or 'good' or 'acceptable' representation of these

undentities is impossible. They have no objective definition. They have no standard by which they can be identified. Indeed, such undentities possess no innate characteristic that could distinguish themselves objectively from any other. This makes representation itself, at least when used this way, yet another nonsensical term: used in an attempt to create a standard for which there cannot be one. This is why there can be no satisfactory representation of any undentity in art, media, in any form of communication. You simply cannot represent that which lacks definition. Furthermore, the very act of decrying any 'representation' of a undentity as objectively bad is itself an admission of one's failure to adhere to one's own standard of 'proper' representation in the first place. How so?

### Painting Zero: Representing Undentities

Consider the representation of women. When a feminist decries the representation of women through say, some female character in a video game, she is first and foremost and *only* identifying that character by their sex. See, were the feminist to identify women by her own definition of 'true woman' or 'proper woman' etc., she wouldn't have seen the female character as a 'true woman' being misrepresented, but instead as just some female. Hence the very act of interpreting a female character that is, by the feminist's own definition, not a 'true woman' nevertheless as a 'true woman' who is being misrepresented, the feminist reveals that she does not judge women according to her own personal definition but by mere biology. The very thing they are so apt to decry and deny as sufficient to define a 'woman'. Such behavior is almost as crazy as viewing a film with a roofer in it and protesting that roofer as a poor representation of a plumber. Similarly she is masking her assumption, that which constitutes a 'woman', in a non sequitur. The only reason we don't believe the former is as mad is because of the obvious behavioral standard that applies to both roofing and plumbing and furthermore the standard of how these behaviors, these actions, relate to their respective agents in the form of roofer and plumber respectively. A roofer roofs. A plumber plumbs. A role is a role. In reality however, the feminist isn't nearly as mad but rather exercising an ex post facto justification for her true goal. That is, what she is actually insisting upon is that all *females* meet her standard for representing 'women'. She is imposing her beliefs on others rather than others imposing their beliefs onto her which is how she frames it. She doesn't actually see a mere female as a misrepresented 'woman' or better a roofer as a misrepresented plumber. She is just making an appeal to the non-existent standard for what defines a 'real woman'

without realizing the irrationality of the appeal in the first place. In essence, nothing is a 'woman' to her and can be a 'woman' to her save for those who would self-proclaim it. Any representation of a woman is to her an act of affirmation, of affirming and so defining what a 'woman' is. But since 'woman' to a feminist isn't just something borne of her own projection but nothing at all, any affirmation of 'woman' results in schism. It is worth noting and as with the case of race, ascribing some extra quality or behavior to one's sex is a similar form of bigotry. It is sexism by any other name making those who engage in this behavior, and feminists en masse, sexists by definition. Every instance of decried 'misrepresentation of women' is a demonstration of feminists' own sexism though not by imposing some standard onto how women are presented. This is mere authoritarianism. Rather in claiming that women can be misrepresented they imply that particular characteristics cannot be used to define a woman and so establish restrictions on women's exercise of agency through their self-presentation.

Having now explored this realm of language and especially of how our minds create meaning for said words, taken as true it effectively makes every single ideology on the planet, indeed ideological belief itself, the belief in an undentity. Furthermore this need for validation that ideologues uniformly share, be it a perpetual need or with an ultimate end-goal, is the attempt to discover or to create or to in some way socially substantiate this identity. It is the attempt to make the identity itself innate. That is, to take it out of the realm of anti-objectivity that is presumption without any discernible criteria and inject it into the realm of objective existence. It is the attempt to transform the assumption into physics. To make it not an assumed truth but a fundamental reality. To transform the axiom into an absolute and inescapable truth. I will say it again:

'A belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.'

Even if that belief is one's own undentity and the ambiguous label they use to describe it. In fact, especially if that belief is an undentity.

So what does that make of feminism? What is it really? Feminism dear reader, is the final culmination of the long overdue feminine identity crisis. It is the behavior borne from the attempt to substantiate the undentity of woman as something apart from biological characteristics and especially, if not most importantly, as something innate regardless. Hence we would understand the assumption that defines all of feminism, subsequent to the 'I am right' axiom, as: "Woman, apart from any criteria, exists." But

because feminists certainly don't recognize their denial and subsequent anti-objectivity, their assumption is as follows:

"I am woman."

### Sexual Objectification: A Self-Inflicted Dehumanization

Given what we know understand is the impossibility of a proper or 'good' representation of a woman, what does the representation of a woman mean to a feminist? 'Representation of Women' as a term, not in practice, is a form of affirmation absolutely in line with its religious counterparts. It is a declaration that such a thing objectively exists, that 'woman' exists, and those who rally around anyone who affirms this, either in collectively decrying the crime of 'misrepresenting women' or rallying around yet another feminists' *attempt* to properly represent women, is merely reaffirming the assumption. Keeping within the religious context, what does this make of one who would dare misrepresent women? It makes them a heretic as misrepresentation is heresy. It is to take divine truth, gospel, and speak against it or twist it to some evil purpose. Furthermore, what happens to the hapless feminist who reveals their attempt at properly representing, that is properly *defining*, women? They are condemned and ostracized at worst and shown how 'mistaken' they are at best and asked to 'repent their sins' as it were in the form of relinquishing and denouncing their own definition of what a 'true woman' is. Of course, given that this definition is inextricably tied to their own identity as either an embodiment of themselves or some paragon, what they are truly being asked and to 'repent of' is their own identity. Amazingly they do so. Just like the Muslim whose behavior can be shaped by other ideologues as a means of reaffirming his identity as a Muslim, so too can a feminist's behavior be shaped to reaffirm and strengthen their identity as a feminist. Yet such reaffirmation is not without cost. The cost is one's personal identity, their individuality, and a slow amalgamation of one's identity into a hivemind. More on that shortly. Always remember that it is this sort of attempt at affirmation that leads to schism. What ideologues believe can never be properly defined but spoken of in at best vague appeals with interpretable meaning. So what does this make of sexual objectification and why, as I stated earlier, are feminists and skeptics alike correct when they label it dehumanizing?

Sexual Objectification:

- 1) The act of treating a person as an instrument of sexual pleasure. Objectification more broadly means treating a person as a commodity or an object, without regard to their personality or dignity. Objectification is most commonly examined at the level of a society, but can also refer to the behavior of individuals.

Sex Object:

- 2) A person regarded especially exclusively as an object of sexual interest.

Naturally I could go into the impossibility of an agent viewing another agent as a non-agent, that is a human viewing another human as nothing more than a rock, an electric razor, an object, but frankly that claim is so absurd I have always refused and will continue to refuse to dignify it with a response.

Furthermore, that one would notice the body of a person before recognizing their agency is absolutely necessary. I know of no way to recognize one's agency first and then, lo and behold, a body in which that agency resides is then realized. This is absurd. To be able to do so with regards to human agency would be like a strange form of agency déjà vu. In déjà vu one remembers something before they recognize that they are cognizant of it resulting in the belief that one has seen this 'exact same thing before'. So with regard to a person, one would first recognize their agency and then become cognizant of their form. It is akin to recognizing the color of one's hair before recognizing their hair. Furthermore it must be said that I know not of any way to determine more about one's character with my eyes than I learn about their body with those same eyes. But this matter of viewing one as an object is just so much hyperbole anyway. It's meant to add weight to the notion that one is being dehumanized, that their personhood is being ignored when 'sexual objectification' occurs; so much so that their very identity as an agent isn't recognized.

Regarding this concept of sexual objectification, this notion of being a 'sex object' betrays one's ignorance of human sexuality. That is, humans by and large are attracted to agents and sex itself is an interplay between those agents. To say that one can be a 'sex object' when sex represents an interplay between agents makes the term 'sex object' a complete non sequitur. Do the people to whom this accusation of 'sexually objectifying women' is charged believe that the sex they engage in is mere masturbation? They may say so jokingly or to express their disdain of a particular person or persons', but such is hyperbole put to the same employ as feminists. The agency of their sexual partner is recognized and not denied. Were it not so, any man could not only make due but be entirely satisfied with a flashlight, a pair of silicone breast implants in his drawer, and a subscription to Pornhub. He

wouldn't even consider the act of sex with an attractive woman, without reference to any of the possible stigmas, in any way a greater experience or even desirable. So with that hyperbolic nonsense out of the way, let's focus on what sexual objectification really is and the root of the dehumanization that it actually creates.

Sexual objectification is indeed created through the eye of the beholder, but that isn't to say they are the cause of it. That is because there are always two beholders in each instance of this phenomenon. See, it's all a matter of whose eye. Whose beholder's eye creates the sexual objectification? There are those who view a woman sexually, or to put it another way recognize her sexuality, and those who recognize that the first group have done so. Since the former group is necessarily required to generate the dehumanization that is sexual objectification, they cannot help but feel responsible for it in some measure. This has allowed the concept itself to flourish near-uncontested for decades and for the blame to be misattributed to that same former group. In reality of course, the latter group is responsible for creating sexual objectification, even if it is the woman whose sexuality is being recognized. That is, she can and often does sexually objectify herself and it has everything to do with the undentity of 'woman'; in particular the conflict that arises between it and its objective definition.

See, when anyone recognizes the sexuality of women they are, in fact, identifying their sex. Whether it be a particular shape to the body or physical pose, the fact remains that the recognition of female sexuality is necessarily the identification of their sex and specifically their body. As such this recognition is predicated on the objective definition of woman as 'female human'. This is the ultimate heresy to feminists and many women alike for two reasons. The first is due to the behavioral standard of men by which these women define themselves. Since the act of recognizing female sexuality is based on the definition of a woman as a 'female human' which is intrinsically based on a female's biology and thus body, it denies said women their undentity of 'woman' apart from any criteria. Secondly those holding to an undentity shape that identity through the actions of whomever they consider the 'other'. In this case it's men. With men's behavior denying women their undentity by setting biological criteria for it, it challenges such women's axioms. Hence men's behavior must be shamed and altered in order to continue to deny the true definition of a woman. Yet all this is merely a challenge to the identity of such women. It is hardly dehumanizing. No, the dehumanization comes as an effect of women projecting their own definition of 'woman' onto their sex and what that definition holds.

Recall that every woman's definition of 'woman' outside of the objective definition is personal and descriptive of their core identity. As a part of their core identity this definition of woman is essentially

their definition of themselves, of their own self-righteousness. It is their personage, their perceived character, the entirety of, or a great part of, who they are as a person. Yet these women have misattributed this to the identity of 'woman' which is, in reality, nothing more than mere biology. So when anyone, man or woman, recognizes such a woman by her sexuality these women feel that their personage, their perceived character, that the core of their identity is being absolutely ignored – even denied. What these women interpret as 'woman' is so much of who they are as a person rather than mere biology. So when these women are recognized by their biological and so sexual distinctions they feel that their identity is being denied and so are *dehumanized*; their identity replaced by an object i.e. their body. Thus it is such women who are to blame for sexual objectification because it is they who have misattributed their character, personality, etc., to a descriptor for a physical object: the human body. Basically, it was these women who first denied their humanity by defining themselves not through their exercise of agency, the necessary criteria to defining an agent, but a biological category. They dehumanized themselves. They made themselves non-agents rather than agents by attributing their personhood to their sex rather than their exercise of agency.

So regarding such a woman, whenever a man recognizes her sexuality, her identity as a woman via her biology and not via the characteristics she projected into it, she feels her identity is being denied. Though in reality she is being disillusioned. It is being revealed to her that she had long ago dehumanized herself. In keeping with the denial and projection so common to ideological belief, she blames those who disillusioned her rather than herself. She has used her own sex to establish herself as a non-agent. She has used her sexuality to define herself as an object. She has sexually objectified herself. Hence sexual objectification is a self-inflicted phenomenon.

This is why the opposite doesn't often occur. That is, men by and large don't feel or interpret the recognition of their sexuality as dehumanizing. Men generally speaking have not projected any innate, non-criterial quality onto 'man' and so shape their identity according to the behavioral standard exclusively; by their roles. To recognize or admire a man's body is viewed as praise for yet another asset he possesses and the work he put into it. A man's body is a measure of accomplishment and even then only if he sought to accomplish something with it. To admire a man's body is to admire his deeds and, while not necessarily his motivation, certainly his ability in having achieved them. A man's body is an effect of his exercise of agency. After his sexuality is recognized a man may then display his personality or rather what is not already displayed through his sexuality. In such an exchange and indeed between either sex, no real dehumanization is occurring. The dehumanization is entirely a matter of perspective

and borne from the misattribution of such women's identity to a descriptor for their sex. Therefore when it comes to such people and feminists in particular, the mere identification of feminine sexuality is dehumanizing to them by definition.

Furthermore and as with all undentities, they can never tell you or rather never agree on what isn't sexually objectifying or dehumanizing. Put a woman in sensible business attire and you will be decried for the inclusion of a skirt. Replace the skirt with pants and you will be decried for, ironically, denying her sexuality. This lose-lose, can't-win scenario should be familiar to you by now and why countenancing the complaints of those adhering to such behavior is folly. It is the definition of one by who one is not, rather than who one is. It is nebulization. Perhaps now you understand why the dehumanization that occurs in instances of so-called 'sexual objectification' is entirely real and why feminists and skeptics alike are right in recognizing it. Though you're sure to also understand how they fail to recognize its true origin and thus who is truly responsible for it. This brings me to the concept of 'Ms. Male Character' which, by sheer popularity alone, I believe requires a rebuttal.

#### Ms. Male Character: The Fault of the Beholder

From the Feminist Frequency website:

"We've defined the Ms. Male Character Trope as: The female version of an already established or default male character. Ms. Male Characters are defined primarily by their relationship to their male counterparts via visual properties, narrative connection or occasionally through promotional materials."

Unfortunately the observations and subsequent claims in that series are, at surface level, sound. That is, there are several female characters who are essentially gender-swapped male archetypes both in behavior and in appearance. Except they are not. The issue lies solely and exclusively with the misattribution of said archetypes to males. That is, the dashing rogue, the hulking brute, the scheming villain, the aloof intellectual, nearly *all* the character archetypes you can think of are actually genderless. So, why do we view them as male? Think about it yourself and really, you know the answer.

It is the behavioral standard of identity conflicting with the undentity of woman. Just about everyone including most of you reading this attribute intrinsic value, innate quality, some distinctive characteristic

to women in lieu of any behavioral or biological standards. That is, the feminine is uniquely distinguished and defined apart from their behavior and their biology and also defined by the fact that they aren't men. We claim this as some special quality when in reality it is nothing at all. This nothing, this non-criteria by which we perceive the feminine is paradoxically a quality in and of itself. The quality of existing without reference to any criteria or any standards. The quality of being axiomatic.

Considering that character archetypes are all descriptors of not just personality traits but their associated behaviors and even motivations, character archetypes are essentially roles and roles within their particular narratives. With men exclusively defined by the behavioral standard, by their exercise of agency, essentially as the default means of establishing identity, these roles are seen as intrinsically male as they lack the distinguishing quality of the feminine. They are just roles and thus not sufficient to defining the undentity of 'woman'. The 'default setting' of male isn't because our minds are wired to grant extra precedence to masculinity but because the distinguishing feature, the special, the extra that defines the feminine isn't present in the description of mere roles. In fact, given that roles are necessarily behavioral standards this ensures that they cannot describe an undentity by definition. This again is why the feminine also defines itself as distinct from the masculine since the masculine defines itself by a behavioral standard which the feminine as an undentity cannot. Yet there is one particular role for women that is telling. The archetype of victim is most often identified as feminine. Now this could speak to wider motivations of wanting to save women or that women are worthy of saving and the corollary that men are not or that women are weak and in need of rescue. But in reality it is the loss of agency that comes with any undentity that has us immediately identify the feminine as a victim which in turn may actually fuel those motivations. Think about it. Who is defined not by their behavior but by the behavior of others? Who is defined by the actions of the 'other'? The woman. The woman is a victim of the 'other' by definition. So the trope of women as victims was borne.

What does this all make of the concept of Ms. Male Character? Well the phenomenon it describes is nothing more than the recognition that people, generally speaking, view male characters as 'Role' and view female characters as 'Role+'. This undefined quality we attribute to women forever distinguishes them from similar male characters and their roles. The fault is entirely with the observer, not the author of such characters. So when we observe a character archetype we observe it through its behavior, its role, and since we've granted special quality to 'woman' that role is always seen as the default, as a male. Hence when a woman is seen to fill that role she is observed as 'default plus woman' or 'Role+' or

finally 'Ms. Male Character'. It is we who simply cannot view a female character as defined solely by her archetype without reference to her special quality as a woman.

Yet there are exceptions of course. These exceptions come in the form of characters whose sex remains hidden long enough for their role to nevertheless define them despite their revealed femininity. Samus Aran immediately comes to mind as the quintessential exemplar. A video game character whose sex was never revealed and either assumed – or not – that she was male or even a robot. This allowed the character to become defined solely by her role as, in her case, an intergalactic bounty hunter. Feminists claim that people were tricked by the reveal of her sex at the end of the game and they are correct. Though predictably they erroneously attribute this to a trickery of men's assumptions of women's inability to fill such a role. Instead the trick was to fully define the character by behavior, by the default, without revealing her sex until after her role had been firmly established. What the character of Samus Aran had done was not to challenge our assumptions of women but to instead challenge our misattribution of the default to men and of some intrinsic distinction to women.

This led to a respect for the character in the video game community which was eventually devastated. Samus' character was further 'explored' in a game known as 'Metroid: Other M' by focusing on her femininity and worse, using that very femininity to devalue her ability as a bounty hunter, as her role. Naturally the feminists again accused those who decried this bastardization of Samus as misogynistic but in reality the backlash came about from the author's attempt to redefine or at least inflate the importance of Samus' femininity over her abilities. It became the first instance of a retroactive attribution of intrinsic feminine distinction onto a female character who had managed to persist unmolested by it. Of course this created an enormous divide amongst fans and onlookers alike but for reasons no one quite understood. A divide that remains until this day, perpetuated by the fact it represents the divide that exists between those who subscribe to notions of undentity, ideologues, and those who do not, methodeologues.

This concept of Ms. Male Character, taken as wrote, has also been applied in a malicious attempt to 'right' the past 'wrongs' it is informed by. This has resulted in the gender swapping of long-time and highly developed male characters but more importantly the archetypes that they represent. Such was seen in the comic community with the gender swapping of popular and long-time male character Thor. What this does in reality is to introduce femininity itself as a quality to be added to the repertoire of the character. As such it raises 'feminine' up to parity with values and principles such as justice that the character represents though worse, it presents femininity without ever defining it. The only definition

provided is the maintenance of the distinction and nothing else. The comic community recognized that femininity not only had no place as a part of the character's repertoire but also devalued the loftier concepts and ideals the character was based on. This culminated and indeed revealed its malicious motivations in a cringe-worthy moment in the comics wherein this female Thor decries a villain's disparaging of feminists.

See, gender swapping as well as race swapping has happened before but when one's race or sex is made a core part of their new identity it is recognized as not in keeping with the behavioral standard the archetype is defined by. Not only that but upholding race and sex as something as integral to merit as behavior, as treating the innate as something meritorious in and of itself, is racist and sexist respectively. Though any equating of the innate with the behavioral results in a devaluing of merit. It's like giving a science and technology based character a magic power or worse, retroactively claiming that their prowess in science and technology was due to magical talent. It defeats the purpose of the character altogether. In reality this is easily observed in sport where genetic differences have come to define excellence given similar exercise regimes and physical methodologies. There is the pull in all of us to respect more those who try hardest. Those who exemplify the behavior we admire rather than merely those who win overall.

Now the phenomenon of Ms. Male Character, hereby referred to as Role+, doesn't manifest in roles that are distinctly feminine. Roles which require or rely upon femininity. Imagine that. Roles such as mother, sister, daughter, wise-woman. Neither does it manifest in roles that are typically feminine such as runway model, porn star, nurse, prostitute, stripper, maid, care-giver, and so on. Naturally some of those aren't flattering to women's personal definition of 'woman' but such is the result of defining yourself according to your biology without regard to your behaviors. You will be defined according to your sexuality and so whatever behaviors are informed by it. Having revealed this, is there a 'Mr. Female Character'? No, men can only be seen as trying in vain to achieve Role+ status and appear rather ridiculous for it. They may act or pose or dress so-called femininely, but these men are never seen as the elusive feminine, as Role+. Instead what these men are seen to be doing is trying to attract male attention. Such behaviors aren't seen as in keeping with one's subjective definition of 'woman' but rather just attempts at being sexually attractive to men. Therefore Mr. Female Character is just perceived as gay or an act of humiliation.

Then there is the disposability of males as the default character archetype, in particular the henchman. What we have in such characters are seemingly never-ending hordes of 'bad guys' that the hero slays or

defeats in some way. Thing is, such characters aren't seen as male or rather aren't defined by their masculinity per se. Again as the default, they are merely their roles. So what would we make of a story where we reverse this and all the 'bad guys' are women? The role as disposable henchmen would be treated the same as any role when exposed to the feminine and become Role+. As such these disposable henchwomen could no longer be viewed purely by their role as disposable and thus the act of slaying them would be seen as pure, unadulterated misogyny. It would be seen as a singling out of a particular demographic and even an equating of femininity with disposability.

While particularly strong with women, this works with any demographic really. Consider a game where you kill exclusively blacks or Jews or Buddhists. Anything but 'just men', anything but the default will bring with it accusations of targeting a demographic for enacting some sort of bigoted fantasy. You would also be sure to hear cries of never-before-heard sympathy for these henchmen and especially for henchwomen as merely 'doing their job' and 'ignorant of their actions' and 'not responsible for themselves'. Essentially Role+ separates a character from their role and they become 'women' or 'black' or 'Jewish' over all other considerations. Within this context, the destruction of the Death Star of Star Wars fame would be seen as an act of horrific slaughter rather than triumph, which is rather amusing.

In the end, 'Ms. Male Character' boils down to yet another attempt to deny one's own agency. That is, the feminists who view a character as such are attempting to blame the author, the creator of the character, for their own perception of the character. Like sexual objectification the fault for this perception and thus of this phenomenon is entirely of the beholder. As yet another foray into 'offense taking' it manifests as censorship, always.

#### Denying Human Agency: The Booth-Babes Paradox

Predicated on the concept of sexual objectification, the existence of the aptly named 'booth-babe' introduces a paradox for anyone who subscribes to sexual objectification. A booth-babe is:

Booth babe:

- 1) An attractive woman hired to draw attendees of commercial exhibitions into promotional booths.

What she has come to represent is the most blatant use of the mantra 'sex sells'. She uses her sexuality to draw attention to whatever product she has been hired to help sell and it is in this exchange that we find the paradox. Should we consider such displays exploitative, whom do we consider exploited? Is it the woman who must 'objectify' herself for payment or the potential customers who are drawn in by the display? Is it not an exploitation of one's sexuality, typically men's, to use a booth-babe to draw their attention? Human sexuality isn't something that one can simply shut off so such displays necessarily prey on an aspect of men that they cannot completely control. Hence booth-babes are those *exploiting* men's inability to control it. Which is it reader? If the woman doesn't wish to put on such a display it is no more a wish for men to react to it. Men do so as a consequence of their biological sex drive, not reason. Ah you say, "But those men enjoy the display!" Often true but the same can be said of the woman who similarly enjoys her work. But I can hear the protest. The proposed myriad of employment options this woman would supposedly rather do and the declarations that booth-babery is something that one should never have to subject themselves to. As if garnering the sexual interest of men is some disgusting experience. Fundamentally these are protestations to the effect that her employment was a matter of necessity and not choice. Though in a similar fashion we can just as easily state that such men would not choose the position they are in: preferring to be somewhere else, doing something else, or having enough wealth to afford the marketed product without any need to experience such marketing to influence their purchase. Dear reader it is at this point that we find ourselves attempting to deny the choice and so the agency of either party. We are crafting an innate identity; one without agency that is forever reactive rather than active similar to 'woman' or the 'adult-not-responsible-for-their-poverty' that I presented. Whether or not either party is exploited as a victim of the other is a matter of the perceived social power of each party or the demographic they find themselves in. In essence, this paradox is fashioned by whatever narrative one subscribes to making this scenario a matter of flawed personal perception rather than an objective observation of reality.

What is really going on in such scenarios is that a woman is demonstrating her sexuality and men are responding to it. It is a shared and mutual identification of either sexes', well sex. Truly you can take any such instance of human sexuality, any scenario wherein you can objectively identify sexuality itself and through a narrative determine an exploited party. So with regard to feminism what we would normally define as sexual identification, the identification of some sexuality, feminists would define as sexual exploitation. So in very real terms what we identify as sexual feminists will identify as exploitative. To reiterate, sexual is to us what exploitation is to feminists. Sex itself is seen as an exploitative act. But to be fair the scope of this belief varies – even amongst feminists. Though I must state that those who

believe all sex is exploitative are the most consistent with their beliefs. Even if those beliefs are predicated on ideology. This brings me to the concept of 'Male Entitlement'.

### Male Entitlement: Imposing Imposition

A staple of the not-uniquely feminist denigration of men is the concept of male entitlement. Male entitlement, as a concept, claims that men feel entitled to sex and otherwise favourable outcomes in their interactions with women. Now it is a wonder that such a position can be held given the proverbial hoops men are willing to jump through in order to have sex let alone please women. These actions demonstrate that hardly from entitled, men feel or rather know that they must *earn* their desired outcomes and from women themselves. Yet regardless of the empirical evidence to the contrary of this position it remains and as strong as ever. Hence this position is one of personal conviction and so likely rooted in some sort of denial. But a denial of what? Women's sexual agency, of course.

Male entitlement is yet another corollary borne from the undentity of woman. What we have here is a distinction made between men's and women's desire for sex rather than having such desires recognized as a necessary part of human experience. Regarding sex as a necessary part of human experience, naturally sex is required for the survival of the species but that isn't to say it is a right or an entitlement. Rather we understand that sex is something earned by virtue of meeting one's standards and criteria for engaging in it; whatever those standards may be. In other words people will choose to have sex with you based on their own preferences and you will respond in kind according to preferences of your own. Sex is a choice and a value judgement like any other. Yet with women's agency being denied and defined through men's behavior, 'women' have no power to make this choice. Only the men do. Hence whenever a man expresses his desire for sex his desire is viewed as a declaration of force, of a willingness to exploit women or at least his 'right' to do so. So to a feminist any male who expounds on his want and need for sex is necessarily communicating that, through this desire and its associated behaviors, women are for sex or are to fulfill his sexual needs. His expression of desire becomes an imputation of an obligation, an imposition, rather than a call for interested parties. Remember no female agency means no choice and so no ability to be an interested party. Recall also that these women define themselves as women through the behaviors of men. So really any expression of a desire that men have regarding women can be viewed not as a desire but as an imposition. Hence even the

claim that women ought to return kindness cannot and is not viewed as simply a sense of fairness or basic human decency but as some patriarchal attempt at controlling her reaction, her behaviors, and thus her identity as a woman. With this considered as an imposition coupled with the fact that these women define themselves by the behaviors of men, this is perceived as 'Male Entitlement'; that men feel they deserve this by virtue of being men. In reality such women are merely lamenting the reality that they've allowed men to shape their identities as women by divorcing 'woman' from any behavioral criteria.

Compounding this issue though not always present is women's denial of even their own standards regarding their sexuality. This ensures that such standards can never be understood and so dooms any potential partners from ever meeting them. These women will either never engage in sex or they will without ever knowing why and fully prepared to ex post facto justify the encounter with everything ranging from a basic animalistic urge to a lapse in judgment to heinous claims that she was actually raped; anything to deny her agency in the situation. Of course in reality she made a conscious choice and according to her own standards that she denies even exist. Whomever her partner was met the standards that she so vociferously denies she has even if such standards were born in the moment; on impulse.

#### 'Pure' Sexual Interest: Denying Biological Definition of Sex

This denigration of sexuality, the seemingly paradoxical puritanism I mentioned earlier is especially apparent in feminist talk of ulterior motives. That a man wishing to and willing to have sex with a woman is the true motive behind his interaction with them. This is often treated as the norm in American society through the character of the 'sex hungry' or 'sex starved' or otherwise exaggeratedly horny male. While this male certainly exists his shallow sexual exploits aren't as widely praised as you may think. In fact sexual conquest is hardly the measure of male success it once was. Only men desperate for validation by women or indeed other men who similarly value it consider sexual activity itself a measure of success. Typically manifesting in early adulthood and tapering off with age. Hence the culture of the 'Pickup Artist' (PUA) and their referral to themselves and other like-minded men for validation instead of the women whom they've bedded. Their merely providing the means by which this male to male validation dynamic operates. By focussing on the activity irrespective of the motivations of

the women with whom they engage, this leaves all manner of reasons why such women could have sex with these men. Plenty of which are unflattering ranging from said man being an easy lay, just some cheap dick, or even that he reminds her of her father. Truly the choice of any individual woman to have sex with a man is not and ought not be any more interesting or meritorious than her choice of meal or taste in clothes.

What such men are attempting to recreate through their so-called sexual conquest are the effects of success rather than success itself. Success, while submitting itself to subjective standards, is generally the accrument of wealth, power, and associated achievement. Success is also a key factor in establishing sexual attraction. So typically a man who had lots of sex with many different women did so because he was successful. The sex was a measure of his success in other venues not the success in and of itself. But regardless of these men, seeing sex as an ulterior motive not only denies the reality of sexual attraction but also women's relationship to their own sexuality. This is fitting when factoring in such women's sexual objectification of themselves and their avoidance of the reality of the strictly biological definition of 'woman' irrespective of what they've projected into it. To consider her own sexuality through her biology, through her physical body and the bodies of others, is seen as a form of self-erasure much in the same way any man who recognizes her sexuality is seen to have done. There is an irreconcilable separation engendered between her body and her mind with regard to her sexuality when in reality they ought to be intimately linked.

So for anyone, man or woman but especially a man to be attracted to her body first and foremost is seen to disregard her personhood and to be otherwise engaging in a baser, instinctual sexuality rather than this loftier, supposedly more personal and intimate sexuality the woman has claimed for herself. What the woman wants, by my estimation, is a man who isn't initially interested in her physically but intellectually and emotionally and personally. Then through such personal engagement a sexual attraction is born and the feminist feels satisfied that such attraction is based on her as an individual; initially irrespective of her body. Never mind that initial sexual attraction can and is certainly based on personality through observable body language. Never mind that the process of interviewing potential sexual partners i.e. dating and talking is itself a means to become *more* sexually attracted. To be perfectly honest, I can't imagine anyone but a virgin holding to this perspective as any amount of dating and sexual play should bring with it this understanding regardless of one's denial of their personal agency.

So a feminist's puritanical approach to sex, that it is a horrible motive in and of itself, not only denies the impetus of most human interaction but denies how sexual attraction is a litmus test for the likelihood of compatibility and of possible future intimacy. They essentially deny themselves the metric by which they can pick good friends and even lovers out of the myriad number of individuals they are bound to meet. Instead they wish for this unicorn of a man whose interest in them is 'pure': based solely in their personality and character, yet denying the fact that such interest is what results in sexual attraction to begin with. It would seem that if such sexual attraction is formed by the man *before* a 'proper' examination of the feminist's character, it thus becomes an ulterior motive. So to meet with a feminist's standard for 'healthy' male sexuality you can only ever be sexually attracted to her after you've sufficiently exposed yourself to and understood her personality and character. Then and only then is it okay to be sexually attracted to her. Where have we seen this before? This hatred of sexual recognition according to one's biology rather than personality and character? It's the undentity of 'woman' again.

Consent: Agreeing to React

"Consider also how such an application of consent to all of what one experiences, to what is essentially reality itself and one crafted by their own hand no less, would have one appear absurdly juvenile. It is juvenile for the exact reason that juvenility is marked by one's underdeveloped understanding of cause and effect, an ignorance of their individual power and scope to affect reality, and so finally of their unmatured sense of personal responsibility. Though it must be said that in the case of feminists their immaturity is borne from denial rather than ignorance."

You can imagine the mayhem this perspective has wrought in sexual matters. Practically speaking there can be no consensual sex with such people. They treat the concept of ongoing consent, consent that is maintained through the length of any process that affects one, without any benefit of the doubt nor any ambiguity. Should you wish to do something to a woman you must be specific, particular, and even do it in a fashion that the woman interprets you will do. Should you not you will be accused of sexual assault or even rape. Essentially there can be no miscommunication – even of the result of future events. That is to say, what the woman predicts as the result of her sexual encounter and any communication therein must be met to the letter. Whatever room for 'error' that exists is at the mercy of her convictions. This impossible standard has resulted in some institutions of 'higher learning' to issue sexual contracts that

both may sign in an effort to protect them from false accusations. Whether you interpret this as amusing or tragic it is undoubtedly absurd.

This all occurs as a result of the undentity of 'woman'. Basically the only thing she can agree to in any encounter, sexual or not, is to react to a particular action of the other party. She can't agree to act of her own accord. She can't agree to react in real-time or anything of that nature. Only the man may act and should the man act in a fashion she doesn't like it is interpreted as the man:

- 1) Defining her identity as a woman through his behaviors.
- 2) Manifesting his male entitlement.
- 3) Non-consensual sexual activity i.e. sexual assault and/or rape.

This is why such contracts were drafted and put into use. By signing the contract both parties though especially the woman consent to the act of sex at a future date and time. In essence they sign away their ability to consent or rather their ability not to consent. It's like setting a date and time wherein you may engage in a non-consensual or possibly non-consensual or at-times non-consensual activity without any of the associated feelings of victimhood and associated recourse. In a bizarre way this ensures that the woman may maintain ongoing consent by ensuring that any moments of non-consensual activity do not immediately result in the entire interaction being non-consensual. What the woman is really doing is signing away her feminist perspective, signing away her undentity through a singular act of agency and having sex not as a 'woman' with all the baggage that brings but as a contractual partner. Ideologically speaking she's not a 'woman' but a partner; necessarily an agent. She has taken for herself a role and as such can maintain her sense of agency and act without regard to how it defines her femininity or how a man's actions define hers.

When women use their status as a woman to gain some sort of advantage it has been dubbed, 'Playing the Woman Card'. Yet could any of you guessed that this card was real? That as a psychological phenomenon this status as a 'woman' could be played, relinquished, even discarded according to the needs of the user? Cut in half and thrown away like a deactivated credit card? All through something as simple as a contract. Might I just say how silly our species is? At times this language game, this mind-virus presents itself like boys playing make believe.

Billy: "Hey I blasted you!"

Timmy: “Nuh uh! I have a special force-field! It reflects your blasters back!”

Billy: “Hey that was your fault!”

Jessica: “Nuh uh! You can’t blame me as a woman, that’s sexist. Also you have male privilege so really it’s your fault.”

Victim Blaming: Attempts a Humanization

Victim Blaming as the name suggests is the ascription of blame to a victim of some crime or of any action that has affected them. As described Victim Blaming is a meritorious concept. That is I do not endorse the behavior but understand that it exists and as defined. However, the tyranny that is the *accusation of Victim Blaming* is far from keeping with that definition. The conflation of the concept of blame and responsibility has resulted in the act of counseling any means of prevention as itself an act of Victim Blaming. This is absurd since taken as a principle the counseling of children regarding any means of self-preservation would also be considered Victim Blaming. Suffice it to say there is an exception being made in specific accusations of Victim Blaming that is creating a double standard. As with any double standard the fault is ours in applying the incorrect standard to the circumstance in question so we must discern the true standard upon which such accusations operate. Though let us first clearly define the definition of responsibility that I have employed in order to demonstrate the conflation between it and blame.

Responsibility:

- 1) Answerable or accountable, as for something within one’s power, control, or management.
- 2) Involving accountability or responsibility, as in having the power to control or manage.
- 3) Chargeable with being the author, cause, or occasion of something (usually followed by for).
- 4) Having a capacity for moral decision and therefore accountable/capable of rational thought and action.

What we can see with the concept of responsibility is basically the recognition of personal agency. That is, it is a recognition of the relationship between cause and effect. What we don't see demonstrated however, is any standard for the behaviors informed by said agency. Responsibility is only the acknowledgement of one's agency without any moral or ethical or principled evaluations of their behaviors. Therefore you are responsible for everything you experience. To recognize your agency is to recognize your responsibility with regard to every circumstance you find yourself in. Even that which you had not intended or were forced into. No matter what, so long as you are an agent and you always are, you are totally responsible for yourself in that circumstance. Yes, this extends to all matter of victimization be it theft, rape, murder, etc. But what one must also consider is that in such circumstances of victimization, the victimizer is similarly totally responsible for said circumstance. See responsibility, like agency, cannot be divvied up into fractions or percentages. That is, there is no such thing as partial responsibility. Within any circumstance all the agents involved are each 100% responsible for creating the circumstance and their actions within it. Here are two definitions of Victim Blaming each conflating responsibility with blame:

Victim Blaming:

- 1) Victim Blaming occurs when the victim of a crime or any wrongful act is held entirely or partially responsible for the harm that befell them. – Wikipedia
- 2) Victim Blaming is a devaluing act that occurs when the victim(s) of a crime or an accident is held responsible — in whole or in part — for the crimes that have been committed against them. – CRCVC

Blame is distinguished from responsibility in that blame is the ascription of responsibility according to a standard for behavior. So while responsibility is a recognition of one's agency, blame is the recognition of the application of that agency according to some standard be it morality, law, principles, ethics, etc.

Blame:

- 1) To hold responsible; find fault with; censure.
- 2) To place the responsibility for (a fault, error, etc.).

The distinction is clear even in the dictionary definition. 'Fault' and 'error' necessarily invoke some standard by which one's responsibility isn't merely identified by *judged*. Therefore responsibility is

distinguished forever from blame in the same way observation is distinguished forever from conclusion. Thus I can say in total objective truth that, of a rape victim, it was her responsibility for walking through a dark alley unaccompanied at night but was nevertheless not her fault for being raped. The first part of that claim merely recognizes her agency in creating the situation and the last part makes a judgment of that exercise of her agency. In this example, that she is not at fault for being victimized. Though with 'responsibility' and 'blame' being conflated the average person let alone the ideologue would view such a claim as absolutely egregious. That I would in any way suggest, as if it is a suggestion and not a fact, that she is responsible for her circumstances makes me not only a victim blamer but, by god, a rape apologist! Such is the fate of anyone, even a police officer trained in and depressingly familiar with rape prevention and rapists themselves, who recommends any examination of the victims' behavior and cautions prevention. They become 'rape apologists' and 'victim blamers'. So great is the fervor upon which this righteous indignation is formed that it has manifested as a yearly 'Slut Walk' where women parade dressed as, well as sluts. In reality this parade is just a show of ideological solidarity, a means of social substantiation for the denial of personal agency that informs such thinking. As ever what cannot be denied logically, the truth, must find substantiation in the mob: Allied Projection. Ergo the yearly 'Slut Walk' is an act of affirmation of feminine non-agency, of the undentity of 'woman'. Any criticism or claims to the contrary are an act of affirmation in and of themselves and thus court schism and subsequent ostracism. Given that the 'Slut Walk' is specifically designed to socially substantiate 'woman' as separate from any behavioral criteria and thus descriptive of non-agency, any criticism of it strikes at the heart of 'woman' as an undentity. This is why the 'Slut Walk' is both so popular and so fervently defended and why accusations of Victim Blaming are as prevalent as they are caustic to one's social perception. To challenge it one may as well claim that 'woman' doesn't exist and that these women, these victims of rape aren't 'real women'. You can imagine the havoc this sentiment would create – yet you needn't imagine it. Subconsciously this sentiment has already been communicated or rather interpreted by ideologues many times over.

Now, why did I use rape as my example of victimization and also of Victim Blaming? It is because there is no greater instance of false accusations of Victim Blaming than in circumstances of rape. Recall that the special exception from an attributed standard creates the perception of a double standard when in reality it demonstrates that the attributed standard is a false one. As stated the concept of Victim Blaming taken as a principle eliminates altogether any merit in counselling anyone with regard to self-preservation. That is, the recognition of agency and plea to exercise it becomes an immoral act. Seem

familiar? The exception made in cases of rape and the increased prevalence of false accusations of Victim Blaming is an exception made for the victim; to deny them any responsibility, any agency with regard to themselves and their circumstance. Furthermore what have we come to understand as the root of feminist ideology? The undentity that is *woman* and the necessary *denial of its agency* in order to maintain the undentity as innate. Therefore the use of Victim Blaming in this context is beholden to the ideological belief in the undentity of 'woman' and thus the non-agency of 'women' is maintained by denying them any agency with regard to their victimization. This is the true standard by which Victim Blaming operates. Counselling matters of prevention and caution are acceptable only to those who have personal agency. Since women have no agency by virtue of their undentity, attributing agency to them is granting them a greater capacity to act than they can possess. It 'blames' them for not being agents. It tells women what they could have done or ought to have done or how they could behave in the future but without agency, such suggestions are invariably cruel. You are counselling a reactive non-agent to act as an agent, to be what they cannot. So the perceived double standard is eliminated and replaced with the true standard: that one should only be counselled in prevention should they possess personal agency.

As with forms of denial, self-fulfilling prophecy is easily and often generated as a means of erroneous personal validation. But in this circumstance this prophecy isn't relegated merely to ideologues whose perspective and actions create the very victimization they claim for themselves. No, in this circumstance though like many others it is not self-contained but instead creates the very victimization it claims for itself. This manifests in two forms and against two different though equally innocent parties respectively: those falsely accused of rape and those actually raped. As it bears repeating I will say it again clearly and concisely so that you may fully appreciate the magnitude of not just this claim but this accusation:

'Those who harbor this false notion of Victim Blaming, feminist or not, who decry any attribution of personal agency to the victim and actively seek to censor any means of prevention, are rape enablers whose only goal is to validate themselves and at the expense of past and future rape victims.'

Expanding the Beneficiaries of Rape: How Validation Transforms Prevention into Promotion

This harkens back to the consistent need for validation first introduced in chapter 2 as I alluded how this need, this addiction really, becomes especially dangerous in the presence of a dichotomy. Well in the case of victimization but in particular rape, we certainly have a dichotomy: victim and perpetrator. Of course this is only in reference to moral or lawful or principled or otherwise value judgments of behavior so it's truly informed by the dichotomy formed within that. That is: moral vs immoral, lawful vs unlawful, and principled vs unprincipled. Now while we understand woman as being an undentity defined by and so dependent on the behaviors of men with relation to it, for the sake of simplicity I will refer to the particular ideologues guilty of this dangerous manifestation of their need for validation as feminists only. So how do feminists invert this dichotomy and why?

Given the feminist's belief in female victimization and as a corollary male perpetration, instances of female victimization or even just male perpetration against other males is necessary to validate this belief. So the feminist consumes what media she can that reports on such instances – true or not. This has the abhorrent effect of feminists' being personally interested, vindicated, and even pleased in the victimization of others. Now granted they will claim everything to the contrary and it is indeed true that they will never state that they are pleased that a woman was raped, but they are nevertheless; albeit in a hidden, subconscious way. See, no matter how disgusted a feminist is with regard to female victimization henceforth referred to as 'rape' for the remainder of this section, she requires it to occur in order to sustain her need for personal validation which is, should you recall, a means to maintain her self-righteousness and with it her undentity. In very real terms, a feminist requires the rape of women in order to validate herself as a feminist and even as a 'woman'.

This is well demonstrated by feminists through the keeping of lists of instances of their own perceived victimization and often the smiles of self-satisfaction worn on their faces as they read personal threats and disparaging words from 'men' who are, in truth, sexless and anonymous. You see it further demonstrated in the inflated and false statistics about rape that they parrot. Indeed, that rape isn't nearly as prevalent as they claim it is should come as a relief to feminists but is instead met with hostility. Sure, as an advocacy group for 'women' they are keen to ensure that rape statistics aren't being underestimated, but their zeal is hardly borne out of concern and caution. Rather in presenting a much lower and even decreasing rate of rape you are depriving feminists of their means of personal validation.

So with the feminists' personal validation inextricably tied to both the prevalence and occurrence of rape, they have become another beneficiary of the horrible act alongside the rapist. Two groups benefit from rape: rapists and feminists. This is the abhorrent nature of tying the perpetual need for validation into an act of victimization. It creates a necessarily sadistic relationship. Compare this to a goal-oriented behavior with a behavioral standard for identity. Such a person would be an anti-rape advocate whose identity is borne through the actions of their advocacy and whose goal is to decrease and hopefully end rape. They are very much interested in means of prevention, happy to report decreasing rates of rape, and experience no pleasure or validation when informed of another rape. With such people their identity is not defined by another nor themselves. It submits itself to an objective standard for identification.

Now, given my claim that the introduction of a dichotomy to this process of denial almost always results in an inversion of reality, let's explore it's manifestation with regard to feminists and rape. There are four parties to consider. There are the feminists, the victims, the accused, and the realists: the party who operates objectively to prevent rape and help victims. However, in keeping with the roles I've laid out before regarding narratives realists will be termed 'skeptics' and by virtue of their objectivity they are certainly skeptical if not outspokenly critical of feminist machinations.

First we have the interaction between feminists and victims. The party-line so to speak on this issue is that the victim is not responsible for being raped. This is to say that there was nothing she could have done and so, the reasoning goes, it is not her fault. Here we see the conflation of responsibility with blame. The victim *is* responsible for being raped as there *was* something they could have done, but nevertheless they aren't at fault which is the only truth in keeping with the feminist party-line. This conflation creates a re-victimization of sorts or at the very least runs entirely counter to efforts at helping victims. It's not difficult to reason how. By stating that the event was entirely out of their power, that they had no power to prevent it, a feminist only inflicts helplessness on the victim. The victim, should they heed the words of the feminist, will never recognize their own power and so remain in fear of re-victimization because they believe they have no power to prevent it. Rape has basically become a lightning strike on a clear summer day. A one-in-a-million freak occurrence. If the victim believes that they can do nothing to avoid or fight back against future assault their fear won't ever subside. It will remain along with this learned helplessness the feminist inflicted on them through the conflation of responsibility with blame. There is simply no avenue by which one can empower themselves. Even worse, should the victim take this lack of responsibility as wrote and as a part of her identity as a victim

or 'survivor', the thought of any preventative action can be met with indignation and purposeful avoidance. That is, the victim may become a feminist ideologue all her own and so shirk her personal responsibility for her self-preservation. She may subscribe to the undentity of 'woman' and so deny her agency. Sounds absurd, but this has already happened with the 'Teach Men Not to Rape' campaign which holds to the notion that women ought not to take preventative measures but that men ought not to rape women. Compounding the sheer lunacy of this sentiment is the obvious sexism. Not all rapists are men – not nearly, men as a demographic should not be equated with rapists, and furthermore men need not be told this as if they possess no conscience. So the cumulative effect of feminist involvement with the victim is, at worst, to deny them their agency and so re-victimize them by not allowing them to heal, to recognize their power to prevent future victimization. This has said victim spurn prevention as an unnecessary imposition that men should bear as a demographic given men's role of defining women by their own actions thus increasing the chance of re-victimization and essentially aiding rapists. Hence the rape prevention done by feminists results in, again at worst, rape enablement. A complete inversion of their proclaimed goal.

Second, the interaction between feminists and skeptics. Since any counsel regarding prevention necessarily ascribes agency to whomever it is communicated, feminists immediately label this as Victim Blaming and so reject and stifle any such counsel. Thus with the only means by which one can prevent rape silenced, victims and possible victims are left rudderless and, if not confused, zealously adherent to the feminist party-line; to their lack of any personal responsibility and so agency. So the effect of feminist interaction with skeptics is to silence the only means by which rape can be prevented.

Third, the interaction between feminists and the accused. Naturally, the rightfully accused ought to be punished for their crimes. I certainly wouldn't argue otherwise. However, this final party is 'the accused' not 'the guilty'. This distinction is made because the feminist interaction with the wrongfully accused is how feminists manifest the role of perpetrator. First there is the ostracism, the denigration of character, and advocacy for vigilante justice – even murder of the accused. This is nothing more than narrative crafting and an employing of the Zealotry Toolkit. Through these efforts what feminists are attempting to do is to create a mob, even a lynch mob, to affect their ends. This is why, even regarding trials that prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that the accused is innocent, the stigma of the event remains nonetheless; as if the accused was found guilty. As stated, the Zealotry Toolkit is designed to prevent any introspection and doubt of one's position by compounding it with the realization that they, having acted poorly in a state of zeal, have said or done something awful that is itself harder still to

countenance along with the falseness of their position. Basically, it's harder to relinquish a false position when doing so makes you realize that you acted wrongfully under its influence. So we have the stigma of the University of Virginia false rape scandal that persists to this day and with the falsely accused still suffering the stigma of the mere *accusation*.

Secondly, while the personal toll taken on the falsely accused is exacerbated by feminists, the legal toll is far worse. Feminists have affected the legal system in two ways. First they've expanded the definition of rape so much that, in many American states, what constitutes a rape is now a matter of the opinion of the woman. That is, whether or not a sexual encounter was rape is a matter of her say-so. This is in lieu of any sex contracts or video evidence to the contrary of course. Second, the burden of proof has begun to be denied to the accused, now being forced to prove their innocence rather than the prosecution being required to prove their guilt. These are basic human rights afforded by the legal system and Western society for over two hundred years being denied by feminist advocacy on behalf of 'victims'. Furthermore, the right for the accused to counter-sue, even the right to know the identity of their accuser is being denied. Essentially feminists are creating a system wherein the word of a woman is law and any objective means of determining the truth is denied. Feminists are victimizing the accused, the accused are now the real victims, and the justice system is designed to create injustice by victimizing the wrongfully accused. What we have here is the inversion of roles as afforded by the introduction of a dichotomy. Though as you may have noticed this runs parallel to the beliefs and behaviors formed by the ideology of the 'innate feminine', the undentity of 'woman'. We have the imposition of the 'truth' by virtue of claim alone parallel to axiomatic identity. The denial of objective means of discerning truth parallel to denying the behavioral standard for identity. Lastly being a victim of the 'other' parallel to the need to foist one's agency onto another. Thus this entire process is an exercise in ideology, necessarily of Allied Projection and a means of ideological affirmation. To do otherwise, to counter this ideological process is to break with ideological adherents and so court schism and inevitably ostracism. In this role one is not a lawyer, a judge, a constitutional professor or anything of the sort. Rather they have become a heretic interrupting a ritual necessarily of human sacrifice to evangelise non-belief in the ideology. Like an atheist attending and protesting a witch trial.

Rape Culture: Self-Fulfilling Prophecy

“An individual, by making assumptions about others or by ascribing them some intention, transforms them in the eyes of the projector into that which the projector expects or predicts...Yet this prophecy can actually manifest in reality and not just as a delusion of the projector. Take for example someone who believes others are their enemy and acts accordingly: treating them as hostile not just defensively but offensively through violent actions. The people subject to this violence become the enemies of the projector by virtue of their own self defense against what is in reality an aggressive perpetrator who sees themselves as a victim. In this way a self-fulfilling prophecy can be made a reality despite the impetus of it being false. However, this occurs only when such beliefs lend themselves to a dichotomy, especially a moral one.”

Yet most importantly, ‘A belief not based in fact is an expression of a desire for it to be true and manifests in behavior not as a reaction to reality but as a goal to make it reality.’

Not to expound too much on it here as we will be visiting it shortly, consider the feminist-inspired and mandated – to the extent of their considerable power, expansion of the definition of rape but most importantly their abuse of the concept of consent. By virtue of judging every stage of sexual activity by the new standard of ‘informed consent’ and ‘yes means yes’, any and every action during sexual activity that is not communicated prior is grounds for an accusation of sexual assault. Egregious and absurd, yet true. Essentially this leaves whether or not one is raped up to the woman’s and only the woman’s interpretation. Rape essentially becomes a matter of perspective and, lo and behold, the uniquely feminist belief that we live in a ‘rape culture’ has been made manifest. By legal mandate, *all sex is rape until the woman decides otherwise*. Their belief in rape culture has now been made a reality. The sexual encounters that we would view as entirely normal they view as rape and as such we are seen to countenance and condone rape itself thus fulfilling the definition of rape culture. Feminists have created rape culture by virtue of defining rape both personally and legally by their own twisted interpretation – hell just their say-so. Yet for these women to live in a rape culture, they’d still have to consider their sexual encounters rape, right? Well, who says they don’t?

#### Rape Culture: Twisting Reality to Their Fetish

I cannot be the only one who has observed that feminists’ interest in sex is obsessive and bordering on the perverted. They have a great pre-occupation with rape in particular. Why? Well the combination of

their sex with their victimization provides the ultimate means of validating their undentity of 'woman'. There is the focus on their sex thus distinguishing themselves as apart from the 'other' that is men along with borrowing the legitimacy of the definition of 'woman' as human female. Further we have the obvious victimization that is rape but as a unique form of it that is specifically male perpetrated against women; at least to the feminist perspective which denies the existence of female on male rape. Yet there is another reason to consider for this perversion shared amongst so many feminists. Consider, if women view themselves as victims of men in every regard as they are defined by male behavior through their undentity, then what does this make of the act of sex? Well it becomes an action taken upon or against a woman rather than a mutual activity as we discussed regarding consent. Ergo in this deranged feminist perspective all sex becomes rape because the woman, being forever defined by the man's actions and so in possession of no personal agency, cannot express meaningful consent. She has essentially objectified herself. This perspective informs much of what is termed Sex-Negative Feminism:

#### Sex-Negative Feminism:

A branch of feminism concerned with and critical of sex as an act entirely without political, social, or structural influences. Citing the ongoing influence of patriarchy and the circumscribing of women's agency via male supremacy within any patriarchal social model as key factors.

Granted this was my own definition as I couldn't find a single authority on the topic. Though naturally this is an effect of 'woman' existing as an undentity thereby removing any means by which an authority on 'woman' can be established. Insofar as undentity is concerned, authority is determined through logic alone. Through argumentation that establishes and preserves 'woman' as an undentity. This is the only authority on feminism as an ideology. Funnily enough by my reasoning that would make me the foremost authority on feminism. Compounding this is the fact that those who would comprise the authority on feminist history, social influence and legal influence would all be MRAs. Go figure those with the most knowledge of feminism are those not axiomatically feminist or 'woman' or subscribing to any undentity but rather those who allow reason and evidence to shape their perspective. Also, go figure they're all vehemently against it. As is the case with ideology, the most learned in it comprise its opposition more often than not.

So with all sex as rape by virtue of her twisted perspective, a sex-negative feminist is free to use sex or any allusions to it as a means of validation her victimization. So every sexual ad, every man who approaches her, indeed everything sexual is actually oppressive. Furthermore in societies advocacy of or

rather acceptance of these as normal, the 'Rape Culture' that feminists claim exist is made manifest. With that such feminists are free to receive any and all the validation of their 'victimization' that they can absorb through the media and even normal human sexual interaction. But this doesn't necessarily border on the fetishistic now does it? So let's consider a couple of amateur definitions of sex-negativity on our way to that conclusion:

"Sex-negativity isn't about hating sex. It's about questioning our sexual practices and desires in light of the basic fact that patriarchy doesn't somehow stop at the bedroom door. For example: porn. While in a perfect world there would be no issue with porn, the sex-negative feminist critiques the abusive patriarchal dynamics acted out in most mainstream porn and the failings of the industry, particularly in its exploitative labor practices toward actresses who frequently have a very hard time leaving the sex industry due to the cultural stigma around sex work. Another example: strip clubs. Seriously, there's *nothing* healthy or positive about the actual reality of the typical strip club, no matter how fine and celebratory the concept is in some theoretical non-patriarchal world."

"Related to choice feminism is sex-positive feminism, much of which makes me rather uncomfortable. It often seems to me that, for many self-identified feminists, sex is the one domain in which feminist politics should have no import (unless that politic is that sex and/or pleasure is always good and healthy and desirable and that fantasies and desires have no bearing on life outside the bedroom). Sex is not a realm separate from politics — it is always already political and social and it doesn't happen in a vacuum. Kinks are not necessarily harmless. Even the notion of consent, considered by so many to be a simple matter, is problematic — in a patriarchal society where women's agency is circumscribed by male supremacy, how meaningful is consent? These issues are purposefully obscured by sex-positive feminists who believe that sex is an inherent good and that to feel otherwise is somehow aberrant, abnormal, a position that should be remedied."

Observe the use of male supremacy and patriarchy respectively. Given our new understanding of the self-victimization that occurs when claiming an innate identity, in this case innate femininity, male supremacy and patriarchy are themselves an ex post facto justification for the innate feminine; justifications for why women are defined by the behaviors of men. Though in keeping with the common behaviors associated with ideological thinking, those justifications are prone to circular reasoning:

Women cannot express meaningful consent because they are forced to submit to men because of the patriarchy women cannot express meaningful consent because they are forced to submit to men because of the patriarchy women cannot...

Recall my claim regarding projection in chapter 2:

‘A belief about one’s self is the root of projection, not a belief about others.’

So we see this demonstrated through claims of male supremacy and the existence of a patriarchy. It is women who have ‘victimized’ themselves by defining themselves by men’s actions rather than their own and so project the responsibility for this self-victimization onto men. Patriarchy, or rather the perspective that informs it, is of the feminist’s own making. The attempt to claim that we operate according to old patriarchal societal models is an attempt to harness the truth of the existence of that model and so claim legitimacy in one’s claims of patriarchal oppression. Basically, feminists are always going to feel oppressed by men and as there just so happened to exist a societal model that could justify such feelings, feminists jumped on the opportunity to use it. So feminists claim patriarchy yet persists in an attempt to legitimize their feelings through the fact that such a societal model can and has existed.

While sex-negativity does provide validation by maintaining the feminist’s undentity, there is another prevalent motivation that informs this perspective. This motivation is the fetishizing of all sex according to the popular though oft-denied rape fantasy. There is a large contingent of women whose interest in rape or if they don’t wish to phrase it as such a murkily consensual, kinda-sorta-not-consensual sex, borders on the fetishistic if not entirely admitting to it. This sort of sexual intercourse is well represented in the female romance novel industry or ‘porn for women’ as it has come to be colloquially known. Such sex occurs when the man believes they don’t have the consent of the woman or doesn’t even consider it while the woman secretly consents. It has much to do with this notion of a man being so overwhelmed by a woman’s sexuality that he cannot conduct himself according to basic boundaries of human decency let alone social rules and customs. This is undeniably sexually exciting for many women. Of course there is a great danger in seeking such sexual encounters in reality as those who would engage in such behavior, the men anyway, are rapists. They are criminals, hardly the archetype of the dashing rogue come to sweep milady off her feet and into his bed. So given the danger of seeking such encounters in reality, what is a woman to do in order to manifest her rape fantasy? There is role-play certainly, but even with a willing partner it remains a fantasy, not a fully realized faux-rape scenario. Well, such women have turned to feminism or more accurately the ideological adherence to the innate feminine.

Through this they can consider themselves the victims of men in every regard and so define all sex as rape by denying their ability to give meaningful consent. Thus with all sex now rape, though not as a matter of objective fact but subjective opinion, the woman is free to enjoy 'being raped' so as to sate her fetishistic urges. This creates a paradox wherein the woman is being simultaneously raped but nevertheless consenting to it, or at least it would were such women not in denial of their agency. See, this is yet another example of such women defining themselves, in this case their kink, through men's behavior. That is, so long as she knows that the man has not met the current social standards for consent she can, in a strictly legal sense, claim to have been raped or rather that the man 'raped' her. That he'd been overwhelmed by her sexuality so much that he didn't acquire legal consent before engaging in sex. Remember his behavior is what she uses to define the interaction, not her own. Hence that she secretly consented regardless of the man's ignorance of this consent is moot. She will still claim to be raped, even just to herself, to sate her fetish.

#### Con-Sensuality: Sex, Lies, and Virtual Rape

The ever growing expansion not necessarily of rape but what *defines legal consent* is not an attempt to prevent rape but rather to create it; not in reality but through legal definition. With what constitutes consent ever changing, ever expanding and to the ignorance of your average person, such people grow more prone to 'raping' another by mistake. Ergo those with the knowledge of this new legal definition for consent, undoubtedly feminists who are chiefly interested, are free to assume the other party is also in possession of this knowledge and will certainly never inform them should they suspect they are not. So when said other party initiates a sexual interaction which is by legal definition non-consensual, feminists are further free to assume that the other party is 'raping' them; either maliciously or in ignorance. Either way, such sexual interaction meets their fetishistic criteria and is thus sated. To be frank, the mindset of such women reads as follows:

'I was raped, but that doesn't mean I didn't enjoy it.'

So am I claiming that such people, such feminists, are using feminism and the legal system in order to manufacture their rape fetish? That they are using the veneer of rape prevention and all the thousands of real victims therein in order to 'get off'? That their telling a real rape victim that they aren't

responsible is just a means to maintain their denial of their own agency and thus continue to view their own sexual encounters as rape? Yup. Regarding such women, their relationship to real victims isn't just sadistic but sexually sadistic. With this in mind consider what is really going through such a feminist's mind the next time you hear them consoling a victim.

"Oh honey, there was nothing you could have done."

### The Feminist Hivemind: Pursuing the Illusory Paragon

One of the defining features of many ideologies, if not all, is their penchant for operating as a hivemind.

Hivemind:

- 1) A collective consciousness, analogous to the behavior of social insects, in which a group of people become aware of their commonality and think and act as a community, sharing their knowledge, thoughts, and resources.
- 2) A group mentality characterized by uncritical conformity and loss of a sense of individuality and personal accountability.

Both definitions are apt though I hasten to point out that the former is a description of a behavior while the latter is a description of a mental state. Though it must be said that those so afflicted by such a mental state can engage in the behavior of the former. Yet there is an exception made in such circumstances. That is, those so afflicted *do not* become aware of their commonality. Far from it. Instead they become aware of their disparity i.e. what they lack in common. So how is a hivemind generated from dissimilarity? Through their shared undentity, of course. First let us establish what we already know. An undentity, while possessing no special quality or characteristic, is nevertheless considered innate. Essentially that it exists yet without reference to any actual criteria for this existence. As such it technically cannot be shared in common with anyone else claiming said undentity. The only thing shared is the claim of the undentity itself which is merely an expression of their self-righteousness based on the 'I am right' axiom. Furthermore given that undentities are characterized by their denial of personal

agency, there exists no standard to judge fellow ideologues' choices or their subsequent actions as in keeping with said undentity. Hence not only does there not exist any commonality between claimants of a particular undentity based on said undentity, there *cannot ever* be any commonality. It is a complete nonstarter. The premise is entirely faulty. The hivemind is truly formed through ideologues' shared pursuit of their undentity perhaps better understood as the attempt to define the undentity ex post facto. I touched briefly on this creation of a hivemind in chapter 3 with regards to the creation of collectivized behavioral standards:

'[As a fellow Muslim], when you observe Abdul acting in a way you think is counter to your ideology it operates as a challenge to your identity. Do you judge Abdul as failing to adhere to the ideology or do you instead doubt your own understanding of the ideology? Of your own identity?...It's doubt. It's actually doubt. Finally, the counter to the 'I am right' axiom manifests and through social pressure of all things. Unfortunately it's not a rational form of doubt and so not a true counter. Instead it circumvents the axiom by manipulating it or rather the axiom manipulates itself. How? Through projection and the need for validation inherent in all false beliefs. When one externalizes their identity so greatly that such projection forms a core of their identity, it can usurp other beliefs that are simultaneously fueled by the axiom. For example, one believes that they are right as determined by the axiom, but when one believes that they are simultaneously right about being say a Muslim, and Islam informs them that they are *wrong* in their judgment of Abdul and so understanding of Islam, one has to choose between these two options. This choice is made subconsciously though and is fueled by the need for validation otherwise it results in schism and disbelief in the ideology. Often the 'choice' is made to admit to one's error in judgment and submit to Islam - in this case. In effect Islam, or rather proponents of it, can now influence and change one's identity via their own interpretation of what constitutes a paragon of Islam. But I know what you're thinking, "How does admitting error validate oneself?" Simple really, in such circumstances admitting error admits to the truth of Islam and in having externalized one's identity as a Muslim it validates one's belief all the more. Essentially:

"I was wrong since Islam is truth. Hence I am a true believer because I submit to Islam and also am now righteous in following it. I am Muslim."

Through this phenomenon ideologues begin to shape their beliefs and behaviors in order to synergize with fellow ideologues. Hence the hivemind isn't borne from a recognition of commonality but disparity.

Though recognize that this process of altering one's behavior is itself an attempt to adhere to and so define the undentity. That is, ideologues are forever attempting to become or at least to establish the beliefs and behaviors of the paragon of their undentity, of the true exemplar. As ever the only belief they share in common is that of their own self-righteousness which is never actually recognized by the hivemind. In turn it influences their subsequent belief in undentity and undentity, while necessarily describing an identity without criteria, has to us as observers the quality of being non-criterial. It is from this position that ideologues subconsciously yet nevertheless logically extrapolate their non-agency along with denial, projection, and all behaviors typical of ideologues. So in essence the hivemind is generated through a shared belief but one that is not and must not be recognized. While the belief is irrational it is nevertheless logical and operates within a logical framework. This brings with it the similarity in subsequent beliefs and with that the behaviors that typifies those of a hivemind. While this consolidation is most certainly an effect of their similar belief, it is most assuredly not the result of their recognition of this similarity but rather their distinctions.

This process results in an increasingly conservative attitude toward beliefs and behaviors. The hivemind slowly restricts the beliefs and behaviors of its ideologues so not only is a hivemind created, but a hivemind that sanctions and tolerates less and less with each subsequent iteration of the ideology. It is not difficult to understand why of course. Given that any act of affirmation invariably tempts schism, the more an ideology attempts to set rules, necessarily restrictions, the faster and more often it will generate it. This is further compounded by the fact that an ideology is influenced by outside forces by definition. Given that undentities are nothing more than affiliations without any standard by which to determine any associated beliefs or behaviors, they can only define themselves by what they are not. So in order for the ideology to persist it must increasingly define itself by what it is not. Through this process whatever beliefs and behaviors are associated with that 'what', with those apart from the ideology forming the 'other', are similarly rejected and restricted; preventing ideologues from engaging or adhering to them. So the hivemind slowly begins to restrict the beliefs and behaviors of all ideologues within it becoming even more conservative. So as is the case with feminism we see ever-increasing restrictions on specific beliefs and behaviors all the while maintaining the same vague allowances to what can be done i.e. 'fighting for women's rights' and 'being a good feminist'. Furthermore in order to maintain the ideology as truth previous restrictions cannot be lifted. Such an act brings the legitimacy of the ideology into question which again courts schism. So with the restrictions specific and the allowances vague, it invariably restricts and shrinks what constitutes those allowances. This creates a hivemind that shares the bulk of its similarity in what it restricts of its ideologues. That is, such

ideologues share more in common with what they don't do and don't believe rather than what they do. They define themselves and their association by their shared restrictions which is again apt considering the undentities of ideologues are forever defined by what they are not.

Naturally you could see how this ever-growing restriction on the beliefs and behaviors of ideologues would result in a collapse by attempts at standardization and indeed it does through the twin mechanisms of schism and nebulization. Schism trending toward some particulars and nebulization trending toward no particulars. More in line with the logic provided by undentity. Simply put, the more one's beliefs and behaviors are restricted the greater chance one's personal identity will become challenged via restricting a belief or behavior that defines it, breaking their Allied Projection. Also, the more one can only define themselves by what they are not the more the ideology and so the undentity becomes vague and meaningless. Returning to its core characteristic as non-criterial without the excess that Allied Projection built around it.

Though this will be covered in great detail in the next chapter, consider now that nebulization is more representative of undentity, of ideological belief, than schism is. Allied Projection can either splinter or fade. Can either create new ideological groups founded on some criteria or nebulize any criteria wrought through Allied Projection, returning to its core non-criterial status. Returning to the only belief they share, that of their self-righteousness alone. What this means dear reader is that there are, in essence, two forms of ideological belief. One wholly committed to undentity and one trending away from it, though never removing it entirely considering that both are based first and foremost on self-righteousness and so an axiomatic identity. There are always these two and only these two. More similar in their extremes than in moderation.

### Retroactive Attribution of Malice: The Origin of Patriarchal Oppression

By feminists and feminist sympathizers alike, we are regaled with historical tales of uniquely female oppression and from men ranging from the highest king to the lowliest serf. We are told that in every instance of perceived inequality it was always based on one's sex or rather that it had everything to do with one's sex and nothing else. That is, *every* inequality women experienced that men did not was based on sex *every* time and for no other reason. Perhaps in phrasing it this way you begin to see the

absurdity of this perspective? Do we really believe that men and the 'patriarchy' were so concerned with oppressing women based on something as insignificant as the characteristic of 'female'? Of course not. Fact is most of the 'inequalities' that are attributed to past social dynamics are only perceived as inequalities in retrospect and typically by the omission of the truth of the origin of these 'inequalities'. That is a nice way of saying that such claims are lies that attribute the reason for the perceived inequality to 'patriarchy' rather than something like convenience, necessity, and choice.

To examine and expound on just the major claims by feminists of historical female oppression by a patriarchy let alone all their minor claims is a book in itself and a waste of my time. Why? Firstly, one's ability to associate one's self with a past oppressed demographic in no way earns them said demographics' mantle of 'oppressed' nor does it earn one any restitutions for what was done to said demographic. Such 'Sins of the Father' thinking is merely a manipulation borne as an ex post facto justification for one's sense of indignation combined with their false sense of entitlement.

As an aside, you see this quite often with so-called 'proud natives' who, in my eyes, relinquish whatever pride they have every time they engage in this 'Sins of the Father' argument. What pride is there in begging and bitching? None. What pride is there in *earning* it all back? All, and it ought to be sought as such. But I digress.

Back to the topic at hand, the second reason expounding on such claims are a waste of time is that they aren't the impetus for feminist claims of patriarchy but rather the ex post facto justification for maintaining such belief. As such addressing them is pointless and a diversion from the true origin. Such is in keeping with all defenses of the 'I am right' axiom of course. Once again, ex post facto justification is a hydra. Destroy one means of justification and two more take its place. Their veracity never factor in as they act only as a proxy through which one can plant and express their conviction. It is a matter of quantity over quality. The third and final reason I won't address any feminist claims of historical female oppression at the hands of a patriarchy, as if the first two reasons aren't reason enough, is because it has already been done. Many people have done the busy work of debunking feminist claims of historical oppression. If you are interested in them they are an internet search away though as I've said they are a mostly pointless exercise. Debunking feminist claims are for our benefit only. They only ensure that what we believe about these claims, that they are false, meets our own standard for truth. We do it to ensure that we are not dismissing such claims out of hand. It is not to convert feminists who, as I've said,

don't care for the veracity of these claims one way or the other. Really, such activity is an act of conscience clearing. To relieve any anxiety that arises in dismissing claims without evidence of our own.

As the title of this section suggests, this 'History of Patriarchal Oppression' is the phenomenon of the retroactive attribution of malice to a particular demographic, in this case men. Combine that with the victimhood inherent in the undentity of 'woman' and you have all men, regardless of social station, oppressing women all the time and through everything they do throughout all of history. You have a feminist-defined 'patriarchy'. Yet of course, all this 'oppression' is an effect of women defining themselves through men's actions. In essence, 'patriarchal oppression' really means 'male definition'. Feminists have, albeit not recognized as such, identified that they define themselves through men's actions. But rather than attributing this to themselves, to their own warped perspective, they attribute this to men and so call it 'oppression'.

Now it must be said that the definition of patriarchy, as with all feminist and ideological definitions, has succumbed to nebulization and schism which has engendered much debate as to its size, scope, and participants. This defining of women by male action isn't uniquely feminist of course so I would wager that most if not all societies share similar histories of 'female oppression'. If not now, then at least when their socially defined sex roles are dismantled. There is an important and telling exception however: societies that haven't subscribed to the undentity of 'woman' to such a degree as the West or those who are comfortable with ascribing to each sex particular roles.

See, if a society socially enforces a particular role for each sex then that sex can be defined through behaviors, at least socially and generally, and so what constitutes a man or woman apart from the objective definition can be determined through said behaviors. Hence in these societies one can act womanly or manly rather than simply be a woman or a man respectively, without any particular negative connotation either way. So am I saying that sex stereotypes can actually engender a greater sense of identity as a man or woman through maintaining behaviors particular to them? Yes, yes I am. Whether or not this is 'better' than an egalitarian perspective on sex depends entirely on what is sought, naturally. I mean only to say that sex stereotypes provide a greater sense of sexual identity. Though is there really any doubt considering the dissolution of sexual identity in the West coincides with the perception of sex roles as some nefarious, patriarchal control scheme? No. Simply, to dissolve an identity one must remove its behavioral criteria.

So patriarchy is the void left from women denying their own agency. All it is, is a non-female agent responsible for all the effects of feminists' exercise of agency that feminists deny. It's is merely a logical placeholder that targets men as a result of our sexual dichotomy and nothing more.

### Allied Projection: The Impetus of the Dissolution of Sex Roles

Sex roles or sex stereotypes, whatever your preferred term, are much of what is perceived now as the chief demonstration of patriarchy; that men's and women's behaviors were restricted by the social enforcement of respective roles. Naturally this is true in some respect. However, the feminist ascription of these roles to a patriarchy isn't being entirely honest now, is it? In truth, in the times of sex roles and their social reinforcement one could be a male without being a man and one could be a female without being a woman. Man and woman were so intimately tied to their roles (defined by their behaviors) that what constituted a 'real man' or 'real woman' while submitting itself to some subjective interpretation, could be as close to objectively determinable as social constructs get. This is why terms like 'real' were introduced. It separated the role from the biological identity as either male or female whilst retaining the current colloquial terminology of 'man' and 'woman'. Hence one could be a 'real man' but one could also be 'just a man' or 'typical man', meaning 'man' and 'male' respectively. What earns one the title of 'real man' is a behavior in keeping with their sex role. What earns a man the denigration of 'just a man' is often not adhering to that role and so disappointing expectations; especially with regard to men's basic sexuality which is an aspect of their maleness, not their manliness. With regards to women, that one wished to be a 'real woman' or 'lady' while not adhering to the set of behaviors socially required to earn the title is where much of the conflict arose. It was that the descriptor of 'woman' meant something to these women apart from the current socially enforced behavioral definition. So they insisted upon and agitated for not necessarily their personal definition of 'woman' but rather that it be freed from its current definition according to behavior. In essence, the early feminists sought to remove the current standard for defining 'woman' but not to replace it or if they had any such intention of replacing it, Allied Projection prevented them from ever establishing what a 'true woman' or just a

'woman' would become. Now we are left with an entirely nebulous meaning to both man and woman where once we had a subjective but nevertheless socially reinforced behavioral standard for both.

It should be noted that the behaviors that informed both sex roles were necessarily in reference to the other sex. That is, they defined themselves by the 'other' and arguably for the benefit of that 'other'. Now, I've established the problem in defining one's identity according to the 'other' rather than the self, but in this instance there is a closed loop of sorts and a positive feedback loop at that. With each sex referencing the other sex regarding what ought to be done and in accordance with what the other sex is doing, it builds a model of interaction that is self-sustaining and complimentary rather than antagonistic or mutually exploitative. Think of it as an 'I'll scratch your back, you scratch mine' situation. However, whether or not one wishes to engage in this model of behavior as it can be seen as restrictive, is again a matter of what one wishes to accomplish in their relationship and what one values. That is, do they prefer a methodology for human interaction or free-for-all and to what extent can they countenance a methodology? Is the goal of the relationship to produce and sire offspring or to grow in intimacy? Does one bolster or preclude the other? I don't know dear reader and frankly I don't much care. These are personal questions with personal answers. The best I can do is demonstrate that this interaction was in no way oppressive.

It must be said that yes, having a majority of people telling one that one is not a 'real man' or a 'real woman' can certainly be disheartening. Yet countenancing such opinions is entirely one's fault as it is said one who put stock in the identity of 'man' and 'woman' in the first place. Furthermore, the agitation of one regarding their own definition of what so constituted a 'real man' and 'real woman' was in no way a different sort of social enforcement than what was the current status quo. It was just taking a term that already existed and agitating for your own interpretation above all others. This is a behavior that ideologues engage in right now through their invasion of non-ideological spaces foisting upon them their own warped values and virtues. In truth, past feminists' actions to redefine sex roles or eliminate them altogether was just another means of communicating their self-righteousness. So no, I don't sympathize with the plight of those who felt restricted by their roles as it was they who countenanced such feelings to begin with. They were free to act against the grain and establish their own norm. Everyone who would disparage or ostracize them for it well, to a feminist they were merely demonstrating their own irrationality and cruelty. Such people ought to have been seen as unworthy of friendship, unworthy of recognition, and whose opinion was worthless. Nevertheless they were recognized and their opinions valued. Feminists couldn't simply ignore them. It cements further in my

mind the link between feminism and insecurity. That social substantiation, that validation was so integral to early feminists they sought a reformation regarding the opinions of such disparaging people because, no matter what they claimed to the contrary, they put great stock in the opinions of those people. Such people had to change in order for a feminist to validate her identity as a 'woman' rather than such validation coming from her adherence to the established role. But as we've come to understand, 'woman' came to be defined by the 'other' and not by the sex role so naturally what the 'other' thought of 'woman' became necessary to control and so the perpetual quest for validation through the control of the 'other' began and continues to this day. Early feminists were no different than their modern-day feminist counterparts. They are women and fewer men who misattribute some innate quality to 'woman' apart from biology. The only 'liberation' feminists could offer women was to 'free' their identity from behavioral criteria and with that their own sense of personal agency.

Sex roles, whether you think them good or ill, were the last and only defense against this and they at least provided identifiable behaviors that allowed 'woman' to exist distinct from mere biology; even if those behaviors weren't objective but rather a result of social custom. I think it was better than literally nothing at least insofar as social cohesion is concerned. While tackling this problem of the undentity of woman was likely inevitable, there were surely better avenues to take rather than letting the feminists run hog-wild over the society and zeitgeist the old system had created. I suppose you could say that rehabilitating mankind regarding this mind-virus would have likely been better than letting it loose on the streets to get whatever 'fix' it can get to fill the void in the definition of 'woman'. Mankind, if I can speak in such broad terms, is a junkie when it comes to preserving its identity and so the 'I am right' axiom itself.

### The Innate Feminine: Why Men Can't Be Victims of Women

A common fixture of feminist interaction with men and in particular advocates for men's rights is their reaction to the concept of male victimization and especially from women. This reaction ranges from hostility to bewilderment and has everything to do with the undentity of 'woman'. With 'woman' being defined through men's behavior, it ascribes to men this perceived hyperagency wherein they are responsible not only for their actions but also for women's actions. Given such an erroneous

perspective, how *could* a man be victimized by a woman when he defines and so controls her behavior? Perhaps not as an individual man himself but as a complacent contributor to 'patriarchy' which is surely, the reasoning goes, what the woman is *reacting to* rather than acting according to her own will? Recall that such ascription of malice to the ignorant is entirely in keeping with the observable behaviors of ideologues. Furthermore, by attributing agency to women or a particular woman who victimizes men, men are not only challenging the undentity of woman by robbing it of its innate quality but devaluing it with the possibility that such an identity is capable of victimization: of unethical, aggressive, violent behavior. Thus these men are met with hostility as their observation is interpreted as a personal or generalized accusation against women or better understood as a challenge and disillusioning of the undentity of 'woman'. This is why feminists can actually find such claims, claims of women's victimization of men, offensive.

Offense: Threats against Undentity

If the title alone doesn't give it away let me expound some more on this idea of offense. First a definition:

Offense:

- 1) A thing that constitutes a violation of what is judged to be right or natural.
- 2) Annoyance or resentment brought about by a perceived insult to or disregard for oneself or one's standards or principles.

The second definition offered here is actually quite apt but naturally falls short of fully communicating the true nature of the concept. Credit where it's due, the notion of 'disregard for oneself' is quite close though your mileage will vary depending on your understanding of 'self'. Now given the frequency of debate on this concept and the traction it has gained in society you'd think 'offense' would be something more complicated than what I'm offering, but sadly it is not. As with feminism, the power of either concept is in everyone's avoidance and so denial of the truth that is revealed as a necessary replacement to either concept. That is to say, these concepts exist as placeholders for truths that are avoided due their difficult and challenging nature. The more a society wishes to avoid these truths the

more powerful the concepts designed to take their place become. So in effect, the power of the concept of offense and the ideology of feminism lie in the fear of the reality that both are designed to mask, not in the so-called 'evidence' (ex post facto justifications) they provide. Their power has nothing to do with their merit but a genuine fear of reality and really, am I not just restating the premise of this entire work? A fear of reality or, to put it another way, a fear of *challenging the 'I am right' axiom*?

Offense, dear reader, is any challenge to one's undentity be that challenge objective or subjective. It does not matter because both result in the same effect: the elimination of the placeholder. This challenge is interpreted as a personal smear and so a personal attack (even so far as a physical threat) on each individual who *feels* offended. With their undentity threatened along with their axiom, they lash out in what they interpret as a counter-threat when in reality it was the only threat in the entire interaction. This threat ranges from everything to censorship (protecting the placeholder belief) to violence (kill those who threaten the placeholder). Perhaps now you understand how well 'disregard for oneself' can encapsulate this concept though again depending on your understanding of terms? It is a disregard taken to such an extreme that those said to be disregarding or offending you care so little about you and your humanity that they care not for your existence or are even opposed to it. Hence this 'disregard' becomes a threat though such escalation is a product of their fear of challenging their own assumptions, not so much the content or nature of the disregard. This is why people are murdered over cartoons.

It must be said though that 'offense' can be taken, and the definition states as such, according to one's standards and principles. Though again, if such standards and principles aren't objective they are designed around and to justify the 'I am right' axiom that the individual holds and its corresponding identity. Say as a 'moral' or 'upstanding citizen'. So if offense is taken according to these standards or principles, they are still just challenging an undentity. Yet if such standards and principles are objective, can we objectively state that any behavior that attacks or defies these is offensive? Yes and no. Consider that if one holds to an objective principle of never initiating force/violence/coercion against another and that such initiation is the basis of what is typically understood as immorality, then if someone else disagrees with this principle and instead concludes that initiating force/violence/coercion against others is acceptable behavior, such a position when put into practice is by definition violent behavior and the person subscribing to said behavior a threat to others. Hence such a position can be considered 'offensive' insofar as it is certainly a threat. However, it is not 'offensive' in that it does not threaten an undentity nor the 'I am right' axiom. Perhaps this merely demonstrates that the term 'offense' has been

co-opted and applied to a realm of anti-objective nonsense. If such is the case I'll leave that word to the ideologues and stick to 'threat' as my word to describe instances where I am objectively threatened by another's position and associated behaviors. I needn't mask the true nature of my perspective with the term 'offense' nor attribute this perspective to emotion rather than reason. Do what you will dear reader, but I will call a threat what it is rather than communicates merely how it makes me feel.

### Man-Hating: Sexual Attraction at Odds with Ideological Alliances

It's pretty simple to infer why it is feminists hate men so much, whether they admit to it or not. Given their perceived status as victims of men and thus men as the perpetrators of their 'oppression', hatred is easily manifested. Yet I would be remiss not to point out the less obvious and actually more invariable source of this hatred. That is, their blatant denial of their sexual attraction to men though not only men, but the very traits found in men that feminists so scorn. I'll state from the onset that the application of denial to a great enough extent produces an inversion of reality, not simply and not just some alternative falsehood. Thus the effect of their love, or at least sexual attraction, producing the opposite effect insofar as they maintain this denial. This is amusingly established when in the presence of a particularly robust and attractive male specimen as such feminists are often found to become passive – submissive even and to swoon over him whilst others, keen to mask their passion but nevertheless affected by it, begin to denigrate or otherwise negatively react to him. Essentially no matter the superficial expression of this passion, that it's so easily and hopelessly triggered makes a mockery of their entire ideological position. Yet even such an instance isn't enough to claim their hatred as the result of some inverted attraction. Instead we look no further than their perpetual need for validation. A trait they share with all such ideologues but one whose vitriolic nature betrays a certain poignancy that other such victim/perpetrator dynamics don't share. That it betrays such a desperate need for attention.

In effect, such feminists are using victimology along with their social platforms and political pull to garner the attraction of men. To make men interested, concerned with, or otherwise to acknowledge women in some fashion. In other words, to make men give a damn about them. Naturally the collective

nature of ideology, though feminist ideology in particular, doesn't allow for any individual targeting of particular feminists. Thus they must and indeed do frame their efforts at courting male interest in the guise of 'all women' or women as some demographic rather than their individual selves. As such men are met with certain commandments on their behavior that, amusingly, only one or a few feminists may prefer and so desire in men they are attracted to. It's like a checklist on a dating profile but operating at the level of the entire ideological collective. Still, this is hardly proof of my claim and neither it is necessarily hateful. Granted, so it's in the eventual and frankly inevitable rejection of feminists by men that we observe this attempt to attract men devolve into vicious spite, grievance, and thinly veiled regret. See, through this ineffective and unintuitive process of attracting male attention it hardly serves to validate feminists let alone remediate the conflict between their sexual attraction and ideological belief. Either in men simply rejecting their demands or just rejecting such women while nevertheless submitting to these demands, feminists become entirely sexually unsuccessful let alone unfulfilled. That's not even to mention whatever sexual play they engage in with men that may meet their ideological standards but hardly their sexual tastes. Essentially such women fail to court the outcome they wish through this process and so become embittered; seemingly through their rejection by men but truly through their own denial and so apathy regarding their own sexual desires. A bitter regret in other words. As such and as is my chief evidence for this matter, as feminists who engage in this process become older or otherwise less sexually attractive to men and thus fail to become sexually satisfied let alone successful with men, that's when their hatred really begins to manifest. All the nonsense about oppressive hierarchy and victim dynamics falls by the wayside as the reality of their failed sex life begins to take root. So it is that such hatred or rather the worst of it manifests in the old, the unmarried, the uncourted, the ugly, essentially the sexual losers of the feminist collective. Sure they blame men for not taking interest in feminists, but it's really feminists' efforts to attract men is such a bizarre and impersonal fashion that is to blame. Truly it is a wonder that in order to court a man, though really to court anyone, one must meet or succeed their preferences. Go figure that courtship could be so individualistic.

So in summary, many feminists are trying to get men to care about them or rather are trying to create an unreality wherein beliefs and actions that have nothing to do with women or aren't in any fashion or intention directed toward them are nevertheless interpreted as such. In this way they can receive a validation of sorts from men while at the same time claim to not need men for this purpose. Yet as this process continues on and their sexual needs aren't met they become embittered and hateful toward men, unable to countenance that this outcome is entirely of their own making. Hence the hatred of men

by feminists tends to scale with how sexually unsuccessful or otherwise unfulfilled such feminists are. You could say that they hate their desire, their need, hell their dependence on men in this regard and in some cases you might be right. But really, it's themselves they hate and so punish accordingly.

There'd be a whole lot less feminists in the world were they simply to learn how fun it is to give a blowjob. Though I hardly kid, frankly just accepting their attraction to men and the traits that they irrespectively scorn men for would do wonders not only to end feminism but just to make them happy.

## CHAPTER 6 – Identity: Axiomatic Origins and Identification of Purpose

## Introduction:

It was inevitable that matters of identity were to be discussed in this treatise. In fact, I've been discussing them through ideologies for most of it. Yet even I hadn't considered the depth of my investigation into identity as necessary to my goal of defeating ideology. That I have found myself drawing conclusions regarding the nature of identity itself, surely beyond my station, I admit is unnerving. That is to say I find myself outside of whatever comfort zone I had previously occupied. Operating at this level, hell at the level of axioms themselves, isn't anything I'm unfamiliar with given that this treatise is dedicated to exploring one. But matters of identity so vastly challenge one's perception of self and of others that I am no longer merely presenting another axiom one must consider with regard to their identity, that of 'I am right', but also the inevitable, subsequent conclusion that one's identity is false. Yes I have been presenting the claim that the reasoning behind one's actions are largely unknown to them and thus they are operating more or less in a state of nature. But a failure to properly recognize the true impetus to one's beliefs doesn't necessarily challenge one's beliefs with regard to themselves i.e. their identity. The rest of this investigation will however. So no longer will one just be unawares of the true nature of their beliefs, they will be proven unawares of their own identity. So with everything said, let's embark on the most challenging aspect of this treatise.

## The First Axiom: The Origin of 'I Am Right'

As I've employed it, an axiom is an assumption taken as truth, as something believed to be self-evident. I differentiate an axiom from an assumption as while an assumption can be admitted to and rejected, an axiom cannot be similarly rejected. In essence it is a belief that we are forced to believe. But why are we so forced? Why can't we choose not to believe it? Well for the same reason we can't be wrong in the moment. For the same reason that everything we believe we believe we are right about. But that was just a silly language game right? Some dumb trick that exploits a technicality in the definitions of both right and wrong. Except it's not a game or a trick. It's a rule.

As I said language operates on a logical framework. One that determines the relationship between different words depending on their meaning. This framework is reason and all the rules that accompany it. Rules designed to determine what is logical but also to establish logical consistency throughout all that we believe; so that our beliefs aren't only logical but do not contradict each other. So despite the ambiguity that plagues most languages they nevertheless submit themselves to reason insofar as meaning is concerned. Meaning being the attempt to represent nature, to represent reality. With reality a matter of objective fact, truth essentially, there exists a standard and so ruleset that language must submit itself to. Basically since there exist hard rules for reality, physics fundamentally, and language is designed to describe, represent, and communicate reality, language must also follow these same rules. Otherwise it would fail to describe reality accurately. So language is fundamentally based on reason and operates according to it. This is why in spite of the fantastical and impossible things people believe they will give a reason, provide a thought process, justify their thinking in some fashion. Think about it. Why should they? Why don't they just claim something without any rationale and why don't we just believe the claim as soon as it is said? If everyone is so unreasonable, illogical, and irrational why do they submit to these rules? Why can't they simply ignore them? Why can't they deny them like the rest of reality they twist to their perspective? Why, because they aren't mad. Sure at the most extrapolated point, at the most superficial levels of their ideology they are speaking and believing utter and complete nonsense. But remember this nonsense is just ex post facto justification for their axiom. By the rules of reason they know they require some justification and have selected some to fill that role. It doesn't matter *what* those beliefs are. It matters *that* they are; that they are present. The core belief ideologues demonstrate through any such justification is, 'belief requires rationale,' or more simply 'conclusions require process,' or even more simply 'ends require means' and lastly 'effect requires cause'. Basic fundamentals of reality. Of course I absolutely understand that their justifications are without merit. But their knowledge that such justifications must be made is entirely meritorious. In other words, the belief is irrational but the process for believing it is logical. Basically, *what* is communicated is illogical but *how* it is communicated is logical.

What this makes of the 'I am right' axiom is that it is similarly logical. That it is an effect, a carry-over, a necessary consequence to the development and employ of reason by every individual. So with that said, whence cometh the 'I am right' axiom? Well as the title suggests it comes as a corollary to the first axiom. The first axiom we all share. The axiom that serves as the foundation of all reason. In the words of René Descartes himself, "Cogito ergo sum."

“While we thus reject all of which we can entertain the smallest doubt, and even imagine that it is false, we easily indeed suppose that there is neither God, nor sky, nor bodies, and that we ourselves even have neither hands nor feet, nor, finally, a body; but we cannot in the same way suppose that we are not while we doubt of the truth of these things; for there is a repugnance in conceiving that what thinks does not exist at the very time when it thinks. Accordingly, the knowledge, *I think, therefore I am* is the first and most certain that occurs to one who philosophizes orderly.”

He puts it simply as:

“...we cannot doubt of our existence while we doubt, and...this is the first knowledge we acquire when we philosophize in order.”

Allow me to reiterate for those who require it. The act of doubting, of thinking, of reasoning first and foremost presupposes that you, the doubter, the thinker, the reasoner exist. You are your own single point of reference from which you perceive, and doubt, the rest of reality. Question your existence as you like. Doubt it. Think around it. Consider other options. Do this for eons and you will never, never be able to actually take the position that you don't exist. Furthermore there exists no way to substantiate yourself, to prove your own existence. No means other than reason itself which requires that you presuppose your own existence. In other words, reason is the method by which you determine truth but in order to exercise reason you must axiomatically exist. It's the original Catch 22. It is the first thing you believe. It is the first thing you must believe and for all the value and praise we grant reason, it is ironic that it is based first and foremost on an axiom. On a single irrationality.

Isn't that fitting though? That reason is irrational by design? That in order to employ reason, to rationally justify every belief we develop, we have to found it all on an axiom that by necessity must seek to justify itself after the fact? An ex post facto justification? Sure reason determines what is rational, but reason determines that it is fundamentally founded on an irrationality. Yet we can't shake our dependence on reason. Why? Because our belief in our own existence is axiomatic and from this axiom we develop reason. Or rather by first establishing a single point of reference we develop reason. See I told you, *I told* you that you can't disbelieve an axiom. Even when I lay it out for you. Even when it's presented in all its irrational glory.

Now I imagine there are those of you who protest the existence even of 'I' and so would doubt my judgement in this matter. I don't dismiss this off hand. Neither do I aim to supplant Kierkegaard or Simondon or Stiegler with Descartes. But as of right now I'm putting matters of individuation at the

wayside so as to not convolute my thesis with unnecessary complications. Regardless, so long as the ideologue believes in 'I', in their self, that they exist, the theory holds. If 'I exist' isn't axiomatic, then it's just another belief the ideologue holds that they needn't though is nevertheless responsible for the corollary belief of 'I am right'. On that note let me explain the origin of that axiom.

### I Am Right: The First Recognition of Belief

'I am right' is a product of 'I exist' given a particular definition for existence. Essentially, that which is true and thus that which one can be right about, is what exists. With 'I am right' based on one's perception of their own existence, the 'I' in both axioms is shared. That is, whatever this 'I' is both exists and is right without any distinction made between how these different forms of truth should define it. Call it a fusion of objectivity with subjectivity. So naturally the first thing 'I am right' applies itself to is one's existence. But rather than a simple rephrasing like, 'I am right about my existence,' or as a reiteration with 'right' being equivalent to 'exist' insofar as truth is concerned, it's a restatement using the point of reference, the self, as created through the axiom 'I exist'. So 'I am right' represents the first recognition or claim of 'truth' using the self as our point of reference. Something akin to, 'I exist, therefore...' Imagine the opposite. Imagine that the claim 'I exist' is followed by 'I am wrong'. It wouldn't work. It self-destructs. The 'I' is claimed to exist, but then claimed to be false.

Through the fusion of objectivity with subjectivity, 'I am right' takes on a certain duality. It can be applied to every subsequent belief an individual has, but it also represents a reiteration of 'I exist' using the self as the point of reference for truth. Literally 'I, am right' or rather 'I is right'. So with 'I' as the reference point for truth and representing or at least founded on one's belief in their own existence, 'I' becomes righteousness itself. 'I is right' rephrased as 'I is righteous. This is what I mean when I say ideologues are literally *self*-righteous. Their self is their core of their sense of what is right, what exists, what is true with regard to all considerations be it moral, just, social, whatever. This is why they, along with us, are necessarily the heroes of our own stories.

There is also a query begged from the axiom 'I exist' that we must also consider. This is simply 'As?' as in 'I exist, but as what?' This need to answer 'As?' is responsible for our ex post facto justification of

ourselves *as* whatever we claim ourselves to be. It's not that we require this information to be what we wish. That's entirely a matter of self-righteousness and thus axiomatic. We can claim and so believe whatever we wish in that regard. Instead we require it in order to develop our ability to individuate, to discriminate, to make distinctions. We need it in order to determine the different things we can be. Without this need our beliefs would cease at the existence of the self and of some undefined 'other' that we are not. Basically, what 'As?' does is create our ability to categorize. It's probably true that we couldn't change our minds, shift our righteousness and so perspective, without 'As?' operating as a means of ex post facto justification. Were you someone who believes the earth is flat, then you couldn't change your mind without changing your person. This would be true of every belief. Yet in reality *you* remain irrespective of any shift in perspective and so how you define yourself. This is because 'I' is axiomatic and thus not beholden to any means of justifying it after the fact. You're always going to be yourself no matter how this self changes. You're always going to be your point of reference for truth. In this way beliefs are a form of ex post facto justification for the self. 'I' is made to exist and then this 'I' is defined through one's beliefs, essentially one's perspective. As I said in chapter 1:

'Who am I?' can only be answered with, 'What I believe'. It's strange when you think about it. The beliefs one person may hold that shapes all they are as a person may be completely trivial to another. Yet still to another such beliefs may have never even been considered. Think of it this way: some beliefs are personal and of those beliefs the strongest and most intimate form *persons.*'

Beliefs do form the core of one's identity. This is as ever true. But these beliefs are not responsible for 'I'. They are only responsible for 'as'. They form one's self-perception but tellingly as an answer to a question. This is phrased as 'What am I?' and 'I am [X]'. The 'I' and the 'as' always remain separate. Again, it's why one may change 'as' whilst maintaining 'I' as ever true. In reality this 'I' should suffer doubt considering what justified it, the 'as', has been eliminated, but it does not. As you know by now, no axiomatic belief suffers from the elimination of the ex post facto justification for it. Hence why I've claimed it's a waste of time to address it.

However, as a means of ex post facto justification this drive to determine 'as' is ultimately futile since it's fundamentally impossible to justify an axiom. Hence this quest is a perpetual one resulting in what we might call thought. What some call a 'Quest for Truth' is the development of motivation itself

through the need to justify an impossibility. Not the impossibility of our own existence, but the impossibility of disbelieving it. It has us explore everything the universe has to offer, whatever form it takes.

It's quite beautiful in its own way. It's something we feel we must do yet can never accomplish, a perpetual task. A perpetual need to validate the self. It's like a debt that can never be repaid though nevertheless one wants to. It's a debt we cherish rather than abhor. Since this 'debt' is so much a representation of the existence of the self, that we are borne from a fundamental irrationality and how we owe ourselves to it, it's really no wonder it's held in high consideration. It's like the sort of debt we feel we owe to another who sacrificed for us. To one who is responsible for our existence. The debt you feel you owe to a savior. It's probably why the Christians phrase their relationship to God and Jesus Christ in a similar fashion. In fact it's exactly why.

#### Undentity: The Product of an Impossible Equivalency

As we discussed anti-objectivity describes that which cannot exist. Essentially that which has no criteria or that which is contradictory. So any undentity or a square circle respectively. This is in contrast to objectivity which describes what does or does not exist and subjectivity which is what one believes does or does not exist or is the truth. This trio arises through the interplay between the axioms 'I exist' and 'I am right' and the justification 'as'. Basically 'I exist' is anti-objective insofar as 'I' describes itself without any criteria. That it always exists irrespective of any criterial shift is a state of non-existence and nothing can exist without criteria. 'I am right' is obviously subjective, embodying the very essence of the self as a point of reference for one's determination of truth. 'As' therefore describes the objective aspect of our understanding of our existence. Naturally this 'as' is ultimately *chosen* subjectively, but this 'as' is entirely objectively determinable regardless of our own perception of it. In essence, the 'as' is real. It describes something that is true whether we perceive it as such. Putting them all together, a male may claim he is a female yet never question his own existence. His belief in his self is anti-objective. His claims to be a female are subjective. His state of being male is objective. This is why when claims of undentity are made they are similarly anti-objective as they represent a false equivalency with 'I'.

What an undentity is at its most basic is a failed reiteration of 'I'. It's a term one attempts to fuse with 'I' to inherit the same non-criterial, axiomatic existence. It's their attempt to answer 'As?', to justify 'I' by granting another term the same unique characteristics. However, an undentity isn't axiomatic. Only 'I' is axiomatic. Try as they might only 'I' can ever be. So any identity one attempts to fuse with 'I' is a means of ex post facto justification and is thus an 'as' in reality. Ideologues try to remedy this by removing whatever criteria from 'as' they can in order to make it as close to 'I' as possible. This results in a removal of all criteria, hence why undentities are characterized by the quality of being entirely non-criterial. It's why they can no longer say what a woman is in belief, action, purpose, or even biology. Though as ever bound to the logical framework afforded by reason, ideologues still need to justify this pseudo-self, this undentity. So it's from here, this pseudo-'I', that they begin the process of ex post facto justification. In this way the creation of an undentity is so much a shifting of the goalpost. Instead of trying to justify 'I' alone, they present their undentity as that which justifies or is in truth 'I', then attempt to justify this new undentity. This is why an ideologue's undentity persists regardless of your efforts to dismantle their justifications for it. Not only are such justifications a hydra of excuses, but they are also entirely divorced from their belief in their undentity to begin with.

Disproving the existence of an ideologue's undentity is as impossible as disproving their existence. Except it's not because an undentity doesn't share in the one characteristic that protects it from all disbelief and scrutiny. An undentity isn't axiomatic and this is its great weakness. Remember, an undentity is just an 'as' presented without criteria. It's a *something* transformed into a *nothing*. Still it's a particular *something* isn't it? Every undentity is, in fact, an identity. An identity that has been distorted and all but destroyed in its meaning yes, but an identity no less. Now, do you suppose the logical framework at the root of all language, that of reason, governs its use and particulars? Do you suppose there are any hard and fast rules governing identity? Well yes dear reader, there are.

### The Duality of Identity: The Fusion of the Two 'I's

Identity represents the result of the process of justifying one's own existence as something. It's a culmination of all the necessary criteria and their interactions with each other which develops a meaning that we then attribute to ourselves. That's a bit esoteric. Perhaps it's easier to understand

identity as how objectivity and subjectivity interact with each other. Since 'I' is shared between the axioms 'I exist' and 'I am right' that 'I' represents a duality. It is a claim of existence and it is a claim of truth using one's own self as a point of reference. 'I exist' is the claim that this reference point, the self, exists while 'I am right' is anything regarded as true using this point of reference, even the nature of this reference point. In this way it's a matter that operates in the objective realm and the subjective one. It's both a claim of existence and a claim of the perception of that existence. So with identity ultimately an attempt to justify 'I' and the duality it represents, identity shares in this duality somewhat. That isn't to say that an identity is a duality, but rather in attempting to justify a duality it must justify both aspects of it. As such identity, any identity, is founded upon both objective and subjective criteria and for this reason the criteria for an identity can be differentiated as either one. This allows us to split every single identity into two facets. Call them an objective identity and a subjective identity respectively. In this way we can determine what is true or fact regarding any claim of identity and what is merely perceptual, what is just self-referential, what is merely self-righteous. The beauty in this ability to discriminate the objective from subjective is that it affords us a unique opportunity. An opportunity not only to determine the subjective aspect of one's identity, but to actually examine the rationale for it. A rationale that goes unrecognized by the ideologue and the skeptic alike. But it's even better than that. Since identity, this means of ex post facto justification is designed to substantiate 'I' and nothing else prior, it represents *the end* of what is a near-infinite layering of any self-righteous ex post facto justifications. In essence, matters of identity are the *body of their hydra of excuses*. It's the very core of their subjectivity. It's where they first transform the objective, demonstrable reality, into the subjective. It's where *what is* becomes *what they are*.

But how does that help us? How does knowledge of this psychological primordial soup that transforms the objective into the subjective help us fight ideology? How do we strike against it? Simple. It allows us to disprove opinion. Disprove not subjectivity itself, but the claims therein. But that's impossible right? You can't disprove an opinion. You can't disprove someone's belief that something is 'good' or that they value it. You can't disprove someone's preferences, someone's standards. Or can you? *Time* will tell.

Identity: What Was, What May Be, Thus What Is

Throughout this work you've no doubt observed my use of the term 'standardized'. Standardized behaviors, standardized principles, standardized concepts, and standardized identities. While I imagine we share the same definition and so use of the term we hardly share the same understanding of it. I employed the term as the notion of objective definitions or 'true words' is nonsense. Language, at the level of our employ, is hopelessly interpretable and so subjective. Yet even the term 'standardized' begs the question as to whose authority ultimately determines it. Is it a matter of mere popularity or is it a matter of some scholastic authority? Furthermore how is a standard any less subjective? What distinction does it offer from mere subjectivity? Well first, there is no ultimate authority that determines a standard and neither does consensus play any role. Neither does this matter. Secondly standardization, as the term itself implies, is descriptive of a process rather than a mere proclamation. Standardization is the process through which something is determined which is then represented by some word, which is then proclaimed. The process is understandably simple given it's a basic function of reason. It's just a combination of two or more criteria. That's it. A woman is a human female. A fireman is a human male firefighter. On and on it goes. Criteria too are determined through this same process of standardization since every single criterion is itself a standard, not unlike every cause is itself an effect of some prior one and for the same reason. A woman is a human with an XX chromosomal pair. Fire is an exothermic chemical reaction resulting from the combination of some substance with oxygen. You get the idea.

What's important to note is that any standard must include a minimum of two criteria. So consider how undentity seeks to remove such criteria. Feminists would have you believe that 'woman' exists by virtue of proclamation alone. That it isn't descriptive of a belief, behavior, purpose, or even biology. So in reality any undentity is absolutely and entirely impossible. That is to say, it is impossible to standardize and thus to represent. But we know this already. While it's helpful in understanding ideologues and so useful in demonstrating their irrationality to observers, this doesn't help to combat them. It doesn't until you recognize the particular characteristic inherent to a standard.

As stated a standard is made up of some criteria which are themselves standards and so on. It's the infinite regress of discrimination, differentiation, of the process of individuation, all a reflection of our understanding of cause and effect. Molecules are made from atoms made from protons, neutrons, and electrons, themselves made from quarks, etc. The key lies in recognizing that a standard is necessarily descriptive of a *process* rather than a *state of being*. Standardization doesn't determine *what* something

is but rather *how* something is. How someone is a woman is also how they are a human female which is also how they are a mammal and so on. In essence, while a standard is absolutely representative of what something is, that 'what' is achieved as a product of something else. That 'what' is a result of prior criteria. Hence it's an outcome, a result, an *effect* of some prior *cause*. For this reason standards, even if subjectively developed and chosen, can actually fall under objective scrutiny because they represent a claim of existence. Basically, standards are claims of effects. Effects that are wholly demonstrable and so provable one way or the other.

#### Standards: Claims of Process and Prediction

A standard represents both *what* and *how* something is. Given that language is fundamentally designed to describe reality, that 'what' is necessarily descriptive of an effect in reality. Ergo that effect is demonstrable. Furthermore how it is achieved can also be objectively determined. What a standard is, when presented *without* any self-righteousness, is essentially a hypothesis. It is a prediction as to what has created a particular effect or a prediction as to what will create a particular effect. Though when presented *with* self-righteousness, necessarily a self-referential perception of truth, a standard is a conclusion rather than a prediction. It's like the scientific method in this regard. 'What' is the conclusion and 'how' is the hypothesis. So basically a standard is 'how something is what'. It's how an outcome is brought about be that outcome a woman, an explosion, or a characteristic like leadership. Yet since our standards are necessarily self-referential they are also self-righteous. They are *our* standards after all. Ergo the predictions inherent to our standards, our understanding of 'how something is what', are to us statements of truth. They aren't nearly as humble as a hypothesis nor recognized as mere prediction. For this reason any standard we possess is itself a specific claim as to what will achieve a specific outcome. Therefore all standards are entirely demonstrable and thus fall under the realm of objective scrutiny.

This doesn't mean standards are wholly objective matters of course. The subjective aspects of a standard are word choice, the construction of the hypothesis, and the choice of what outcomes to reference with regard to the hypothesis. The subjective aspects of a standard are all a matter of choice and naturally we cannot disprove a choice. Yet while how one chooses to construct a standard is entirely

subjective, the materials of this construction, the criteria, the effects, are all entirely demonstrable in reality. Hence an opinion, and the standard it necessarily represents, can actually be disproven. Well, disproven only insofar as the predicted outcome fails to manifest.

See dear reader, it's time that disproves our opinions. It's time that can bring about the outcomes we reference through our standards – or not. It's only in the future that the subjectivity of our standards is allowed to persist. Though really it's no wonder considering that matters of objectivity, of fact and truth, are necessarily matters of the past. I mean, there are no such things as future facts or objective predictions. Objectivity has always been a matter of the past, of fact. With that subjectivity has always been a matter of the future, of prediction. No really.

Take the concept of preference. Dare I say the purest manifestation of subjectivity that exists? Even preference is a matter of prediction. You prefer something for the outcome it creates. Typically the end-goal is that of happiness though such happiness may be the result of several necessary outcomes all of which are preferred for the sake of achieving that ultimate outcome. While happiness is very much personal, it's still a 'what' determined through 'how'. It's yet another standard. Why we may not recognize why something brings us happiness or indeed not be in control of the emotional state itself, there nevertheless exists criteria necessary to its achievement hence making happiness a standard all its own. Even happiness operates as a matter of prediction and so our understanding of cause and effect. So as a matter of prediction, the passage of time is able to make true our predictions – or not. In this way time and the facts it brings is able to alter our opinions. We may call this an effect of experience, often times bitter, but it's really the disillusionment of our self-righteous beliefs, that of our opinions being proven wrong, that forces us to alter them.

So we may prefer something for the better part of a decade and then no longer prefer it based on a new outcome it produces or a different understanding of the outcome it had previously produced. Unhealthy eating is a prime example. The preference for unhealthy foods may persist for decades until the result of this preference, poor health, may have one spurn this preference altogether. Not only that but the new outcome produced through this preference may have one retroactively label their prior preference, and the prediction inherent to it of 'it will make me happy', as a false prediction. It is also at such times one will claim that their preference 'wasn't worth it'. This is an act of grading their levels of happiness throughout their life and even an evaluation of the necessity for happiness altogether. So hardly sought

for its own sake, happiness can itself be evaluated and ultimately discarded as a necessary pursuit. It's just another outcome after all. Though still, given another decade and the new outcome it produces for the individual, they may change their opinion all over again. Since every opinion is a communication of a standard, or several standards culminating in a single opinion, and each standard represents a prediction, every alteration in opinion is done in response to a particular outcome in an effort to predict, and hopefully achieve, a new one. So opinions are free to change not just *with* time but *because* of it.

### Opinion: Not an Excuse, Not a Justification

The claim 'it's just my opinion' is designed as a deflection of criticism by appealing to the self-righteousness inherent to all our beliefs. I've said as much. But now that we understand opinions as not only a matter of perspective but of prediction, we can recognize a more insidious nature to this appeal. That is, 'it's just my opinion' isn't merely a deflection but a mask, concealing the intentions of those who employ it and with that the true nature of opinions themselves. See, with an opinion a matter of prediction it is necessarily a matter of purpose too. That is, an opinion is both representative of a particular outcome to be achieved, a purpose, but also a reason to believe it, again a purpose.

When someone makes a prediction they are claiming how some outcome will be achieved. Call this 'how' [Y]. Call this outcome [X]. So [Y] is given the purpose of achieving [X] or in other words, the purpose of [Y] is to achieve [X]. Naturally [Y] may not achieve [X] in reality, but the belief remains regardless. This belief is what we call intention. The purpose we attribute to something is our intention for it. Be it a sandwich to sate our hunger or an umbrella to shield us from the rain and all the actions taken therein. So an opinion isn't merely some innocuous manifestation of our perception but a manifestation of our predictions and so intentions. My opinion on something, whatever it is, will determine my actions insofar as I seek to achieve the outcome of the prediction my opinion references. Furthermore it will also dictate my tolerance and even support for the actions of others who seek to achieve this same outcome. For this reason an opinion is a statement of purpose. It's a claim of personal intention. 'It's just my opinion' is the deflection used to *mask* this intention from being discovered, often by the claimant himself who prefers such motivations remain subconscious. If the deflection fails and the criticism of one's opinion continues unabated it can be met with, 'I just do', in reference to the belief

communicated through the opinion. This is so much a statement of self-righteousness. 'I just do' is a claim of existence, at least of self-referential truth, made without reference to and indeed without any need for prior justification and thus criteria. Hence 'I just do' is a claim of axiomatic existence. For this reason this claim is better interpreted as, 'I just *am*', since it's merely the expression of self-righteousness. Anything one 'just does' is something one perceives themselves as 'just being'. For this reason any action or belief, any opinion one has that is expressed in such a matter is necessarily ideological and should be treated as such. It has formed an identity. They are akin to an 'adult not responsible for their poverty' who, when questioned as to why they are poor would answer, "I just am."

But so what if someone believes the purpose of [Y] is to achieve [X]? Why is masking one's intention so insidious? It's insidious because intention is actionable. It's because we're not so divorced from the process through which these outcomes are achieved. In fact, we're wholly a part of this process. We're entirely involved. An opinion determines your actions or as a matter of ex post facto justification, your actions determine your opinion. You may not believe it, but every opinion is a matter of action. Simply put, opinion determines interaction. Of course it does. Even something as simple as your opinion as to what constitutes a seat will have you act accordingly. Look around yourself right now. What can be sat upon? What would be comfortable? What would you be comfortable in labeling a seat that typically isn't? Furthermore what could be used as a weapon? As a lever? As a fulcrum? Notice that in the expansion of all around you into different and perhaps atypical categories, you're necessarily evaluating them with reference to particular outcomes. In other words, you're attributing a purpose to something thereby developing it into something else. As I said, the essence of standardization is a process of 'how something is what'. Of course, we're unable to transform a chair into gas or a metal lamp into wood by virtue of attributing to it some purpose. That is a matter of existence, of fact, and thus divorced from the subjective aspect of standardization. Once a lamp it has always *been* a lamp. Once a past it isn't a future. Sure, burn wood, melt ice and you transform its state, but through an action, a physical *process*. Not a perceptual one. Not a subjective one. Not through the attribution of purpose. We can't change the effect of its current composition, but we can certainly predict its effect in the future and of its composition therein. See, whatever purpose we choose for something determines its role in achieving that outcome. Furthermore our effort to manifest this outcome determines our own actions, our interaction based on our opinion. So it determines our role as well. From the mundane to the fantastical, the only limit on this evaluation is our own imagination. All you need is an effect of your choosing that you then treat as causal to some predicted outcome of your choosing. Though only limited

by our imagination, objective criteria nevertheless remain divorced from subjective criteria. With the necessary inclusion of time, this process distinguishes between cause and effect and so objective criteria and subjective criteria as well. Objective criteria being the effect treated as causal to the subjective criteria, the predicted outcome we chooses to relate the effect to.

So all that said, all this exploration of standards, prediction, opinions, of subjectivity and objectivity and of matters of the past and future, what on earth does this say about identity? Well dear reader, it's simple. Tell me, what's a reader and what makes him dear?

### Identity: Attributions of Purpose

The false equivalency between the objective and subjective criteria for identity has generated a pervasive misunderstanding of identity. While we rightfully hold both aspects as necessary to forming an identity, we do not differentiate them. At least not with any consistency. Without this necessary differentiation we're lead to believe objective criteria may operate in the same fashion as subjective criteria and vice versa. We're lead to believe that matters of preference and value, matters of *mattering to something*, all of which rely on some predicted outcome, can be ascribed to objective criteria like race and sex.

This takes the form of ambiguous claims like 'Black Lives Matter', 'Women are great', 'Femininity is valuable', etc. Of course the question begged from these is why? Why are women great? Why is femininity valued and what do black lives matter to? This ultimately is a reflection of the need to justify any identity through 'As?' Without some outcome to reference we cannot determine what women or black lives or femininity matter to let alone how, or rather for what reason, we may value them. For us to do so we must attribute to them purpose. We must transform them into subjective criteria as well. We must complete the duality necessary to any identity.

Consider that you may certainly prefer whites or value women, but for what? For what reason though ultimately for what purpose? Should you value either you are necessarily attributing to them some outcome to be achieved through them; particularly through your interaction with them. They come to

matter for a reason, for a purpose, by your own standard. You take the objective criterion, be it race or sex, and through your attribution of purpose transform it into a subjective one as well. You complete the duality necessary for it to become an identity rather than a lone aspect of it. So now that these objective criteria have some purpose attributed to them, some outcome that is predicted to be achieved through them and through your interaction with them, you can form an opinion on them. Not only of their composition, of what makes a woman or a man or a white or black or whatever as a matter of physical composition. But of how these compositions, these objective criteria, then come to affect reality.

Identity as an attribution of purpose is as simple to demonstrate as listing as many identities as you can. Leader, healer, worker, killer, soldier, jumper, speaker, baker, butcher, operator, the list goes on and on. In essence, they all describe an action and the actor responsible for it. In fact, they describe the actor through the action itself. The necessary duality of identity, akin to the fusion of the two 'I's. Furthermore characteristics like humble, arrogant, kind, charitable, irritable, nosy, and rebellious all describe an action with reference to a particular outcome. They are all of them effects of actors, otherwise known as behaviors. For this reason identity is always a description of an agent's exercise of agency. I've dubbed this, 'to '-er' is human'.

Naturally there is no way to transform 'woman' or 'black' into actions or behaviors in and of themselves. Just ask yourself, 'What is the effect of 'woman' and of 'black?' There aren't any effects. This is why treating these categories as though they produce effects results in a non sequitur often labeled prejudicial or discriminatory. For example, 'Blacks steal from others.' Some blacks do. Others don't. 'Black' is irrelevant to theft but not exclusionary. That is to say, blackness doesn't determine thievery one way or the other. Now were I to claim, 'Thieves steal from others', I've not committed any logical fallacy. I've merely attributed to thieves the action that defines their identity. I've correctly attributed to them their purpose. We cannot do this with race and sex as these are entirely matters of existence, of fact, of objective and demonstrable reality. Apart from maintaining their own existence as their given race and sex respectively, not unlike an atom maintains its existence as an atom, all produce no secondary outcome. In essence, they are their own outcome. They are matters of the past, of objective reality. There is nothing to predict 'as an effect of sex' or 'as an effect of race'. They aren't causal to anything. Their composition is the entirety of their influence.

Look around you once more. Consider how everything can be used as a seat, a torch, a weapon, a wall – anything. Now consider how they may be used as a woman or as a black. It's a non sequitur exactly because you're attempting to equate objective criteria with subjective criteria. You're essentially attempting to substitute a purpose, an effect, with a cause. A seat, a torch, a weapon, and a wall all have purpose attributed to them. Race and sex, as of this era, do not. However, should you have subjective criteria for race or sex you most certainly can use things around you as a woman or as a black. Just relate those things to the same outcome you attribute to woman and black. Use things around you for the same purpose. Interact with them in the same fashion; the same means to effect the same predicted ends. *Treat* them similarly.

#### Attributing Purpose: Our Intention for Others

To better distinguish objective criteria from subjective criteria I've described the former as a matter of composition and the latter as a prediction. Presented as such it is a false dichotomy though nevertheless reflective of the true one. As discussed the true dichotomy is that of the past and the future so in truth any matter of the past can operate as an objective criterion. This can be an object, an action, anything. That said the prediction inherent to subjective criteria needn't always be a matter of the future right now but one relative to the objective criterion. Remember that this entire process relies on our understanding of cause and effect. To determine standards, opinions, purposes, and identities are all matters of establishing causal relationships. Ergo the subjective criterion, the predicted outcome as the effect of some objective criterion, need only develop at any point after the objective criterion exists, after it produces this effect. In this way we're able to maintain opinions regarding the past insofar as the truth isn't entirely understood and thus objective. So for example, we're free to form our opinion as to what caused the collapse of Rome or more topically, what is responsible for feminist beliefs. What we aren't able to do however, at least not reasonably, is maintain an opinion where the outcome is entirely known to us and thus objective. We can't maintain the opinion that it didn't rain yesterday when it did, that the sun didn't rise yesterday and neither the day before, when such opinions are disproven by our own knowledge of the contrary.

While all opinions can be disproven given enough knowledge, some will forever lack this knowledge and so persist in our ignorance. Be that ignorance in the past or ironically as a matter of *fact*, the future. So long as it isn't known it cannot be disproven. Hence subjectivity is always allowed to persist and exist in the future but only insofar as that which it references, the predictions inherent to our subjectivity, aren't known. It's really knowledge that determines what is objective and what is subjective. Where objectivity can be determined and where subjectivity can exist and persist. Though of course this is true. If we knew the future we'd know the truth of our predictions therein. So since prediction references the unknown, that which we are ignorant of be it the future as of now or a future result of some cause long past, claims of intention are wrought from this same ignorance.

In focussing our understanding of objective criteria as the cause in a causal relationship, we're free to explore our ascription of identity to others, our attribution of intention to others, in a more demonstrative manner. One that doesn't result in the non sequiturs provided through race and sex or the obvious tautology in, for example, describing a thief as one who thieves. So we take as our example Howard and Watson.

Howard has cut off Watson's arm. How and why and under what circumstance this act has been performed isn't known. All that is known is that Howard has removed Watson's arm in some fashion. This act has earned Howard the identity of dismemberer. With or without his intention the effect of Howard's actions has resulted in Watson's loss of limb. Ergo Howard has dismembered Watson earning Howard the eponymous identity. The causal relationship is established and known making Howard's identity as a dismemberer what I would dub an Objective Identity. Consider that while Howard's intentions are entirely unknown he, like all of us, acted according to his own predictions. Such is the nature of our interaction with the world. Even if unintended, even if something entirely accidental, the outcome of Watson's severed arm is the demonstrable result of Howard's interaction with Watson. Now, prior to this result we as observers could have predicted all sorts of possible outcomes for their interaction. Inherent to these predictions are the identities we'd grant both Howard and Watson. Of course these identities would be entirely subjective and in time ultimately disproven, save for those of us who correctly predicted this disarming outcome. Though regardless of any *eventual* truth in our predictions, they aren't ever true nor should be considered as such. They become true by virtue of manifesting in reality, in demonstrating, in becoming objectively determinable. When what was once a Subjective Identity becomes an objective one, an Objective Identity.

Yet the question remains, how do we *judge* Howard? What do we make of this dismemberer? Well we can't make anything of him – literally. We can't exercise judgment without the ascription of some subjective criterion. We can't judge Howard without predicting some new outcome of his past action. We can't attribute to him any personal intention nor any subsequent purpose for his behavior. We can't create an associated identity for Howard, necessarily a subjective one. Hence we literally cannot make anything of him. We cannot attribute to him a Subjective Identity. Well, we can't unless we craft a scenario that his actions may operate within thereby allowing us to attribute to him some intention. Let's try this now.

- 1) Watson suffered from gangrene and Howard amputated his arm to save his life. Howard is a healer.
- 2) Watson was trapped under the flaming wreckage of his crashed automobile. Howard, acting quickly, severed Watson's arm to save him from a fiery fate. Howard is a rescuer and first-responder.
- 3) Watson has offered his arm in the first-ever human arm transplant and Howard is performing the operation. Howard is a surgeon.
- 4) Watson has stolen yet another cookie from the cookie jar so Howard has removed Watson's arm to dissuade him from any future transgressions. Howard is a disciplinarian.
- 5) Howard and Watson are enemies fighting on either side of some conflict. Howard has used a grenade in an effort to kill Watson, tearing away his arm in the explosion. Howard is a soldier.
- 6) Watson has attempted to rob Howard at gunpoint and Howard, armed with his trusty arming sword, has lopped off Watson's arm in an act of self defense. Howard is a defender.
- 7) Howard has trapped Watson in his dungeon and has sliced off his arm to revel in Watson's pain and to sate his murderous urges. Howard is as of now an attempted murderer.
- 8) Howard has separated Watson from his arm in an effort to extract information from Watson, his being an enemy spy. Howard is a torturer.

Note that there is certainly some crossover between these scenarios. More than once Howard is likely a sadist as he is a savior. As with matters of dismemberment we're keen to predict the survival of the maimed individual which itself offers new subjective identities for Howard regarding this new Objective Identity, that of killer. But in moving that one step forward in time we're selecting for Howard a new

objective criterion. We're developing for him a new causal relationship for the death of Watson by Howard's hand. We can keep doing this, predicting more and more future outcomes of Howard's actions, in order to craft Howard into well, anything. Again, the only limit is our own imagination. This act of justifying an identity, even one that isn't our own, has us attribute to Howard any number of intentions, actions, and outcomes thereby crafting him into whatever we see fit or desire. Naturally this is the great danger in identity crafting since we're rarely so objective about this process. Given that it is necessarily a matter of prediction the only thing we can be objective about regarding prediction is our knowledge that it is just that, prediction. In essence, our objectivity lies in recognizing our limitations and thus ignorance, which is rather difficult considering the self-righteous nature of this entire process. Therefore humility is our best defense against crafting a false identity for Howard.

The example of Howard and Watson is certainly a simpler version of attributing purpose and so identity to individuals, but nevertheless follows the same process. Increasing the available information increases the number of objective criteria, the number of variables, which serves to complicate this process though not necessarily the conclusion. More variables means more considerations, but some may be so indicative of the true identity of Howard that they serve to simplify the conclusion regardless of the greater complexity of the scenario. A video and audio recording of Howard's interaction with Watson provides a plethora of information but very much narrows the possible identities for Howard, mainly confined to and defined by his full intentions which, to be fair, can never truly be known.

In summary, while a Subjective Identity requires intention it nevertheless references the actions of some actor or as I said, an agent's exercise of agency. So too does an Objective Identity reference an agent's exercise of agency. At their most basic an Objective Identity is what was done, necessarily some effect, and a Subjective Identity is the purpose of this, some future effect, some resultant outcome. An Objective Identity is thus treated as causal to a Subjective Identity revealing the nature of identity itself as a representation of a causal relationship. The objective aspect of an identity is the cause and the subjective aspect is the effect. Given the requirements of any causal relationship, indeed of cause and effect itself, and the necessity of an identity to refer to an individual, identity is thus a description of an effect of an individual. This translates into the actions of the individual otherwise known as their behaviors. Hence identity is a description of an agent's exercise of agency. Perhaps we require some new word to represent the necessary duality of an identity with regard to both objective and subjective criteria, or perhaps we need to understand the distinctions between these criteria insofar as they

describe an individual. Either way, this understanding is paramount should we seek to end the pervasive misunderstanding of identity.

### Identity Crafting: All the World's a Story

So consider how you engage in the process of identity crafting every day. Recognize how your attribution of identity to others is so much an attribution of purpose to their actions and so to themselves. Consider that in your ignorance you craft for others identities that while founded on the objective criteria, their actions which you observe, are themselves only predictions. Lastly consider that your predictions may be compromised by that which you desire. In other words, the outcomes you prefer to occur can easily be attributed to others rather than that which is more reasonable. Call it a falsifying optimism. Allied Projection is a great example of this wherein you attribute to others the same understanding of and so purpose of a mutually shared identity. Consider also a narcissist who may attribute to others an envy of herself thereby validating her narcissism. Even a young man may attribute to a woman an infatuation with himself thus supporting his desire for and so belief in a mutual sexual interest between them rather than in truth, an unrequited one.

Now, does this entire process seem somewhat familiar, that of crafting an identity? It's an act of justification, an act of attributing to others particular purposes and so roles, and of developing a scenario in which these can be made logically – not necessarily reasonably, manifest. It's Narrative Crafting. Indeed, such narratives have always had more to do with the actors within them rather than the scenario itself. As we've seen through the Victim, Threat, and Submission Narratives the goal is to craft for others particular identities rather than to craft a scenario for its own sake. The scenario only serves to provide some logical foundation for everyone's respective attribution of purpose and so identity. For this reason the prevalence of the Victim, Threat, and Submission Narratives becomes fairly obvious. Given that identity is descriptive of, at its most basic, a causal relationship, narratives founded on victimization and perpetration are easily adapted to the process of identity crafting. In essence, matters of victimization and perpetration are matters of action and reaction, of cause and effect. Though naturally one needn't be a victim nor a perpetrator within a causal relationship which is why the Victim Narrative begins as denial. A denial of one's role in creating their current state of affairs though

ultimately a denial of their responsibility for it. It begins as a claim of one being reactive rather than active, of being a non-agent or object acted upon by some ambiguous force. Hence undentity, identity without standardization, identity without reference to criteria though especially without reference to one's exercise of agency, is the origin of one's sense of victimization which is, in truth, self-inflicted.

While this exploration of identity and its origins was likely new, at least insofar as its depth is concerned, I imagine it wasn't unfamiliar. Its revelations hardly revelatory and its introduction of new perspectives hardly foreign to us. This is again because of the universality of this material. It is founded on a logical framework that regardless what beliefs are generated through it necessarily operate within it. So that said is there a concept that ties together identity and an agent's exercise of agency? Well yes, of course there is. It's responsibility. Your exercise of agency and all the effects generated from it is that which you are responsible for. In the same way an identity refers to a specific agent's exercise of agency so too does responsibility refer to a specific agent's exercise of agency. This is why we could not and still cannot hold race and sex *responsible* for one's actions. Simply put, race and sex aren't an individual's responsibility. They aren't a result of their exercise of agency ergo they aren't responsible for any effect an individual creates. Sure race and sex are matters of composition, they *comprise* the individual, but the individual is in no way responsible for them. It's really that simple. Should you consider responsibility as a matter of one's exercise of agency, you can determine all that they are reasonably responsible for. Of course, responsibility is necessarily a matter of the past. It is that which you effected, that which you have created. Ergo while responsibility is most certainly core to one's identity and necessarily descriptive of their exercise of agency, it's an objective criterion. We may attempt to predict what one may be responsible for thus establishing a Subjective Identity, but what one is truly responsible for is always objectively determinable.

"In reality, a 'who' can be identified as an individual according to what it does as such actions are themselves objectively demonstrable. Such actions are better understood as effects. Thus 'who' only characterizes the ability to effect, understood as agency, and a particular 'who' is the one who created a particular effect, exercised their agency to create a particular result, understood as their identity. Perhaps this seems convoluted, but this linking of 'who' with 'what', or rather the establishing of a 'who' from a 'what', is how we determine identity. In essence, 'who' merely describes agency which is something we all possess. The 'what's' that were done are the effect of our respective exercises of our agency. This is better understood as

our responsibility. Responsibility represents our understanding of the need to distinguish and so establish an agent by their exercise of agency. From here we label their responsibility, or rather what they are responsible for, as some identity be it healer, leader, killer, soldier, etc. For this reason...matters of responsibility are entirely a black and white issue. They describe only what you effected which is, in truth, any of what you've experienced."

The black and white nature of responsibility is due to its nature as an objective criterion. As a matter of fact it is therefore either true or false. Responsibility can best be understood as one's 'legacy of effect on reality' or as one's 'legacy of affecting reality'. Consider the reality in which you exist, obviously this one. Now consider a reality in which you did not. The difference between these realities is your legacy. All of reality that changes due to your existence is that which you are responsible for. Naturally this seems absurd given that one's existence especially as an infant or child can have innumerable consequences all of which we wouldn't normally claim as one's responsibility. This absurdity is of our own making however. It's created through yet another false equivalency, another conflation. We're conflating blame with responsibility. Blame is our application of subjective standards to objective reality. It's the subjective aspect of identity crafting, typically associated with guilt. It has no bearing on what one is objectively responsible for insofar as their self is concerned. Though granted this doesn't stop us from applying our own standards to that which one is responsible for, which is why blame and the subjective identity crafted through its application must be determined through one's exercise of agency rather than their mere existence. In other words, one's identity must describe one's responsibility, but only with regard to their exercise of agency. Otherwise according to the Butterfly Effect we'd all be technically to blame for everything that occurs. Only able to divvy up our respective guilt rather than to dismiss it or accept it completely. Some call that sin. Others call it privilege.

For this reason, any identity that could be created through our application of subjective standards to one's objective responsibility must be based in their responsibility *as an effect of their agency alone*, not their existence. This is again why race and sex aren't identities themselves but instead objective criteria that can be used to form a true identity through the attribution of subjective criteria, the attribution of purpose to race and sex respectively. It's also why matters of guilt are necessarily subjective rather than objective.

This deepens our understanding of the phenomenon of what is called, but rarely is, Victim Blaming. As I said, a victim of rape is no less responsible for it than the rapist but nevertheless the rapist is entirely guilty. Rape is a particular outcome of their interaction that we, in the West, have made illegal and

punishable thus forming a subjective standard. Their involvement in the rape, regardless of their consent to the act, is a matter of fact. In claiming that both are responsible for it we are simply claiming that both are required for and so created the scenario; obviously necessary in any case of victimization. Consent is irrelevant to responsibility. Only their respective exercises of agency in crafting the situation matter.

In recognizing the agency of either party we're free to predict or even objectively demonstrate means of prevention, given enough knowledge of the situation. We're also free to attribute to either party their respective identities, that of victim and perpetrator. Without any such recognition of agency the attribution of either's identity becomes, predictably, an attribution of undentity. The victim becomes a non-agent, a 'forever victim' to the actions of agents. Due to this, all agents become 'forever perpetrators', victimizing 'forever victims' through *any* exercise of agency that can be *perceived* as affecting them. Call it micro-aggression. It thus becomes an ideological matter and succumbs to the same traits which characterize ideologies. Hence the 'Slut-Walk' as a simultaneous means of denying personal agency as well as validating one's undentity. Also the entirety of feminist rape advocacy as an exercise in masturbatory self-righteousness.

As I've come to do after complicating these matters through this analysis, is there a simple way to sum up what an identity is? Yes. Simply put, an identity is a role – always. Your identity is a seemingly paradoxical progressive culmination of your affect on reality. Every second of everyday manifests new identities for you whilst shaping the near-limitless possibilities of your future horizons. Your identity is your purpose in and for the world. It is ultimately determined by your actions, not your intentions. Nevertheless to choose a purpose and so an identity, whether you would achieve it or not, is merely to intend and to intend is to recognize both one's responsibility and one's agency; to recognize both their legacy and their ability to craft it.

'All the world's a stage, And all the men and women merely players; They have their exits and their entrances, And one man in his time plays many parts'. – William Shakespeare

Naked Ideology: The Ego-Centric Model of the Universe

So what is an ideology? What is it from beginning to end, from the very first belief to the last? An ideology is the narrative crafted to ex post facto justify a non-criterial identity, an undentity. Since we are all fundamentally self-righteous by virtue of the axiom 'I am right' as a necessary corollary to 'I exist', we forever view ourselves as our reference point for truth. In essence we, our individual selves, will always and forever be right. This is subjectivity. Yet we are all possessed of subjectivity hence subjectivity alone, with it the axiom 'I am right', isn't enough to form an ideology. We all think of ourselves as ourselves along with the axiomatic nature of our respective selves. We are ourselves, always. It is only when we attempt to extend the axiomatic nature of self into some other term, a term designed as ex post facto justification for ourselves as the answer to what we are, that we create an ideology. So this pseudo-self, this placeholder self, is born. While not treated as such this pseudo-self is, in fact, an ex post facto justification rather than a legitimate answer, a legitimate understanding of the self. In order to treat this ex post facto justification as their self, ideologues remove the criteria necessary to forming any standard for it. In essence, they have divorced this pseudo-self from any objective and even subjective means by which it can be determined, discriminated, and individuated. Now in the same fashion the self just exists, that it is axiomatic, this pseudo-self is seen to just exist too. With that, ideologues believe that they are these pseudo-selves, these ideological identities, by virtue of nothing other than belief. Yet because this ideological identity is in truth a corrupted identity, an ex post facto justification stripped of all criteria, it still requires logical justification based on observable, demonstrable, objective criteria. In this way such ideological identities, such undentities, must still submit themselves to reason which threatens to destroy them. To reveal them to be the irrational and impossible, the anti-objective creations that they are. Hence a perpetual need for validation is born the moment an undentity is created. This takes the form of social substantiation since the objective substantiation that is evidence i.e. criteria must remain denied as necessary to defining the undentity. Otherwise the identity would become rooted in objective reality and eliminate the axiomatic nature the ideologue attempts to uphold. This fuels the tribalism inherent to ideological belief. The 'evidence' that is the similar belief, the actions, and even just the existence of others. Finally since reason itself operates as a means of discerning and understanding objective reality, reason itself becomes a threat to their undentity. As a methodology its employ can only result in the destruction of their undentity. With reason fundamentally the means by which truth is determined, an opposing methodology for justification develops in the ideologue. Thus denial becomes a necessary component to the maintenance of their belief which develops into defense mechanisms such as projection and circular reasoning.

So ideologues have taken for themselves a false self that must be forever claimed as true and as truth itself. It is not shaped by their actions as it does not rely on them. It is always their truth and as such isn't affected by any of what they do, only that which they believe. In essence, it is not and cannot be affected by reality as it is a belief made entirely divorced from reality and in opposition to our ability to interpret and understand reality, that of reason itself. So for example, no matter what the socialist ideologue does they will always view themselves as a socialist. Nothing they do defines their ideological identity. Nothing they do can strip them of that identity. They may craft a narrative to ex post facto justify their socialism through claims of ambiguous purpose and intention, but these are entirely superficial and ultimately irrelevant. They don't matter because by definition nothing *matters* to their ideological identity as a socialist. Without describing some effect in reality, their socialism literally doesn't matter to anything; doesn't affect anything. Importantly, since this pseudo-self operates at one removed from the self, it may be claimed by others. Others cannot claim to be you but can claim the same pseudo-identity, the same undentity, resulting in a collective made manifest through Allied Projection. A collective ironically based on a single self, a collective of the self-righteous.

A non-ideological person shapes their axiomatic self through their actions and their understanding of those actions, of what is their responsibility and what is not. They claim for themselves an identity or several identities based on standards, standards themselves representative of causal relationships operating in reality. They understand that their self, in lieu of any standards and the criteria necessary to them, isn't their identity. It's merely their reference point. They understand that an identity exists according to criteria – as does everything. Hence to them their identity isn't some absolute truth but rather an identity is itself true, is standardized, and thus something that may then achieve and maintain. No identity is granted through existence but rather earned through action. Call it character.

Ideological belief is fundamentally conviction operating with regard to one's entire identity and so self. There exists not a single criterion necessary to their identity hence it operates entirely divorced from reality and in fact, in denial of it. Any narrative crafted to justify this conviction ex post facto is a placeholder. It exists only because the logical framework of reason requires that we justify belief, that we standardize using criteria, in order to claim to believe something; literally *something* as opposed to nothing which anything non-criterial is by definition. Again, this makes such narratives superficial. They don't fulfill their purpose but rather fill a void. In truth, such narratives can be anything and what they become is merely reflective of tertiary beliefs an ideologue may hold such as a sense of superiority, a

love of ritual, hatred of Jews, etc. The primary belief, that of the non-criterial nature of their identity, forms the true belief system inherent to their ideology and that of all other ideologues. This belief system creates similar characteristics and behaviors across all ideologies, unifying them through a single system. A common purpose insidious in every sense of the word. This reveals that conviction is ultimately a belief system in and of itself and the one trait shared across all ideologies though indeed, defining all of them at their core. Divorced from their respective superficial narratives, all the actions of ideologues are designed to affirm and bolster their conviction as well as deny any means of objective scrutiny. Though most importantly to ensure that their undentity remains non-criterial and those who would claim it similarly treated as in possession of no defining criteria both within the ideology and without. Hence ideologues defining themselves through the other, the sinner, the privileged, the bourgeoisie. Crafting all perception of reality to permit their undentity.

In a single sentence, ideology is self-righteousness broken free from reason, indiscriminately applying itself to all of reality rather than sequestered to only ourselves. It is when all humility is lost and 'that's how I see it' becomes 'that's how it is.' Where reality becomes as axiomatic as yourself. Where reality becomes *your reality*. "All is because I am," the rallying battle-cry of the ideologue.

#### Standardizing the Fantastical: A Single, Crucial Vestige of Reality

So dear reader, why are we not all ideologues or at least not ideological in all matters? Why have we not all succumbed to the expansion of this single irrationality to all that we behold? It is because while we may attempt to perceive reality in any way we see fit to, we must still operate within it. We are forever exposed to its influence. Thus reason, despite how much we attempt to deny it, is always being bolstered by evidence. In this way objective reality is overwhelming, diminished only by our lack of capacity to understand it as well as our ability to deny it. But we cannot do this entirely. Objectivity creeps on, slowly but surely, gnawing away at whatever falsehoods we cling to.

With any denial of person agency, the moment we take credit for a single action in a chain of denial we reveal our agency to be complete. So too with our denial of what constitutes our identity. Such is the black and white nature of responsibility. The moment a single objective criterion is selected we begin to

craft a standard for our identity thus eliminating it as non-criterial, as an undentity altogether. Now the purpose we cite for our identity may remain entirely fantastical of course, especially insofar as it is designed to justify our axiomatic selves, but we are nevertheless creating a logical means through which this is accomplished. Naturally this means being based in objective, observable, demonstrable criteria, will ultimately terminate the undentity and any fantastical purposes for it, but we're ignorant of this. So in denial or ignorant of the nature of identity we engage in a behavior that will result in the inevitable destruction of undentity. Ironic that our attempt to substantiate a false identity will result in its falsification.

So we set a single action necessary for our undentity. From there another and then another and in time these behaviors come to submit themselves to objective reality through their interplay with each other. Say for example a behavior of storing food in order to last the winter. In order to accomplish this one must acquire enough food to store and also ration their food so as to not consume it all. Furthermore they must learn how to properly store it and, should they wish to increase the efficacy of this standard, to develop expertise in all the aforementioned areas. As is the case with Objectivity Creep, it begins to spread quickly and as is its nature, accord with reality despite the fantastical purpose it may be originally tasked in accomplishing. So given a few years an ideological collective may have created several demonstrable standards for their ideological identity all of which accord with reality and a true demonstrable purpose. Should this aid in their survival the ideology and the standards therein survive alongside the collective. This continues until a standard is seen to fail and thus not to accord with the 'truth' that is the ideological identity. Thus a change is made or in fact a schism is produced through those who wish to keep to this standard, those who do not, and amongst those who do not, those who develop differing standards in its place. Of course another camp remains, those who claim that this failed standard isn't integral to the ideological identity either way and thus allow others to engage in it or not. Though this effectively terminates the slow creep of objectivity through what was a form of trial and error. Where once an ideological identity was becoming increasingly standardized, it has lost a standard altogether drifting back into its non-criterial origins.

Simply put, schism results in three groups:

- 1) Those who would keep to the old standard.

- 2) Those who introduce new methods and thus new standards. This group may form several subgroups each with their own standards, their own way of doing things.
- 3) Those who remove the standard as a necessary criterion to their ideological identity.

The first group could be considered Traditionalists of sorts, sticking to the established means of substantiating their ideological identity. The second group and all subgroups within it as Reformers, altering the means of substantiation often in the attempt to achieve greater efficacy in the overall purpose of the ideological identity. The third group is of course the Nebulizers, removing the standard and so its criteria for the ideological identity.

After Objectivity Creep has resulted in schism and nebulization, you really have two main groups with regards to standardization. You have those that uphold standards and so criteria for the ideological identity – even if these standards have changed. You then have those who have discarded some standards and their associated criteria for the ideological identity. All are fundamentally self-righteous, all claim the same ideological identity, but the first group claims theirs' is the true one. They are the true Christian, the true conservative, the true Muslim, etc. The second groups claims only that the first group isn't right. True the second group holds the same ideological identity, they also claim to be a Christian or a socialist or a Muslim, but in refusing to standardize it or at least standardize it to the same extent, they claim only the unnecessary of the standards espoused by the first group. If they claim to be right at all, it is only because they claim the first group to be wrong. A false dichotomy to be sure, but entirely in keeping with the 'self vs other' dichotomy. Their evidence for their own claims of righteousness is the same evidence the first group uses to claim their own, just twisted to their purpose. In essence, that the first group has selected any criteria, any standards at all, is demonstrable proof that the first group is wrong and thus the second group is right or at least not wrong themselves. To them, the action of selecting a standard is itself wrong regardless what that standard may be. A pure manifestation of nebulization.

So with regard to the standard that created the schism, not the overall ideological identity itself, the second group only claims that the first group is wrong. They don't introduce their own standard, some new standard, but rather remove one altogether. Should they continue in this fashion through successive instances of schism, the second group will only ever claim something as unnecessary to their ideological identity thus trending toward complete undentity, completely non-criterial identity. The first

group in successive instances of schism will only claim more or different things, more or different standards, as necessary to their ideological identity thus trending it toward, though never reaching, a true identity. An identity founded entirely in objective reality and the demonstrable criteria within it.

So in the end, these two groups are distinguished first and foremost by their understanding of identity with regard to the necessity of standardization. Both groups' identity is fundamentally axiomatic, but the former seeks to standardize it while the latter refuses to. When you take the fundamental beliefs and behaviors of these two groups to their respective logical conclusions, you have all those who claim to be *right* and all those who are just *left* over after the schism. All your supposed principles and values within those camps are just that, supposed. They're ex post facto justifications. They're excuses. It's all a façade. This is the true origin of the Left and Right political binary.

CHAPTER 7 - The Political Binary Part 1:  
Individuation

## Introduction:

Throughout this treatise you've perhaps noticed a lack of definitive distinction between different types of ideologies, namely their disposition toward and indeed congruity with either the Left or Right sides of the political spectrum. Of course I've spoken of goal-orientation vs validation orientation and how the former can end while the latter is perpetual. Naturally this does accord with the Left and Right with the Left trending toward perpetual validation and the Right trending toward achieving particular goals. However, these aren't exclusive to either as they operate amongst ideologues. That is to say, ideologues don't act exclusively in either orientation but in some amalgamated form. There is no pure form of either, no pure Right or pure Left, at least insofar as they're expressed in practice as opposed to theory. Tellingly however, those of greater goal-orientation will label acts of validation as Left-leaning or Leftist and those of greater validation orientation mirror this behavior labeling goal-orientated actions and their practitioners as Right-leaning or Rightist. So while no pure form exists, no true Scotsman as it were, both types of ideologues can recognize the defining characteristic of both Left and Right ideologies insofar as they manifest in their respective behaviors.

This defining characteristic is their understanding and employ of standardization insofar as it justifies identity. One's position on this matter forms their relationship to their identity and with that their position on either the Left or Right side of political ideology. So it's not really a position. Rather it's reflective of how either engages in the process of justifying one's identity though ultimately how one develops their standards. Thus Left and Right don't describe positions but rather processes. These processes may produce positions as an effect of their respective ideologues developing their own conclusions, but ultimately both are methodologies rather than strict positions. Though it must be said that the Right submits itself to reality far more than the Left, given its reliance on standardization for developing identity. So that said the Right trends towards positions which reflect the truth while the Left trends towards denial; denial as opposed to pure fantasy. Pure fantasy would be reflective more of madness, of complete nonsense. Since both the Left and Right are fundamentally determined through their differing employ of standardization with regard to identity, both are inextricably tied to reason and so reality itself. The Right accords more with reality and the Left, taking the only other position, denies it. In essence those on the Right use the process of standardization to justify their identity. Those on the Left do not – at all. To be on the Left is to be without standard.

But how does this all come to form? All ideologies are fundamentally self-righteous so where does this split between Right ideologies and Left ideologies originate? Think about it. A *split* in an ideology that results in one group taking a position and another group taking no position at all?

Schism and nebulization. Funny how these little things keep becoming so damned important.

### Schism and Nebulization: Those Right and Those Left Over

Schism and nebulization are not simply the means by which an ideology ultimately self-destructs but are themselves a demonstration of the ideologue's relationship to their identity. It is actually quite simple though as ever has vast implications. First we address schism. As discussed schism is the phenomenon through which particular incongruities amongst the beliefs of ideologues are discovered and splits the community of ideologues according to those beliefs. You have Traditionalists who adhere to the old standards, if there even are any previously established standards, and a series of Reformers who adopt newer standards and alter the old. That is, if there are even any standards to reform. See, the first instance of schism in any ideology occurs only with regard to Allied Projection and the beliefs therein. In this first instance, the only belief that exists between ideologues is one of mutual belief in each individual's self-righteous claim of their collective ideological identity. There are no established standards. Nothing to discard, to alter, to dismiss, nothing to reform. Thus in the very first instance of a schism in any ideology there are no Traditionalists and no Reformers. They are all of them the initial progenitors of whatever standard they claim as necessary to the ideological identity. It is from this point on, where at least one standard exists for the ideological identity, that Traditionalists and Reformers can be produced through yet another schism. So in the first instance of a schism the groups produced are merely 'I' or 'us' and the other. Given an ideological collective based solely on Allied Projection alone it's little wonder that schism results in the self vs other dichotomy; exposing the basis and basics of that phenomenon. Yet as ever, the nebulizers exist from the very beginning and in every instance of schism no matter how established, no matter how standardized the ideology becomes. So long as there is one person who insists that such standards are irrelevant to the ideological identity, they engage in the process of nebulizing it.

So consider that in establishing a belief particular to an ideology and with said ideology necessarily used

to describe one's identity, lastly with one's identity ultimately a description of their effects in reality, this process is an implementation of some tangible goal for an ideologue. It becomes purposeful. It's a belief regarding the effect one must create in order to earn a particular identity. Suffice it to say, by establishing just one belief particular to the ideology and one that isn't so ambiguous as to operate entirely divorced from reality via Allied Projection, it also establishes a behavior particular to the ideology; a means of interaction with reality to achieve a particular outcome in reality. Basically an objective means, a demonstrable means of achieving and maintaining the identity is born rather than it being wholly non-criterial. With that a tangible goal for the ideology is crafted that isn't merely to perpetually validate the ideologue, to believe that one is always and forever some particular identity, some particular self. Of course, this is merely the process of standardization.

#### Right Ideology: True Standards for False Identities

The fact that Right ideologies establish behavioral criteria is actually why they lose most of their ambiguity and thus cannot benefit from Allied Projection; at least not to the degree non-behavioral, non-criterial identities can and do. The way Left ideologues i.e. nebulizers can and do. Standardization is why Rightists establish rules, tenants, and are necessarily discriminatory since individual interpretation, projection, is less pervasive and less integral to the ideological identity. Within a Right ideology one must act the part, act in a manner congruent to the ideological identity, rather than merely proclaim it. Yet while it takes an undentity, say Christian, and establishes some behavioral criteria for it, the undentity that the ideology is designed to validate is still assumed into existence. It isn't real or rather isn't true despite setting some behavioral criteria for it ex post facto. Ergo it's still a matter of self-righteous belief, but one that mimics the criterial nature and so standardization inherent to true identities. It's why you as a non-ideologue can do absolutely everything a Christian does, adhering to the same behavioral criteria, and yet still not be a Christian. So given this self-righteous foundation, ideologues will always see themselves as Christian, always see themselves as right, regardless the myriad ways in which they will invariably define the ideological identity at an often unspoken and even unconscious personal level. This is why when an ideology suffers schism all sides maintain that they are the 'true ideologue' and differentiate between themselves and others through criteria particular to their different standards for it. Standards that always existed at an individual level.

While nevertheless self-righteous, through the inclusion of a tangible goal for the ideology, a

demonstrative effect and thus a means to achieve it, it necessarily requires one's exercise of agency as a primary determinant for the ideological identity. So while the identity itself is false and often fantastical especially when religious, it is nevertheless standardized. The true outcomes of the ideologue's exercise of agency are warped by their self-righteous perspective, so too their intentions, but within this ideological framework is formed a standard regardless. Moreover outside the framework another standard, a true standard, is similarly formed. To take the Christian as a broad example, their acts of charity are to generate and maintain their relationship with God. To secure a position amongst the holy, to avoid the tortures of hell, and many other fantastical beliefs some hold and others do not. Of course outside this religious framework we observe a generous spirit whose intentions while not ignoble, are somewhat marred by ulterior motivation. Nevertheless the effect of societal support is objectively demonstrated. This is to us their true identity of those who engage in this behavior. Those of a charitable and generous character.

This mimicry, or rather this closer adherence to the true nature of identity, allows for Right ideologies to produce and indeed take legitimate credit for their intended results. This is how they may persist. Not necessarily through reason, through some logical and rational foresight, but through near-blind trial and error. Those who champion effective behaviors succeed and thrive. Those who do not fail and perish. The longest standing, most ancient of Right ideologies are *survivors* and their ideologues a type of social survivalist. In essence, Right ideology doesn't explain properly why something works, but it maintains that the methodology it advocates certainly does work – even if it doesn't. Either way in taking a position, in setting a demonstrable standard, it allows for a trial to be run, observed, and with that to be scrutinized. A scrutiny that typically takes the form of another schism. Those still advocating for this failed methodology, the Traditionalist, doomed to fail while those adopting to a new way set to thrive or also fail, should their new way be similarly ineffective. The risk of every Reformer. Whether their methodology is most efficient isn't known and frankly doesn't much matter. Effective results eventually become established in culture by those who survive in what we call tradition.

Here, tradition is a particular means of interaction, a particular means of behavior whose mechanism to achieve and maintain particular goals isn't known but nevertheless effective. Given that it is fundamentally a self-righteous belief system, some narrative is crafted to explain the efficacy of these traditions rather than any rational or scientific analysis and explanation. Hence why conservative ideologues are perceived as ignorant, closeminded, and superstitious. Yet were no position to be taken at all, were no ideologue to claim that their methodology works, their efforts wouldn't be seen as

failures insofar as their ideological identity is concerned. So no schism would develop given that their failures aren't relevant to their ideological identity thus dooming ideologues to continue to engage in such failures. In order to effect schism you must take a position, you must affirm an ideological identity. What better way to affirm this than through your actions themselves and what better judge of these actions and ultimate arbiter of their necessity than reality itself? So in the grand scheme of ideological evolution, it matters far less that an ideologue holds to a correct position. It's far more important that they hold any, regardless of their efficacy. Efficacy determines survival, but it's schism that allows for evolution.

### Always and Forever One: Prophetic Prophecy

Schism can occur many times throughout the life of a single person let alone the life of an ideology. One ideology may continue to split creating slightly different variations of itself all with separate methodologies but all with the same goal. That goal being the maintenance of their ideological identity. This allows for other subsequent fantastical goals such as 'maintaining a relationship with God' but which are themselves a means of achieving the former foundational goal. Yet as ever recognize that ideology is rooted in a single, self-righteous belief. In truth there is only ever one 'true' ideologue as they perceive it. That of themselves, of their own undentity: the lone ideologue. So if an ideology divides enough times it results in what it always was to begin with: one person's beliefs about themselves masquerading as some communal belief system. A single dabbling duck. An ideology of one.

Since undentity is falsely axiomatic and as such just a placeholder term for the self, behaviors ascribed to the ideology will merely be the behaviors the particular ideologue engages in. Simply put, one's behavioral requirements for the ideology only describe one's exercise of agency. It's *their* means of achieving *their* purpose for the ideology though ultimately of manifesting *their* own undentity. Overall, it is merely *their* intention. Not their intention to do something in particular, just their intention itself. The ultimate in undentity, to act because you are yourself. Not to act to achieve a particular purpose, but to act because acting itself is the means through which you demonstrate yourself, how you demonstrate you. The ideologue's credo is, "I do this because this is what *I* do," or more simply "*I* do."

While criterial, don't confuse this with standardization. There is no way to forsake this self, to fail to

achieve any goals and thus not meet any standard. See, the 'standard' of this ideologue is any and all of what they do. There is no reference to purpose. Instead of an action linked to an outcome, the action is itself treated as the outcome, the purpose of the action. These ideologues rightly recognize that they demonstrate their identity through their actions, but never contrast this with any purpose other than demonstrating their identity. Call it a behavior whose purpose is to behave, an action whose goal is to act. Ergo this ideology of one becomes merely the demonstration of intention itself. Not of what to intend, just that one can and does intend. With the rightness axiom operating at the level of their interpretation of their behaviors, whatever they do must be 'right' with their selves; so too their undentity, and lastly their ideology - always.

Again we've hit on another origin, another of the most basic and rudimentary characteristics of ideological belief. A goal that is always met. A purpose that is always manifested through one's own behaviors regardless what they may be. A prediction of the effects of one's behaviors that one makes manifest, but that one always makes manifest and not merely through their actions but through their self. This is self-fulfilling prophecy and again as I must stress over and over and over, a literal *self*-fulfilling prophecy. A self that fulfills one's purpose. A self that fulfills – *that is* one's predictions and the subjective identity such predictions would describe. This literal use 'self', one of the recurrent themes of this treatise, is of course the axiom at play.

Consider that you're always going to be 'you' regardless what you do. Ergo in extending the self into the undentity of say a Christian, whatever you do is what a Christian does and so on. In this way schism allows for the creation of as many ideologies as there are people with Allied Projection, the collective form of self-righteousness operating at one removed from the self, as the only means to protect against this.

Through this potential perpetual schisming ideologues form competition between themselves. See, the survival of an ideology is tantamount to the survival of the individual. It is akin to 'survival of the fittest' with the splitting of an ideology through schism akin to a social form of cell division. The new ideology or ideologies produced are based on the parent ideology, but are slightly different. These differences are a form of ideological mutation that allow for different methodologies and so adaptation to the environment. These different adaptations influence the rate of survival for the ideology be this means of survival a greater form of social cohesion or an ability to understand and so control the environment through science and technology. It's all variable. Call it *Evolutionary Ideological Psychology*. So while the basis of an ideology is by definition false and subjective, the ability for it to assist in human survival is

entirely demonstrable and so can be objectively determined. Again this is an effect of their recognition of one's exercise of agency, one's effect on reality, as necessary to forming their ideological identity. In taking just a single objective criterion as necessary to the ideological identity, in this case a particular action, it opens the door for reality to influence ideological beliefs insofar as success and failure are concerned. In this way Right ideology is like a system of trial and error but operating at the level of the species. Often we don't really know why it is we believe something or do something, chalking it up to concepts like culture, socialization, and religion. Yet regardless of whether or not we understand the purpose of these behaviors, reality can parse those that are effective for human survival from those that are not through human suffering, death, etc. This dear reader, is Objectivity Creep and it is the inherent advantage in schism, as opposed to nebulization, with regard to human survival.

So schism, while operating almost entirely blind, does allow for a progressive increase in the survival of the species. While there is no truth with regard to the subjective aspect of it, the narrative it crafts to justify itself, it may nevertheless result in greater human survival through sheer trial, error, and subsequent schism. So while the methodology presented may be beneficial to the survival of the species the reasoning presented for it is almost always false and where it is not false it hasn't been substantiated. Simply put, *how* it works remains unknown. Due to this ignorance the methodology is necessarily falsely justified regardless of whether or not it is actually logically and reasonably sound. But those ideologies who persist are those who survive and those who survive are, in this example, those most aligned with reality. They represent what does work in reality regardless of their divorce from reality by virtue of their self-righteousness. This is why, as you've no doubt noticed, the Right is very much concerned with survival. In evolving to meet this singular purpose, not through choice but through chance, survival is of paramount importance. Right ideologies select for survivalist traits in humans both in the social and physical realms. Call them traditions. This is contrasted with the Left who are uninterested and often in unwitting opposition to survival as manifested through their denial of reality. This is why the Right often denigrates the Left as being suicidal; in varying degrees of severity but always with more than a kernel of truth.

Ex Post Facto Standardization: Do As I Say I Do, Not As I Truly Do

Naturally as a matter of self-righteousness the reasoning presented for ideological methodologies are

actually ex post facto justifications not unlike the identity itself is justified ex post facto. As with any employ of ex post facto justification, of narrative crafting, of excuse making, there is bound to appear inconsistencies that themselves require further justifications and so on. Such inconsistencies are inevitable if the belief being justified is false – which it is. This serves to hasten schism, typically between generations.

The older generation continues to provide a growing number of ex post facto justifications, a growing standard that serves to encompass more and more of their own individual intentions and behaviors. The younger generation, keen to achieve the ideological identity whose standard is set by the older generation, seeks to live up to this ever-growing standard. Eventually through some inconsistency or through shouldering the ever-growing burden of this standard a schism occurs. This is why, though for other contributing factors, Right ideologies are prone to generational mutation. The younger generation is presented with an ideological identity as something to be achieved, necessarily having not been born into the identity nor the original progenitors of it. Coupling this with the fact that Right ideologies operate according to standards established by older generations it results in a sense of distance and personal separation from the ideology. So to younger generations the ideological identity is viewed more as an externalized identity rather than something founded in self-righteousness alone. Thus it falls more easily and readily to scrutiny, often as a criticism of older generations and their own inconsistency with their established standards or incongruity with their claimed ideological purposes.

#### Intentional Schism: Imaginary Walls Make for Tangible Barriers

So Right ideology is an effect of an ideologue's recognition and so implementation of behavioral criteria as an ex post facto justification for their undentity. They are those ideologues who recognize that objective identity is established through behavior albeit apply this method toward establishing an undentity. Thus they establish intention as the central unifying factor of their respective collectives as expressed through their actions. Now it must be stated that without the same starting belief what could have been a mutual intention merely becomes a mutual purpose which can be undermined due to this distinction. Consider the conservative Christian and the libertarian atheist. In this example though generally speaking, they share in the purpose of decreasing the size and so influence of the state. Their purpose is shared yet in not sharing the same impetus to this purpose, the same belief from which this

purpose is borne and their behavior shaped around it, they do not share the same intention. The conservative Christian seeks to diminish the state as it is an affront to God and His tenants. The libertarian atheist seeks to diminish the state given its infringement of what they claim are their natural rights. This lack of mutual intention, essentially a lack of a mutual 'how and why', can and often does result in schism given that it is essentially the mechanism that triggers it: through the recognition of some incongruity in the belief system of ideologues.

This focus on intention is detrimental to the achievement of purpose. That is, the intention of the individual is irrelevant to the result and when the intention is focused upon it supplants the importance of objective identity, of effect on reality, with subjective identity and one's interpretation of said effect. Basically, were the conservative Christian and the libertarian atheist to ignore their differing intentions and focus on their shared goal, they could pool their power and resources to achieve this goal. With intention a matter of prediction it's foolish to sever ties according to it. With time the ultimate arbiter of the truth, our intentions are entirely irrelevant to the outcomes of our actions and so our purposes.

#### Standardization: The Purpose of All Purpose

Everything we recognize as Rightist, better known as conservative, is at its core an effect of standardization. Not only influenced by it but a means of initiating, continuing, and maintaining the process of standardization itself. Everything that is Rightist, truly Rightist, is an act of standardization.

First we have an adherence to and championing of tradition otherwise known as Traditionalism. These traditions are foremost borne through the establishment of particular behaviors with regard to identity. Such traditions may assist the survival of the ideologue but given that it operates on a system of what is essentially trial and error, the distinction isn't made and the behavior itself rarely examined in order to discern its advantages – if any. Such traditions are treated as sacred and necessary to maintaining one's undentity within the ideology. Yet also with regard to more pragmatic and practical concerns, that is with regard to its purpose, the argument or rather excuse is made that it is 'what worked in the past'. Notice the implication of this statement. 'Worked' is made with reference to the overall purpose of the behavior. Now this can be many different things from the specific to the broad, but in this context the purpose is clear. The purpose is survival. 'Worked' is therefore synonymous with 'kept the tribe alive' or

more vaguely 'the tribe survived whilst adhering to this behavior'. So the assumption is made that this behavior either assists or does not hinder this purpose. As stated there is little to no examination of such traditions but rather an appeal made to the supposed purpose or track record of those who participated in these traditions prior. Again, it is simply trial and error.

Second we have universalized morality as opposed to moral relativity. As stated, given the influence of the rightness axiom the term 'right' has a dual meaning. It's one's own existence and one's perception of that existence. Consider further terms like 'good' and 'right with' are themselves standards necessarily requiring a purpose with which to reference. For example, proper diet is good for maintaining one's health. Though hell, even 'proper' is itself a standard in the same context as 'good'. 'Good' is merely whatever achieves a given purpose. With self-righteousness influencing our perspective of our behaviors, we come to see ourselves necessarily as the heroes of our own stories and develop our own sense of right and wrong, of good and bad, with reference only to the purposes we seek to achieve or to avoid. At a fundamental level morality is relative. Relative to each individual. So that said, how is it that Right ideologies can develop or attempt to develop universal morality? Well through standardization and Objectivity Creep, of course.

Standardization allows first and foremost for the implementation of actions in reality and Objectivity Creep allows for their increase in efficacy. Yet recall that such standards must inevitably and invariably interact with each other. In order to maintain that these standards are necessary to the ideology they must not fail and so must not be made to hinder each other. Thus a means of interplay is developed between standards. A means that is undoubtedly flawed, but through which an overall purpose of seamless and unhindered interaction is borne. With these standards themselves descriptive of the behaviors of ideologues, it strives for the creation of a system of harmonious interaction. With each ideologue themselves a member of the collective, holding to the same identity no different than any other, this system tailors itself to operate at the level of the individual. Ergo it strives for the creation of a universal means of human interaction regardless of its ideological impetus. In essence, "For everyone to be, everyone must do. But for everyone to do, everyone must yet still be." You simply cannot universalize an action designed to establish an ideological identity that destroys the collective and so ultimately the ideological identity itself. Self-destructive behaviors, be they at the level of the individual or the collective, cannot operate for long within Right ideologies. This is why the Right is so opposed to such behaviors be they in the form of irresponsible sex, drugs, or any social influence seen to undermine the unity they strive for.

Third is religion. Religion is actually an effect of the process of individuation. A process we all engage in at an unconscious and subconscious level. Individuation is a topic I will cover in greater detail, but for now take for granted that individuation and standardization share in their reliance on reality, the necessity of at least two criteria, and the causal relationship established through cause and effect though ultimately by time itself. Ergo the Right is far more prone to being religious by virtue of their similar means of justifying their undentity. Aside from religion's role in ex post facto justification, typically as a means of justifying the standards of the Right ideology i.e. 'God wills it' or 'it is our covenant with God', religion is chiefly used as a means of preventing schism and combating nebulization. Religion prevents schism through its appeals to greater purpose and often through its focus on forgiveness. This prevents the often religious fervency that accompanies an oppositional affirmation which results in a schism. Pun intended. I've covered this already. How it combats nebulization is much more interesting. Take note, that it combats nebulization at all puts it squarely in the camp of Right ideologies, given nebulization is Left ideology incarnate.

Simply put, the ambiguous purpose of achieving and maintaining some sort of relationship with a God, necessarily an omnipotent and omnipresent other, absolutely accords with a Leftist penchant for perpetual validation and establishing of self through the 'other'. With God the omnipotent controller of the universe, Leftists are free to attribute their actions and experiences to God, to 'Acts of God', and so claim their part in it as entirely reactive. Within a secular paradigm this similarly results in the attribution of agency to circumstance, but instead of manifesting a God to take responsibility for that which the Leftist seeks to deny, it is invariably foisted onto the shoulders of some tangible other. Some person or demographic who is entirely innocent which begins the inversion of reality through the false victim vs perpetrator dichotomy and all the conflict that arises through it. I mean really, what is Patriarchy to a feminist but God? What is systemic oppression to any Leftist but God? An omnipotent, omniscient, omnipresent agent influencing her every action and circumstance, determining and ultimately responsible for everything she experiences? God is the 'other' incorporeally incarnate. But hey, what of all the awful things a religious Leftist might experience? Well we have Devils for that. Evil Spirits. Jinns. We also have excuses such as 'God is testing you'.

Tellingly, the excuses religious Leftists don't like and often reject are those that foist onto them personal responsibility. First is that their negative experiences aren't an effect of God but rather his absence which was created through a rift between humanity and God known as Original Sin. Thus the Leftist is the original guilty party and so suffers negative experiences by their own hand. Of course, this is merely

religious narrative crafting explaining the reality that one is objectively responsible for everything that happens to them. The second excuse that the Leftist often rejects is, of course, arguments for free will. With free will a concept predominantly concerned with, if not entirely descriptive of, establishing one's identity through their choices, Leftists are loathed to accept it. Nevertheless the existence of God, this omni-other, is often enough to sate the denial of personal agency and need for perpetual validation of the Leftist. So the Leftist clings to religion and in so doing becomes a Rightist in all but intention. Truly they are a hangers-on of sorts weathering the indignity of free will and Original Sin for the sake of God's limitless ability to validate them. However, such people easily discard religion in favor of systemic excuses for their agency that accord far more with their lack of standardization for their undentity. This is why the introduction of Leftist ideologies are quick to sway them or rather introduce them to a collective of the similarly likeminded.

To put it simply, God harnesses the motivations inherent to Leftist tribalism, that of social substantiation, of perpetual validation and all the irrationalities inherent to it, and uses it to produce objective outcomes in reality. God provides an outlet for their victimization and well as an outlet for their denied personal agency. With the dangerous aspects of the Leftist subdued, the religion in which this God is manifested, though ultimately the Right ideology to which it is fused and the standards therein, the Leftist is transformed in all but intention into a Rightist. In reality the distinction is moot, given their actions contribute to the same overall purpose. What they are, to be crass, are slaves unaware of their harness. Fittingly, by their own self-righteous denial of their agency they've become objects, tools used to the employ of others. Of *the* others.

Apart from the standardization of identity and the self vs other dichotomy, the particular bitterness and hatred with which the Left attacks religion is, I think, reflective of their knowledge that God is their greatest enemy by virtue of being their greatest trap. Worse and all the more bitter, as a trap it reveals to them the true nature of their irrational beliefs at all but a conscious level.

Lastly given the duality of the rightness axiom, there occurs a predictable and I would argue inevitable fusion of tradition with religion or where religion isn't present, secular morality or ethical codes. Consider 'I am right' as both a claim of existence and of morality, of goodness. The dual meaning of righteous. Consider tradition as a methodology operating in reality and religion as a means of ex post facto justification for this methodology but both 'logically' and morally. Through this interplay they borrow and adapt to each other and each other's criteria until there appears to be no distinction between them at all. This is where we come to see religions develop traditions themselves rather than

religion operating solely as a means of ex post facto justification. A great example of this is Islam wherein one's identity, politics, morality, and religion are fused into a singular ideology.

Fourth is fiscal but foundationally individual solvency. At its most basic this is just the recognition that one's actions have consequences. This is once again the result of recognizing behavior as the criteria for identity and reality in which it operates. As ever the standard by which such behaviors are defined exist in reference to some purpose. As with tradition this purpose is survival or ideologically speaking, the perpetuation of the ideology itself. Regardless, judging one's behavior with regard to survival, even tangentially like what business decision is most profitable, can be objectively determined. It can be determined not just through the conceptual framework provided by the goal of survival, but through the crucible of reality itself; through objective observation of the result of one's behaviors. With all this in mind the link between Right ideology and fiscal solvency is obvious. Recall my example of storing food for the winter in order to prevent starvation and so facilitate survival. Though solvency is not simply a measure of survival but a necessity for survival within the conceptual framework as established through basic economics. Even a child can understand that one must produce an equivalent or abundance in contrast to what they consume. Since Rightists understand, at least better than Leftists, the effects of their actions they are dually implored to act in ways that produce their desired effect. I say dually implored because their identity requires not just their proper behaviors but also the proper result in order to establish a mutual intention amongst other Rightists. To adhere to the behaviors but fail in the result is to establish oneself as a failure naturally.

Self-Righteously Realistic: From Ignorance, Truthful Action

To sum up the entirety of Right ideology in one word it is responsibility. In every facet it can be explored, save for the irrational, falsely axiomatic identity on which it is founded, Right ideology accords with acknowledging, maintaining, and understanding one's responsibility. Of course this makes sense as their responsibility becomes the criteria for their identity. A trait it shares with the objective means through which one's identity is truthfully determined.

Naturally determination itself describes a particular process. This is of course standardization as I've defined it: a fusion of criteria forming a new individual expressed through the use of some umbrella

term. Consider that standardization is used to determine the beliefs and behaviors of Right ideologues though in a literal sense. It is the literal, actual process through which determination is itself made. So is it fair to say that Right ideology isn't just predicated on standardization, isn't just determined through standardization, but is in fact standardization as expressed ideologically? Standardization that is fused with one's sense of self becoming axiomatic in the efficacy and truth of its employ? That is to say, standardization as a process that isn't logically and reasonably understood as necessary for determination itself, but rather is presumed true? That is treated as axiomatic? Standardization a truth, a reasonable, rational, and logical process that is nevertheless upheld as an axiomatic, ideological, self-righteous belief? Something that is right but that you claim to know is right before you actually know?

Well yes, dear reader. This is so much the core of what Right ideology is. The truth nevertheless operating not just in spite of our ignorance, but in our ignorance and even through it. The Rightist acts in accordance with reality to logically if not necessarily reasonably achieve his predictions, his goals, and ultimately his purpose. It's not so much an effect of luck but rather an effect of ideological evolution steering Right ideologues ever closer to the truth through failure, suffering, and the mechanism of schism. Guided closer to operating in reality, more in sync with it, rather than in their own self-righteous delusions. But in their ignorance of this mechanism such congruity with reality and the success it generates merely bolsters their self-righteousness. Remember though that there is no redemption in acting in ignorance. It is always a regrettable action insofar as one engages in it not as a prediction but in self-righteous fervor; in the false knowledge that one is right. Such is the path of the zealot and a path that, even when tread in reality, whose purpose accords with the truth, manifests through a false intention; a prediction, a subjective belief, treated as truth and as objective fact. However, this ignorance isn't merely sequestered to the Right ideologue but indeed nearly everyone. Thus the non-believer, the methodologue, Leftist, and Rightist doubter all ignorant of this mechanism, describe the success of the Right ideologue as what they can only term providence, mundane or divine. Naturally providence as a concept is developed through their ignorance of the underlying mechanism governing the success of the Right ideologue. They simply cannot logically connect the intentions of the ideologue with their success in reality which, to be fair, is entirely reasonable given the falsity of the Right ideologues' justifications.

Though with all parties involved ignorant of this mechanism the Right ideologue is no less prone to see providence in the success of his actions. Self-righteous though he may be, if he is unable to connect his exercise of agency with his successful outcomes nor connect his intentions with this same success, a

void is left. A void that he cannot attribute to himself and so must attribute to another. Some other agent responsible for granting him the knowledge of the 'truth' that he possessed. Some other agent responsible for guiding his actions or bending the world to effect a successful outcome. An agent of great knowledge, of great foresight, and of great power. An agent whose chief characteristic is all that we are not. Whose power is everything that we did not and could not effect. Whose knowledge is everything we did not and could not know. Whose foresight is everything we did not and could not foresee. For in our limitation lies the breadth of his power. Thus he is nearly omnipotent if not entirely. His power limited only by our own ability to exercise our agency. A limitation he perhaps respects rather than cannot surmount; reflective of his actual station as a void left in our understanding of the effects of our agency. Ergo this agent remains divorced from us, from other agents, and responsible for all that we cannot take responsibility for ourselves. All that we cannot link to our own actions. He exercises his agency, his will in everything that we do not, leaving us *free* to exercise our agency, our *will* without his interference, his control over us. An agent possessed of all the characteristics of man, but so abundant they are infinite in their capacity and, in our worship of them, their majesty.

Individuation: Hence Cometh God

The origin of religion though more specifically god is predicated on what I call, and will later need to argue for, the fallacy of the individual or the fallacy of the state of being. That is to say that individuality is not what it is purported to be but something else that while certainly related and even objectively claimed, isn't at all what it is commonly understood to be.

Individuality: A Product Only of Perception

We start with the strangeness that is the creation of the concept of individuality itself. Consider the universe. A vast system of interconnected cause and effect wherein every effect is ultimately caused by some prior effect and so on until, we assume, the beginning of the universe should the universe even have a beginning. That is to say, all of the universe is a single uninterrupted chain of cause and effect

with the first and only cause, a cause for which there is no prior one, the beginning of the universe itself. Call this cause the Big Bang or Ultimate Cause or whatever you'd like. In essence, everything is linked to or rather the result of it.

So it is curious then that we have created the concept of an individual; an existence within the universe yet distinct from it. For every individual we observe, be it a human individual or a rock or atom, we are the ones who distinguish it from the rest of the universe. We are the ones who make the distinction between a solid and a gas and with that distinguish a bedside table from the air around it. Naturally there are physical laws governing such distinctions. Yet regardless, the interplay between individuals as we observe it is a product of just that: our observation. It's we who set the boundaries between individuals. It's we who determine, distinguish, and categorize. Whether or not this interplay is what we could call 'real' or 'truth' isn't relevant to our perception of it since this perception exists irrespective of the truth of reality. Suffice it to say our perception or rather our ability to perceive, while operating with regard to reality, isn't necessarily correct but real. This is fairly obvious of course. One need only consider the vast array of that which cannot be detected with the human eye that nevertheless exists within light. What is most important in all of this is that even the models that we have created to explain reality, namely physics, isn't necessarily correct and as any good scientist will tell you, this is absolutely true. In fact, it is the source of the agnosticism inherent to science i.e. that nothing can be known but rather vary in probability.

With physics and all fundamental sciences incomplete at the moment, that is they do not fully explain the nature of the universe, they are all necessarily flawed in some respect; even if only in their limited scope. So whatever is the current theory regarding some subset of physics, for example the leading edge of quantum theory, it is predicated on an unknown. My knowledge of such matters is of course limited, so let's just use a placeholder as an example. Let's assume that the current theory regards the Higgs Boson as entirely necessary to all physics, but where it comes from or how it is created is entirely unknown. So what we have here is the current end of the cause and effect chain regarding physical theory. It has been narrowed down to the necessary existence of the Higgs Boson, but none know where it comes from or how it was created. In effect, the Higgs Boson becomes causal to the entirety of physical theory as we understand it. Without any knowledge of some prior cause that effected the Higgs Boson, the Higgs Boson is treated as its own cause. That is, it is treated as something that generates an effect, but for which there is no prior effect.

The issue is that as such, the model is most certainly wrong. Given this notion of a beginning to the universe and with that an Ultimate Cause that effected its creation, this Ultimate Cause should invariably be the root cause of every single theory regarding reality. That is to say, at some point all theories regarding reality should make their way back to the Ultimate Cause. This coalescing of all scientific theories into a singular cause is known as the Grand Unifying Theory.

Anyway the importance of the incompleteness of, in this example, quantum theory is that in its incomplete state it has created an arbitrary cause upon which quantum theory rests. Instead of being founded on the Ultimate Cause as it should, the link cannot be established and so it rests, for now, on the Higgs Boson. So what we have created through this scientific endeavor is a descriptor for a subset of the universe. Instead of describing the universe as it actually is, we can only describe a portion of it and an incomplete portion at that. Furthermore in its incomplete state it was required that we attribute to it its own cause apart from the Ultimate Cause. Such attribution isn't merely arbitrary as it was necessary to this scientific model, but it is nevertheless wrong to treat or to interpret the Higgs Boson as its own cause. Of course as rational people we do not believe that the Higgs Boson isn't in some way tied to the Ultimate Cause, but as of right now we cannot do so and as such must treat it as ultimately causal to physical theory. In this way and until a Grand Unifying Theory is developed, science can only describe what are by definition subsystems of the greater system that is the universe. Or to put it another way, if the universe is to be considered as one set or rather as *the set*, all scientific models that do not describe it in its entirety should be considered subsets of this set. And what, given your understanding of what I have described, is the defining feature that separates out these subsets from the greater set that is the universe? What is required in order to distinguish these subsystems of cause and effect from the true system of Ultimate Cause and effect?

The answer is the attribution, wrongly, of cause. Simply put, by claiming that some effect is caused without reference to the Ultimate Cause, we create a subsystem of cause and effect based on this new cause. So for example, a bump on your head caused by a falling apple is a subsystem within the universe. But to describe it in its entirety, to describe it with reference to the Ultimate Cause, would require an understanding of every instance of interaction of matter and energy all the way from the Big Bang to that falling apple. Naturally given our scope as humans such description is absurd, but such a description would nevertheless be true and far truer than the subsystem we presented: that of the apple alone being causal to the bump on your head. The contrast between these two explanations for the falling apple is simply a limitation of scope.

Now the significance of the creation of these subsystems is that it is fundamentally an ever-expanding accrual of knowledge and of particular knowledge, truth: an objective understanding of reality i.e. of cause and effect. With that said, that humans can even gather and observe truth is made possible only in our lack of understanding of the universe or more specifically our lack of understanding with regard to cause and effect. See, should humans possess a perfect understanding of cause and effect they would also possess a perfect understanding of the universe: the entirety of the system of the universe all the way to the Ultimate Cause. Should humans be bestowed with this, what I would describe as omniscience, then there would be no need to create subsystems of explanation within the whole of the universe. Such subsystems are necessarily created through humans' lack of scope; lack of understanding of cause and effect. Now while humans certainly aren't omniscient, their recognition of the truth that everything is ultimately determined by another, that everything exists as an effect from some prior cause and so on down to the Ultimate Cause, is where the argument and I would say reality of determinism comes from; that ours is a deterministic universe. So if determinism is the truth of reality, whence cometh the individual?

The creation of an individual is actually what I've just been discussing: the creation of a subsystem within the universe. As stated the creation of a subsystem is necessarily the creation of some cause without reference to the Ultimate Cause. Yet within a deterministic universe this designation of cause is ultimately arbitrary. That is, one can say that [X] has been caused by [Y], but in expanding this subsystem to describe more of the universe, in other words to make the subsystem 'more true', one would say that [Y] has been caused by [Z] which is then ultimately responsible for the observed effect of [X]. Such expansion results in what seems to be a near-infinite regress down a cause and effect chain.

As an aside, should this regress be infinite, truth with regard to reality is ultimately impossible as our understanding of the universe would forever be a subsystem rather than a system describing the whole of the universe and so incomplete in its understanding. No link to the Ultimate Cause, no Grand Unifying Theory.

So for example, the designation of the atom is itself an umbrella term used to describe a collection of yet smaller particles which in turn are used to describe a set of smaller particles and so on. That atoms exist as individuals in and of themselves is false. That is, conceptually they exist as an umbrella term for a collection of smaller particles but in reality the 'atom' as we describe it is itself a subsystem. It is a collection of protons, neutrons, and electrons. There is no 'atom'. Yet even those particles are formed by quarks among others. In this way the atom is really a 'section' or 'chunk' that we have distinguished

from the universe in what is termed individuation: the creation of an individual. As demonstrated in the example of the infinite regress, what creates this concept of the individual is our necessarily arbitrary attribution of cause. Our designation of a beginning of a cause and effect chain to something that is in truth an effect or *caused*; not a cause in and of itself i.e. not the Ultimate Cause. Suffice it to say, where we designate a cause we create a subsystem of explanation for the universe and so individuate this system from the greater system that is the universe, creating an individual. Individuality is thus created through one's scope or rather through their lack of scope; lack of ultimate (omniscient) scope and with that their arbitrary attribution of cause.

So where does this leave our relationship to the universe? Well, the universe is most certainly entirely deterministic. That is, it operates as one system with no subsystems, no individuals operating distinct or distinguished from it. So with that said the concept of the individual as existing in reality is false, correct?

Yes.

So if the concept of the individual does not actually exist in reality, would that not mean that individuality with regard to humans is non-existent? Yes absolutely, yet what we refer to as individuality, or rather our often adamant designation of it to humans and other subsystems, is entirely objective. That is, what we perceive as individuality is real but what we describe this perception as is false. Suffice it to say, that we observe it is true, but our explanation of it is false.

#### Individuality: The Truth of a Falsehood

The truth of the designation of individuality is not with regard to the truth of the individual as actually existing in reality, but rather with regard to our lack of scope. That is to say, when humans designate one as an individual, the truth in such designation is not that one is actually an individual, but that such a designation is the extent of one's scope and with that the limit to the subsystem they have created. In other words, a designation of individuality is a demonstration of the limitation of one's scope of understanding of cause and effect. This limitation of scope is the objective truth with regard to our relationship to individuality and to the universe, not the individual itself. Ergo when one claims another to be individuated from the universe, that it is an individual, one is actually communicating the extent of

their scope; the extent of their ability to arbitrarily designate cause and the greatest extent to which one can create a subsystem within the greater system of the universe. Such can be and is a true claim.

So essentially the objective truth with regard to the universe and individuality is the act of individuation itself and not that individuals objectively exist. Describing a limitation of our ability to perceive the universe, something linked to our subjectivity if not necessarily descriptive of it, as objective may seem erroneous but there exists examples we take for granted. Such examples are our senses themselves. What we see is false of course. It is only what our brain produces for us that we then observe. It is therefore demonstrative of our limitation of scope with regard to the perception of light. Yet that such a limitation exists is without question and it is such limitation that is objectively true. So with the perception of individuality a product of a limitation of scope, individuality itself may not be objectively true but that we perceive it as a product our limited scope, is true.

So to put it simply, what we sense is false but *that we sense* is true. Individuality is, in effect, a product of the hardware and software we run as humans. Our programming produces it and this is without question. It is only the truth of what is produced that is in question. In this example it is the perception of individuality, but it can just as easily be sight, taste, touch, and so on.

#### God: A Product of Perception

With this foundation laid, the impetus to religion and god(s) should be clear. Religion, at least with regard to god(s), is the application of individuality to the universe; the attempt to individuate the universe from itself. In other words, it is the attempt to describe the universe as a subset or subsystem of itself. This is of course impossible. A subset cannot encompass the entirety of the set and neither can the subsystem encompass the entirety of the system. Yet even in ignoring that, it is truly the arbitrary designation of cause that leads one to attempt to individuate the universe from itself. As stated, the ability to individuate is the ability to designate a cause for which no prior effect is observed as causal to it. In essence, it is an effect for which no cause can be attributed thereby becoming a cause by default. This is the truth of our relationship to individuality and what has been termed 'free will'. Free will is the belief that one is not caused but a cause in and of themselves. That it is they who cause everything they do to happen through choice. Naturally living in a deterministic universe as we do this is false. Yet as

stated, we can objectively demonstrate the limitation of our scope and thereby claim this limitation as the subsystem we refer to as an individual.

So with our limited understanding of cause and effect foundational to our ascription of individuality, it is no wonder then that in considering the entirety of cause and effect, that is the universe itself, humans ascribed individuality to it. Individuality is forever borne through the arbitrary designation of cause so with regard to the universe, arguably that which was itself caused without prior effect or 'ultimately causal' to everything, we determined that the universe itself was an individual or itself created by an individual. We described it as a subsystem, as an individual, because we recognize it as caused. Yet to consider the universe as being created or caused by another individual is to necessarily describe the universe not as a singular system but as a subsystem: made distinct from a prior cause that is god(s). So what was done to parse this? Well recently god has been described as existing apart from the universe. While being ultimately causal to the creation of the universe, in not existing as a part of it He therefore doesn't transform the universe into a subsystem but allows it to operate as a system entirely devoid of His influence. This is understood as the 'stepped back' or 'another dimension' theory of god(s). That god(s) started the universe but was never a part of it and has never become a part of it. Though as we can see, this was merely to parse or provide excuse for our ascription of individuality to the universe as borne through our limitation of scope. Furthermore it is worthy to note that the omniscience mentioned earlier, the means by which we could and would truthfully understand the entirety of cause and effect and thus the universe, is attributed to god(s). This is no mistake as god(s), in being designated as causal to the creation of the universe, would therefore be the ultimate cause of everything and therefore the concept of ultimate truth itself: the ultimate originator, the Ultimate Cause. As stated earlier, truth is a perfect representation or understanding of cause and effect. As a means of searching for truth it is a progressive march through the near-infinite (possibly infinite) regress of cause and effect with each new designation of cause ever expanding the subsystem and with that our understanding of the universe. Basically, the closer one can establish cause to the beginning (if there even is one) of the universe the truer and more truth one can establish through this designation. Hence god(s) being that cause of the universe are themselves described as omniscient or omniscience incarnate.

From a Single Answer: Tying It All Together

So why are god(s) described as omniscient? Because they are or observed the Ultimate Cause to the universe.

So why are god(s) described as omnipotent? Because they began the entirety of the cause and effect chain of the universe.

So why are god(s) described as 'The Truth'? Because with truth nothing more than a perfect understanding of cause and effect, god(s) either are the Ultimate Cause that brought it about or began it and thus observed it all.

So why do the religious believe so adamantly in free will? Because free will is the ascription of cause as per our limitation of scope which creates a subsystem of cause and effect within the universe and, when operating at the level of the lone human, individuality and the ability to 'self-cause' or 'choose' one's effects on reality.

So why do the religious believe in a soul? Because the soul represents the necessary division between the individual and the rest of the universe which is similarly individuated. Though more on this shortly.

God *is* Individuation: 'Who' *is* 'How'

'Who' is the individual, the result created through any act of individuation and 'how' is the act of individuation itself. Any cause and effect chain, should it describe only a subsystem or the entirety of the universe, will involve a 'who' and a 'how'. In fact, will create a 'who' through a 'how'. Individuation is the most basic form of understanding reality which even then relies on a system of cause and effect to parse. Think about it. Individuation is the cause. Individuality is the effect. At no point in our ability to reason do we lose this binary, at least insofar as I've explored it. Is it any wonder then that Right ideologues, those who have fused themselves with the process of standardization, are so religiously prone? So prone to develop individuals and indeed individuality from the process of cause and effect itself? Furthermore in this fusion of themselves with this process, this process of creating the individual, is it any wonder that they claim for themselves a soul? A single vestige of godliness that forever links them to God? That links their individualities but in truth links them together through the single, universal, near-infinite chain of cause and effect? Of course not.

Humanity's relationship to the concept of god(s) is entirely borne through our limitation of scope creating both the concept of individuality and the act of individuation through our arbitrary designation of cause. The designation of cause creates a subsystem of cause and effect within the greater system known as the universe. So with individuality tied directly to or based entirely on our designation of cause, the designation of cause to the universe was the designation of individuality to the universe. This is Gaia Theory or Deism, etc. Yet with said individuality particular only to subsystems thus transforming the universe into a subsystem, in order to parse this said individuality was described as operating apart from the universe itself in some other dimension or the like i.e. heaven. This is the 'Stepped Back' or 'Other Dimension' theories of god(s). This allowed the universe to remain a system in and of itself without the contradiction of a simultaneous existence as a system and a subsystem. Furthermore the concept of truth is itself a perfect understanding of cause and effect but particularly an understanding of the Ultimate Cause of the universe from whence all effects proceed. Therefore the ascription of omniscience to god(s) was entirely due to their position as the ultimate cause of the universe and so a description of their scope as perfect as in having caused it, they are thus able to observe and describe the entire system of the universe. Though even better, one could describe them not simply as omniscient – having perfect understanding of cause and effect i.e. truth, but rather incarnations of truth itself given that they themselves are the ultimate cause. This is the true new meaning and understanding to the claim, 'God is truth', made by many of the religious.

As such, it is little wonder then why those of many faiths though particularly Christians claim that everyone 'knows' or rather has some inclination of the existence of their God. With God merely the ascription of individuality to the universe, though ultimately the recognition that the universe is caused through the notion of Ultimate Cause, the Christian therefore concludes that by virtue of everyone's knowledge of and adherence to individuation, consciously or not, they therefore possess an awareness of some individual as created through this cause through our natural inclination to determine and so ascribe individuality through this very process. It is truly amazing how social evolution, even through the vector of religion, could allude to such truths through metaphor.

Ex Post Facto Justification: Why Religion?

Religion is merely all the justifications people make after an ascription of individuality is made to the universe. It's little different than how they attempt to justify their own axiomatic undentity ex post facto. Given what we know of the power of a limitation of scope, it is no wonder that the scope of the religious is similarly limited. That is, they do not understand why it is they ascribe individuality to the universe (or just its creation) and therefore are required to justify this belief to satisfy their own minds' requirement for some sort of explanation. That is, everyone believes what they do 'for a reason' even if they themselves cannot recognize it.

This need to preserve such beliefs regardless of a lack of evidence or even contrary evidence is an effect of the self-righteousness we all operate on. This belief system founded on 'I am right' which is presupposed before all other information. That is the 'I', who you are, is presupposed and is then justified ex post facto with all manner of explanation. This is itself a byproduct of the axiom 'I exist' which is itself required for the accrual of knowledge to begin with.

The first thing you ever recognized was yourself. A single individual, a single cause for which there was none preceding. From then on everything you've created in your mind has been through individuation. It was how you crafted your reality and still do. This world of yourself and the 'other'. When you became able you unconsciously began to describe yourself through what you had individuated. Through all the universe that you had observed and categorized you began to craft your sense of what you were in it though really what you were *to it* a la cause and effect. It was when you became not just yourself, but something else too. When you began to recognize yourself *as* something.

The Soul: The Immutable, Perpetual Self

It becomes increasingly difficult to justify my claims, to explain them any further beyond their titles alone. Nevertheless I hold steadfast to my rigor. I repeat and repeat and repeat myself if only for the least of you who've yet to grasp the theme. While I pray you understand now and needn't guess at all the nature of the soul, I nevertheless invite you to present its nature as you understand it. So please venture a guess as to what the soul is. What the soul is in reality? Psychologically?

The soul is 'I'. The first recognition of self. Our single reference point for all perception of reality. It is predicated on nothing yet nevertheless descriptive of all that we are. It is our first and only necessary

irrationality from which we develop our identity, reason, and from which we individuate and so create our reality as we understand it. Thus it remains despite how we may change. Thus it exists without any effort of our own. As something merely attributable to God's efforts, to the Ultimate Cause that all identities are bound to. So of course the soul is in your care. Of course your soul is a matter of your own control and a part of yourself regardless what you may do, what you may say, and indeed what you may believe.

Those of Christian faith who must present themselves to God after death for his judgment are merely describing the true nature of the relationship that identity, true identity, has to reality. With God as truth and identity a description of your causal relationships in reality which when taken in their totality form your purpose in reality, presenting your soul to God for judgment is all an allegory. It's the recognition of your necessary submission to reality, to cause and effect, to truth, regarding the true nature of yourself and so your identity. It's something that cannot be known in full until we are dead, until we may no longer act, and presented to a being who knows all that has been and all that *will be*. A being who needn't predict, who needn't attribute some subjective identity to us, but who knows it in full. Who knows all of our actions and all of their consequences then, now, and into the future. In this way the entirety of the effects of your actions can be understood and with that the true nature of your identity; that the truth of your identity is bound to and ultimately determined by reality, by the outcomes it produces. That it is determined by actual truth rather than your own self-righteous perception of it. So with your death the undentity similarly fades, recognized as the necessary evil that it was, and you become one with God, become one with truth, losing that one irrationality that made you who you were to begin with. You are no longer a subset of the greater set that is the universe but entirely indistinguishable from it.

It is of little wonder then that Adam and Eve were marred with sin when eating from the 'Tree of the Knowledge of Good and Evil'. A tree that exposed them as naked. That created the concept of dress and standards for it. That created shame. That allowed them to lie. Allowed them to craft falsehoods through individual perception and communication. This knowledge bestowed upon the legendary biblical pair was that of self-righteousness. The single irrationality, the single evil, the original sin we are all stricken with. It is what enabled them to develop standards. To determine what was good and evil though ultimately to determine what was *right*. To determine what was *righteous* according to their own perceptions. It is no coincidence then that pride is cited as the father of all sins. As the root of all evil. As the root of that damned tree.

Of course religion is fantastical ex post facto justification but do you not see it? The same pursuit we all share? The yearning for understanding of the human condition? Furthermore do you not see its congruity with reality? How desperately close it was? The explanations it offers aren't so devoid of merit nor are they entirely designed as placeholders. They were attempts at understanding human psychology stultified by the traditionalism of Rightism, the individualization of the universe via individuation, along with the self-righteousness inherent to all ideologies. If given enough time maybe, maybe the religious pursuit of this knowledge could have led to the truth. Perhaps instead of designing a religious framework that only reflected our true nature it could have shone a light directly onto it. Though perhaps it was always doomed to fail. Such is the nature of Rightism after all. Forever trending toward, but never reaching, true identity though really truth itself. Yet one need only consider the logical consistency in the Christian religion. Most everything aligns. Most everything makes sense within the framework and that to this day their apologists and philosophers still pursue truth. Their perspectives aren't aligned with ours and thus neither are their intentions. But our purpose is a shared one and so we may join together in this pursuit. We may synergize, combine our efforts towards this goal if only because such a purpose is, in my view, the thing most worth doing. That it is something that should be pursued with the greatest effort, the greatest rigor, rather than in the meekness, weakness, and false pride of a lone endeavor.

Religion crafts an entire world designed to mirror reality through allegory; beautiful in its own way. Beautiful in its crafting, purpose, and the artistry that comes with any form of communication. Yet fundamentally flawed for those very same characteristics. That they are human.

Individuation: The Origin of 'As'

By now the link between individuation and standardization should be obvious. In fact, they are very much the same process. Standardization however lends itself better to matters of personal preference, of *your standards*, hence why I've used and will continue to use it when describing this process of individuation. Using 'your individuals' in place of 'your standards' just complicates things.

Recall that standards are created through the combination of two or more criteria whose product is treated as an effect of this fusion. This process ultimately describes a causal relationship, real or not,

which can be extrapolated upon either into the future or into the past. Granted the past remains true whilst the future is not so hence any extrapolation into the past can be objectively true or false. Now with individuation and thus standardization fundamentally responsible for our ability to individuate, we use it to perceive and create, in our minds, the individual and the concept of individuality. With identity descriptive of an individual it relies on this very same process, whether we recognize this process or not. So with all that said, determining 'As' is the process of individuation which we use to determine and ascribe individuality. It doesn't matter if it's a rock, a tree, a person, or a characteristic. We always use this process.

The Rightist bases his entire reality on this process albeit in the pursuit of justifying an undentity. His beliefs, his behaviors, his religion, his politics, his entire identity is predicated on this single universal system we all share in common. With individuation fundamentally a means of categorization it crafts many individuals into existence, many different standards, from which we may exercise preference, discrimination, though ultimately choice i.e. 'free will'. Furthermore with such categorization necessarily requiring consistency in order to maintain our axioms of self-righteousness, it produces universalization as a necessary means of self-maintenance with the overall goal of perpetuation. Hence its better ability to understand and operate within objective reality that the Leftist struggles against.

When we consider the Rightist regardless what form he takes, we must perceive him as one obsessed with individuation as the means to justify his undentity. It permeates and controls every aspect of his life insofar as he considers it a part of his undentity, necessarily his Rightist identity. Not a single thing escapes its influence and with that the entirety of his ideological character is determined by it. The only thing that separates a Rightist ideologue from a methodeologue, a rational non-ideologue, is the self-righteous adherence to their undentity and the ex post facto justification it necessitates. A small distinction though as ever with vast implications. Yet a distinction small enough that it allows for synergy between themselves and non-ideologues if only by virtue of their greater understanding and acceptance of time and reality as the ultimate arbiters of truth – though not the 'truth' of the existence of their undentity. Thus the Rightist and the methodeologue can join together in mutual purpose though not necessarily intention. Insofar as the Rightist submits his beliefs to reason, to reality essentially, he allies himself with the methodeologue by virtue of their shared operation according to reality rather than in opposition to it, in denial. The Leftist cannot hope to develop any such synergy between themselves and non-ideologues. All they can do is only what they are designed to do: corrupt. The methodeologue cannot synergize with a Leftist. They can only be corrupted, be submitted, and ultimately be assimilated.

The only purpose of the Leftist is to destroy purpose. Call it a non-purpose. Paradoxical, antithetical, impossible by any standard. Though really, that's the whole point.

And it's terrifying.

CHAPTER 8 - The Political Binary Part 2:  
Antithesism

## Nebulization: The Perpetual Null-Hypothesis

Nebulization like schism is the result of a discovered incongruity between the beliefs of ideologues. Yet instead of establishing a particular belief one way or the other and so necessarily establishing a tangible goal for the ideology, the ideology further nebulizes and becomes more ambiguous, more meaningless, and with that preserves not only its ability to benefit from Allied Projection but also to maintain its disconnect from objective identity. That is to say, it is able to maintain whatever undentity it is based around as existing without criteria but whose effects are nevertheless purported to exist; that it affects nothing but creates effects regardless. Like schism before it, nebulization is also based on an undentity and it distinguishes itself from schism in the same way: the ideologues relationship to objective identity. See, while those prone to schism recognize and accept the link between identity and their legacy of effect on reality, essentially that true identity is objectively determined through their actions, those prone to nebulization deny and reject the link between identity and their legacy of effect on reality. Instead they claim that identity exists by virtue of nothing other than self-righteous proclamation and that one may exist as a myriad of different identities but only insofar as those identities also exist without criteria. In other words, you can be anything so long as all those things cannot be objectively determined or even defined.

Recall that in nebulizing the identity of 'woman', in separating it from the behaviors that formed a 'sex role', anyone could describe themselves as a 'woman' and present only themselves as the criteria for it or rather a representation of it. Basically the axiom that informs our existence, 'I exist', and the way we would identify ourselves always as ourselves no matter what, is co-opted by the rightness axiom forming the new axiom 'I am woman'. Thus 'woman' is merely assumed into existence and it is only afterwards that the attempt to establish any criteria for it can be made. Remember that from this point the attempt to establish criteria results in one of two outcomes: schism or further nebulization. The rejection of the proposed standard and its replacement with another, or the rejection of the standard as integral to 'woman' one way or the other. With that said, irrelevance is the only truth claim a nebulizer, a Leftist is willing to make.

Left Ideology: Denial, Dissolution, and Divorce

Leftist ideology begins and ends with the creation and communication of a single undentity. While Rightist ideology begins in a similar fashion, it's reliance on standardization allows for or even implicitly accepts reality as the ultimate arbiter of truth and, with that, the nature of their undentity. Leftism does no such thing. Without relying on standardization for establishing their undentity, even just ex post facto like Rightists, they divorce themselves from reality by virtue of rejecting any criteria that would describe themselves and so their identity within it. Given identity is descriptive of one's responsibility and ultimately of their causal relationships within reality, hell their causal relationship *to* reality, they must reject any means of establishing and even perceiving such relationships. Hence their rejection of criteria as necessary to their undentity. With the rejection of criteria as necessary for standardization itself, they reject or at least attempt to reject the fundamental means through which we interpret reality and discern truth. They reject reason. So quite literally, there is no *reasonable* means through which to establish any causality between their undentity and the effects of their actions. Hell, there is no reasonable means through which their undentity can be established at all. There is nothing causal to it, at least insofar as it is made to exist. This accords with the true mechanism of standardization through which identities are created. Without relying on the fusion of two or more criteria in order to create their identity, the means through which an identity is developed is rejected along with the process of standardization itself. Simply put, by rejecting the process that *causes* their identity to be, they necessarily reject that their identity is *caused* by any such process. In fact, they reject that their identity is caused by anything at all. Hence there is nothing causal to their identity. A necessary trait they craft in order to claim that it is axiomatic.

Yet even whilst opposing reason Leftists nevertheless submit themselves to it in some fashion. Remember, they aren't mad but rather in great denial of reality. As discussed, their submission to reason takes the form of justification. Of providing some means by which their identity may exist instead of none at all. This justification results in claiming, erroneously, that their undentity is effected by others. That it is the target of another's influence and actions rather than being descriptive of their own influence and actions, of their responsibility. In essence, rather than their identity being the result of an indeed descriptive of a particular causal relationship, their identity is made the result of another causal relationship. Basically it becomes an effect of another's actions rather than their own. That isn't to say their undentity exists by virtue of the actions of others of course. That's entirely a matter of self-righteousness. To them, their undentity will always exist. Instead, any characteristics that can be

attributed to their undentity ex post facto are claimed as the result of the actions of others, not their own. Hence anything that should occur, any outcome as a result of their interaction with others and reality itself, is not attributable to their undentity but characterizes it as it exists in reality. In other words, how it is *forced* to exist in reality. This is how the characteristics that have come to define 'woman' are all an effect of the actions of others; descriptive of an imposition rather than a self-actualized characterization.

Taking 'woman' as the example, nothing is the fault of 'woman' and 'woman', as it is *made* to exist, is the fault of others. Forever shaped by the other, 'woman' is forever guiltless. So 'women' are oppressed, are victims, are targeted, harassed, vilified, hated, controlled, etc. They are granted characteristics only by virtue of the actions of the 'other' whilst tellingly rejecting any characteristics attributable to their own actions 'as women'. Instead they claim to struggle to characterize themselves the way they wish to, to struggle to express their femininity and themselves. Naturally this is an effect of their denial of personal agency with regard to their identity and so their inability, or rather unwillingness to recognize that they can and very much do characterize themselves.

As we've discussed, this is where their false sense of victimization comes from. Ultimately a self-inflicted carry-over of denying one's exercise of agency in determining their identity. Believing that nothing can be seen as causal to their undentity, neither can anything be attributed as having been caused by their undentity. Such would establish a causal relationship itself predicated on criteria and ultimately revealing some initial criterion particular to their undentity. Simply put, if you attribute any effect to an undentity this effect is necessarily caused by that undentity. This has the effect of attributing criteria necessary to the undentity, at least in order to produce the effect you had attributed to it. This would be an act of standardization. So the undentity must produce no effects of its own in order to maintain its false position as non-criterial. Yet surely you've noticed that the Left, especially with regard to identity, has created hundreds if not more 'identities'. Transgender is the most recognizable but also pansexual, demi-sexual, non-binary, other-kin, transracial, and the list goes on and on. So if Leftist undentity is entirely non-criterial, how is it that such identities come to be? Are they not standards in and of themselves? Furthermore, are not such identities themselves a creation by Leftists? Well yes and no. They are creations in the same way smashing a glass is also a creation. That is, it is the creation of an act of destruction. Leftist identities aren't creations but rather the shattered fragments of an old standard. Each of them reflecting a distorted image of the standard, once made whole and unified through specific criteria.

## Nonspecific Categorization: The Bastard Children of Nebulization

Gender:

- 1) Either the male or female division of a species, especially as differentiated by social and cultural roles and behavior.
- 2) The behavioral, cultural, or psychological traits typically associated with one sex.

Note that in both definitions criteria are used to determine gender. They aren't specific certainly, but they are particular. They are behavioral, cultural, and psychological criteria which used to establish non-biological distinctions between either sex. As such this process of defining gender is unambiguous. Any gender formed through this process is necessarily criterial albeit whose criteria is left to one's own standard to determine. So despite the subjective nature of how one perceives a gender, what gender is, at least by this definition, is left unmolested. There is simply no undentity that can be formed therein. So that said, what happened to the definition of gender that has allowed for this explosion of hundreds of 'genders'? This definition:

- 3) Gender *identity* is one's personal experience of one's own gender.

Note that this is erroneously, though not mistakenly, termed an 'experience' of one's own gender. The reasoning is twofold. It is used to frame gender as a reaction. That gender is determined not by their standards but as a culmination of their perception and interaction with reality. As such this allows for gender to be 'fluid', to change according to experience and especially to change according to the influence of others. Again, it is an 'experience' rather than a standardized concept. Thus it is ambiguous and truly an effect of others rather than themselves. Ergo their gender identity becomes an effect of the 'other' and they a 'victim' of it.

This concept of gender identity is more inane than it seems. Consider that with gender itself already descriptive of a criterial identity, necessarily a purposeful one, it is of course an identity in and of itself. Now while gender is standardized its subjective nature does make it perceptual. This is true of any standard given its subjective and objective duality. So consider what it means to claim a gender identity. In other words, a perception of your perception. It's like claiming for yourself a plumber identity, rather

than merely claiming to be a plumber, and your 'plumber identity' is your experience of being a plumber. As such your 'plumber identity' necessarily becomes a descriptor of your *emotions* i.e. your *personal experience* of plumbing. As such these gender identities, these perceptions of perceptions, are truly only a communication of an emotional state.

This is even more asinine given that if we were to extend this sort categorization to all objective criteria, we'd make a near-infinite number of subjective perceptual categories. We'd be left with an ever expanding lexicon of words to describe words that describe other words that describe yet other words and so on. This is what happens when you claim a 'what' as another 'what' without reference to 'how'. Though interestingly matters of how, of causal relationship, aren't entirely eliminated from this inane process. Instead we observe the procedural nature of cause and effect manifesting in this very lexicon. A word describes another word which describes another word which describes another word and so on. Though naturally unlike the branching, looping, and self-contained nature of rational language, this ideological lexicon expands out infinitely. Into the infinite regress of the Reverse Butterfly Effect. So, how do you perceive toasters? How do you perceive blacks? How do you perceive Harambe? All would create their own categories and with that an 'identity' for whomever held to those categories.

What this reveals is that identity, even perception itself, isn't simply a matter of replacing or interpreting one thing as another. Of claiming a 'what' as another 'what' without reference to 'how it is what'. We need a common element to link perception with objective reality and then ultimately individuality. Yet we already have this: causal relationship i.e. cause and effect. Remember, personal identity and even the identification of things – all things, is a matter of purpose. That is, it is the prediction of outcome thus attribution of purpose to something, including yourself and your actions, that determines how you perceive something. This inevitably takes the form of interaction via intention and given whatever demonstrable outcome of said interaction, we can objectively establish a causal relationship and with that an identity for the individual. So should you use a toaster to make a panini for customers, you're a chef. But use it to bludgeon a man to death and you're a killer.

Consider that one's standards for either the male or female gender, while being as subjective as any matter, must follow the procedure outlined in the definition of gender thereby resulting in a standard for the male gender and the female gender. As such this allows for many different interpretations of what constitutes masculine and feminine behaviors and purposes. But the result is a standard for males and a standard for females. Period. In other words, it results in a subjective perception of an objective criterion which is, of course, one's sex. In essence, sex is the objective aspect of the identity and gender

is the subjective aspect of the identity which come together to form a whole identity. For example, sex is her biological category. Gender is her purpose.

Given that Leftism is characterized by the dissolution of standards, their interpretation of gender or 'gender identity' reflects this. They have expanded the criteria for determining gender to include *absolutely everything else*. Their standards for what constitutes the male gender and female gender are just as subjective and so in that way similar to ours. Yet the end result of this process isn't only to craft a purpose for the male and female sex. Instead it removes the attribution of purpose to sex as a necessary feature of defining gender. So now gender isn't a means to attribute purpose to sex. Instead every possible purpose, anything and everything that could be attributed to someone regardless their sex, is treated as a gender all its own. This is very confusing so consider this example:

A piece of food may be described in a near-infinite manner of ways so long as they reference the fact that it is a piece of food. So long as we at least reference it as an objective criterion, as the fact of what it is. Everything from delicious to gross to soft to moist to fattening, etc. Such is our attribution of purpose to it. But now let's remove the fact it is food but replace it with nothing. Now our descriptions of it are no longer bound to the fact that it is food – that there is even an objective criterion to describe. As such we're open to describe 'it' in a now infinite number of ways. Murderous, spiteful, gaseous, ecclesiastic, the only limit is our own imagination. With the objective criterion removed, there is no means of establishing a causal relationship between it and the outcome we predict of it; the purpose we attribute to it. So it becomes anything. This is what has happened to gender.

With the criterion of sex removed in the same fashion, the attribution of purpose to one's sex no longer has any objective criterion to reference. That is, it doesn't have 'male' and 'female' to result in nor to describe. Yet since gender nevertheless describe one's sex, it takes the form of what's called 'sexual identification' or 'sexual perception'. This isn't an identification of one's sex or a perception made sexualized, but rather a bizarre means through which identification and perception are made *sexually*. Not in the advance of sex itself, as something flirtatious or involving intercourse, but with reference to sex as a hollow term. As an undentity. In essence, anything determined as one's sex through an act of sexual identification becomes one's sex. The subjective criterion, the attribution of purpose alone becomes one's gender. As such any means through which one's gender can be identified becomes a gender. It's a purpose with reference to nothing. It's a perception of a perception. Doesn't matter if it's male, female, wolf-kin, or an Apache Attack Helicopter. It's like claiming to be a killer without haven't

killed anything. To us this is simply lying but to them the removal of the objective criterion and thus any need to reference reality through causal relationship eliminates any need for demonstration, substantiation, and justification. They simply are, as axiomatically as they 'right'. This is why they refuse to explain and insist that others submit to their claims, to validate their undentity. It's really the most black and white example of non-criterial identity.

Now of course in reality sexual identification as a meaningful term and sex itself deal in one's biological make-up as either male or female. As such any means of determining one's sex necessarily involves one's biology and so either male or female. But when sex as a term, as a standard, is divorced from any criteria the act of identifying sex is no longer an act of identification according to these criteria. It's no longer an act of determining one's biological make-up. It's an act of, well, making it anything you want. It is an act of selection according to personal preference which manifests as an undentity.

Remember the quintessential characteristics of an undentity: falsely axiomatic and non-criterial. So make up an undentity, falsely claim it as yourself, and then seek to justify this undentity ex post facto with whatever criteria you wish. So let's call this undentity 'Blurb'. Now a perception of one's Blurb is an act of 'Blurbal' identification. Though more than just identification, of an observation of reality, it's an act of entirely assuming into existence the characteristics of one's 'Blurb' and thus what 'Blurb' even is. Thus an act of 'Blurbal' identification is actually an act of 'Blurbal' definition, of defining one's 'Blurb'.

Where have we seen this before? Right, when a false victim selects the characteristics they believe they are being victimized for. An act of defining their victimization rather than actually identifying it.

Such is the fate of 'sex' in the Leftist ideological mind. It too has become entirely non-criterial by virtue of nebulizing the concept of gender; the elimination of the 'male' and 'female' as the objective criteria. Ergo acts of sexual identification, acts of determining gender, are to Leftists merely acts of personal affirmation; of making one's sex anything they wish it to be. Now of course, ask a Leftist what their *biological sex* is and you're likely to receive either male or female in response. This is because 'biological' as a term has yet to suffer such dissolution. But insofar as 'sex' is described in gender, sex is anything including the biological. Thus gender is an undentity begging to be justified ex post facto as whatever personalized nonsense an ideologue can come up with. This is why I say that rather than 'sex' becoming nothing, it becomes everything. It becomes open to the void and so may be and can be anything at all.

So if you can believe it and I hope you do, identifying one's sex and an act of *sexual* identification are entirely different things. In the same vein that justice and a just society are entirely different from *social*

justice and something *socially* just. Notice too how in the dissolution of standards and the undentity it invariably creates, what is chosen as one's 'sexual identity' is a matter entirely of personal preference and individual affirmation. Hence there being as many sexual or 'gender identities' as there are people who espouse one. They are all of them dabbling ducks.

So we ask the question, "Is this an act of creation?" The answer simply, is no. Regardless that the dissolution of sex allows for gender to describe a near-limitless number of possibilities, of possible standards and the combinations of criteria therein, the dissolution of gender as a self-contained social construct reveals such creations as, in a sense, a vandalism of the old standard. Fundamentally, dissolving a standard into the swirling madness of every possible criterion, into the conceptual ether, is always and forever an act of destruction. We need only ask ourselves of all the new 'genders' the Left creates, what is one's sex? What criteria in reality do we use to determine sex? What is the standard? The answer is of course, nothing. With 'sexual identification' and with that gender now an act of combining any criteria at all, there exists no standard for sex nor sexuality. In dissolving the old standard and replacing it with none of their own, just some personal garbage sharing no common criteria between them, it is absolutely an act only of destruction. Paradoxically and thus self-destructive, it's an act of nonspecific categorization. This lack of specificity for sex makes anything and everything fall under the category of sex insofar as sex is defined through gender. Yet at the same time they maintain their distinctions from one another. Impossible to be sure, but such is the fate of any standard dissolved into this ether. Simply put, there is no creation without individuation i.e. standardization. With sex and gender no longer standardized, there is nothing new created. There is nothing individuated.

Picture a clear glass bottle with a sticker on it that reads: 'Paint'. It's filled first with blue then yellow paint, mixed to create green. Blue and yellow are the criteria and their combination, the standard they create in their fusion, is green. We now have a bottle of green paint. The Left's interpretation of gender is akin to removing the yellow paint and replacing it with literally anything else. Then removing the blue paint and replacing it with literally anything else. Then claiming that the end result is a bottle of paint – no matter what. Not green paint or purple paint or orange paint or some other mixture of paints. Instead a deceptive, bipolar, well-spoken paint that has no viscosity, no weight, and no color at all. Characteristics that do not and cannot describe paint. This glass bottle filled to the brim with rusty nails, crushed brick, and crawling with fire ants is, to them, paint. Why? Because this glass bottle is for paint and thus anything placed into it is, no matter what, paint. The glass bottle, like the term, is hollow. Filled with whatever you choose the label nevertheless sticks to it, regardless that what's in the bottle isn't

paint. Filling the bottle with anything is like their version of *sexual* identification. Whatever goes in becomes their sexual identity, becomes their gender identity, because that's what they put in there. What paint actually is, what it means and all its characteristics are entirely irrelevant. Whatever goes in the empty glass bottle is paint, *becomes* paint. Outside of the bottle they recognize what these things actually are be they rusty nails, crushed brick, or even feelings and preferences. But anything in the bottle is paint when *inside the bottle*. Now with each and every Leftist filling up their own glass bottles labeled 'Paint' with anything they choose, what paint is becomes relative. Not relative insofar as they judge other's according to their own bottle. No, that would be an act of standardization. Neither do they claim their own to be the 'true' paint. Instead they recognize that everyone has a bottle and inside that bottle, regardless what it is outside of it, is always and forever paint. Thus they all have their paint and all have their own pseudo-standard for what paint is. That is, paint is anything inside these bottles. This is where their relativity comes from. Furthermore they insist that everyone needs a paint. It's important, this self-righteous belief in paint, in sex and gender identity. So important that to impose any restriction on it, say through the exercise of a reasoned critique that activates their own scrutiny of it, is heresy. Though in the cult of conviction, any challenge to one's self-righteousness is heretical. It's blasphemy.

So one may claim to be an astro-sexual, identifying as some astronomical body in space or fetishizing it, while another may be platonioromantic, feeling no difference between platonic and romantic attraction. All fall under the realm of *sexual* identification or 'gender identity' regardless that no common thread can be established between them. Note that outside of strict personal perception, both are fundamentally impossible. Both to be an astronomical body as well as recognizing no distinction between two feelings that one has nevertheless distinguished. See, in keeping with the trend of ever-increasing justifications in order to deny personal agency, itself predicated on an undentity, so too are ever more standards sacrificed and dissolved into the ether in order to maintain the initial undentity as genuine, as something legitimate.

So while it may appear an act of creation, understand that this is absolutely and entirely destructive. The Left destroys standards and the identities they come to describe. They do not invent their own as such is an effect of standardization - always. Hence their effort to dissolve all standards through nebulization rather than to create their own. Any standards and so identities they seemingly create reflect a progressive means of dissolution of the basic standard they once referenced. Thus increasing the genders a la 'gender identity' seeks to dissolve the standard of gender. Ergo new genders aren't so much creations but dissolutions of the criteria once used to determine gender. Instead of sex and particular

sex roles i.e. purposes, sex and purpose are both becoming irrelevant to gender and any identity it could describe. 'Pansexual' and 'non-binary' appear as Leftist creations, but they're really corruptions. Smashing a car doesn't make it a new car, just a smashed one. The damage is something created, but represents the creation of an act of destruction or, as they refer to it, deconstruction. So when they claim to be 'deconstructing a stereotype', what they're really communicating is their intent to nebulize a standard.

Naturally you'd suppose this would court schism. After all, it's a recognition of their individualistic beliefs. It's them perceiving each other as dabbling ducks eating where they do because they believe it's the best spot to eat. But in this instance the standard that has been dissolved to allow for this relativity and its recognition ensures that such schism cannot take place. In the example of the ducks, the standard for 'best' is dissolved. Now there is no 'best'. There is no means of determining it and so no means of claiming it in truth. 'Best' is something they all merely advocate exists but as a hollow term. It is a shared belief but in nothing, in a nonconcept, a non-criterion and the undentity generated from it. So 'best' as a pseudo-standard becomes entirely relative. In keeping with the analogy, all the ducks recognize this relativity and congregate, but not based around an unspoken and assumed projection of what they believe is 'best' and what it means. They have gone beyond Allied Projection. Instead they congregate based around conviction itself. They recognize their disparate views of 'best' and that while they hold their own interpretation as true, they hold it as true only for themselves. That they possess great personal conviction regarding their beliefs, but don't seek to substantiate and so standardize them in any fashion, is the like-mindedness through which they form a collective. Through pure and puerile undentity. Through their shared rejection of standardization, embrace of nebulization, and shared non-criterial identity. This is the Left's counter to Rightist religion. This is the Left's opposition to individuation. This is the religion of the Left.

Antithesis: The Hidden Religion of the Left

Antithesis:

Anti-thesis, against thesis, against proposition itself and so against thought. Itself a proposition it

is paradoxical, subsisting entirely on conviction, the belief in antithesis, characterized by belief apart from any means of standardization and any criteria. A belief in nothing. It is anti-objectivity ever trending towards, though never reaching, pure madness.

Given the reliance though indeed the very nature of Rightism as individuation itself is it any wonder that Leftism operates according to its own hidden mechanism? Well no, but unlike individuation Leftism operates to deny individuation rather than to operate on its own separate system. See, even at its very core there is no standard at play, no criteria or process or method borne from reason and ultimately from causal relationships. Instead it acts to deny and oppose individuation, to deny and oppose reality. Not unlike a parasite who requires its host, Leftism requires individuation and the Rightism it generates not only to exist but in order to act in ways that accord with Leftist ideology. Think of it this way: Leftism corrupts, consumes, and destroys while Rightism universalizes, maintains, and creates. Ergo Leftism requires Rightism in order to manifest these characteristics as well as the purpose behind them. Leftism is a parasite, a leech, the greater and more deadly of these mind-viruses.

So how does one oppose individuation without also taking a position of their own? Without providing their own standard, their own belief based in criteria? Well one cannot. So opposed to individuation, cause and effect, and reason itself borne from both these processes it's an entirely unreasonable position. It is paradoxical. It manifests as the proposition that all propositions are false or, more accurately, that there are no propositions. It is anti-thesis; against thesis itself. Ergo Antithesisism as my chosen name for it. Essentially it is nihilistic in that no truth exists and similarly contradictory in that very same premise, since to be true that claim must itself be true. Ergo truth exists. So theoretically it fails and is entirely unreasonable, but that's the point. In rejecting reason it must be by definition unreasonable, and so it is. But unlike the nihilist who will actively claim such a position, the antithesisist does no such thing. Rather they can only ever claim that something isn't truth. They won't claim that something is true thus taking a position and crafting a thesis. They exist only to destroy whatever truths are presented to them. Their nihilism is passive and implied though never recognized as their position.

Practically speaking however it is able to manifest in predictable and even cogent, though not substantiated, arguments and actions. This is their advocacy or rather their degeneration and dissolution of any and all standards. They claim that any standard presented isn't right, isn't true, and so is false. Their justifications for this are nonsense as they're not operating on any standard and so not referencing any criteria through which they make these claims. As discussed, such justifications are merely their recognition that they need some reason, any reason at all, so they choose one if only to act

as a placeholder. So given some standard for a woman, a Leftist will claim that it is a false one without providing their own standard for what constitutes a woman. Presenting even a single criterion for 'woman' will be met with a similar though more nebulous response. Instead of an outright rejection of the criterion as necessary to being a 'woman', the Leftist will claim that it is irrelevant, that it doesn't matter one way or another. In this way no standard, even one produced through the exclusion of criteria, can be determined. Taken to its logical conclusion, one that we are already intimately aware, the Leftist will claim that no criteria is necessary to the identity of 'woman'. They claim that it merely exists axiomatically through proclamation alone. This is where their nihilism is best demonstrated of course. That is, the only thing that exists, should it even be described as existing, that has no criteria that can be attributed to it is literally nothing. In the Leftist's crusade to deny criteria for anything and everything what they're really advocating is that everything, every standard we possess and the criteria therein, all of it is nothing. They nebulize everything they can back into the ether. An ether that exists. A swirling chaos of all that is, that can be, and has been. An ether that is basically unrefined truth. All of reality imperceptible, indistinguishable, and unknown.

Remember it is only through individuation, our plucking from this ether criteria and their fusion into some new standard, that we can attempt to create knowledge. That we can attempt to categorize and understand the universe and so truth. In the Leftist's opposition to individuation she seeks to return everything to the ether. To reverse whatever progress that has been made in our pursuit of truth as a species. Masked in a guise of humility or justice, she seeks to return to Gaia or Mother Earth or Nature or whatever she calls it, what she believes we ought not possess: knowledge. She seeks to end any and all means to discriminate, to categorize, and to act on the preferences and options such distinctions generate. As more and more of these distinctions, these standards are lost to the ether the Leftist ideologue loses more and more of herself. Less apt and less able to develop standards, she's open to less options, less truths, and so weakens her ability to express her preferences in more individualistic and personal ways. So her individuality begins to fade along with others of the 'faith' becoming less and less distinguishable from each other. What they always wanted in the end, they sacrifice their individuality, their recognition of their agency and their exercise of it to maintain their undentity. To uphold nothing as though it were something, they invert all of reality and transform *it* into nothing instead. Nihilism and the destruction of their world and ours for the sake of a hollow word. For the sake of being without acting. For the sake of existing without interacting. Existing apart from and irrespective of the universe. The inversion of reality they logically required the moment they manifested their denial.

So to us as outside observers, if we can say that they hold any position at all it is that standardization doesn't require criteria though really that just identity doesn't require it. They're hardly so self-aware as to recognize their utter rejection of standardization. It's all identity to them. Both nihilistic and egocentric at its core, it's basically a paradoxically universal relativism. Where everything that is true is subjective and thus nothing can be true, but we must nevertheless operate according to our own truth, our own self-righteous perspectives, but only insofar as such perspectives aren't claimed as universally true. Naturally this is impossible to countenance especially when we consider the myriad ways in which disparate self-righteous individuals would interact, which is why the degeneration of standards are their shared goal, rather than any advocacy of their own perspectives. Though again, such perspectives are that they are merely right and thus their undentities exist. The nature of their beliefs are literally nothing so really, there is nothing to govern interaction and, in truth, no reason why such a perspective even shared amongst millions would generate conflict. Such is the effect of rejecting preference and the ability to discriminate. At least in theory, given these individuals are hardly as devoid of preference and discrimination as they like to believe. Basically they strive for a hivemind, to be the Borg of Star Trek fame. Of course, such a Leftist is just a dabbling duck who has developed an awareness of the mechanism of Allied Projection and the conviction that ultimately governs it. Yet this requires standardization to even determine which makes the position itself, should we even call it one, entirely self-destructive. So it's not a position. It's not a subsequent belief because it's entirely non-criterial. It's treated as something axiomatic revealing it to be merely an extension of 'I exist' and 'I am right' into some other belief; that of an undentity. Call it progressivism, liberalism, socialism, or whatever meaningful political term they bastardize. I call it Leftism or Nebulization, namely Antithesism. In truth progressive, liberal, and social merely describe aspects of Leftism. Aspects they've begun to corrupt and return to the ether. Just consider how impossible it is to even define 'liberal' anymore. That's antithesism at work. It's all just conviction in the end. Belief not in something, not in nothing, not in anything, not even in belief itself. Just belief.

Empty Words Form Hollow Worlds: All Roads Lead to Nowhere

The Left is possessed of no positions, no principles, and no standards. I imagine this seems absurd given our ability to easily observe and cite values and behaviors particular to the Left. However, they merely

accord with the denial the Left must maintain. A denial of the mechanism of standardization itself. Notions of equality, liberty, and freedom are less to do with preaching universal principles of human interaction and more to do with their opposition to any traditional standards. When taken as principles they form their own standards of course, but the Left doesn't hold to them as principles, at least not for long. They are merely a means to an end, a necessary stepping stone in the ultimate goal of nebulization. The Left holds to them for their ability to degenerate current standards, not to replace them. Recall what feminists have done to the identity of 'woman'.

This is why they are so hypocritical in their championing of these principles. They don't understand how they operate as standards in and of themselves but rather as tools of destruction. Notions of equality, liberty, and freedom are adopted only as tools for their practical use in attacking and dismantling traditional standards. There is no intention of implementing them as standards in and of themselves. As I said they are a *means* to an end, not an end in and of themselves. In this way when Leftists attack the standards of Rightists with appeals to these principles, it's not a war of ideas. It's not advocacy of one position as opposed to another but rather the wholesale destruction of the old position without any intention to implement another in its stead. It's the same thing they do with established standards of identity. While the Leftist is certainly self-righteous, of the real world they can only ever tell you what isn't right. They can't tell you what *is* right, what *is* true, what standards we ought to develop and secure. They can only denounce the current status quo, the current tradition, the current culture, whatever are the standards du jour. If they tell you that anything is right, it is their wanton acts of destruction; their process of nebulization itself. The *means* is what is right because it is the only thing, the only action that accords with their nihilistic relativism. Their antithesisism. Suffice it to say, if you can't advocate for a position because you don't have one, yet you still denounce any and all other positions, the only thing you can advocate for is their falsehood and so any means of eliminating them.

Call it the destruction of the *other*, because that's what it is. It is the elimination of everything that isn't them and indeed everything that operates in complete opposition to their self-righteousness. It is the world as others see it, sometimes the world as it actually is – the truth. Though ultimately it is individuation, a fundamental part of reason whose very existence not only threatens but constantly attacks their irrational, unreasonable, self-righteous undentity. It is reality which they can't escape, fighting it in a futile, immature attempt to supplant it with their fantasy. A fantasy that in lieu of individuation, in lieu of standardization and reason itself, can't exist anyway. Always a parasite, always existing as an irrational counter to the fundamentals of reality, it needs the truth of individuation to

pretend to exist at all. Let me say that again. In order for Leftists to claim their undentities as true, they need individuation which itself demonstrates that their undentities are a falsehood. Suffice it to say, in order to claim to be right they must in some way know that they are wrong – always. Their ultimate enemy is therefore not conservatives or the patriarchy or straight white men. It's reality and they make themselves a victim of it.

#### Position from Opposition: Resistance is Futility

So naturally with Rightism borne through an ideologue's recognition and so implementation of behavior as the criterial standard for their ex post facto justification of their undentity, fundamentally individuation itself, Leftism is borne through an ideologue's denial and so rejection of behavior as an ex post facto justification for their undentity. Instead they claim, though not in so many words and certainly not consciously, that their identity exists without and apart from any criteria and most certainly apart from behavior. While they maintain that their identity does create some effect on reality and therefore must exist, they claim no criteria other than the existence of the undentity as the impetus for these effects.

As explored previously, this results in the undentity being nevertheless defined by behavioral criteria albeit at one removed. The behavior of the 'other' is used instead. When perceived as effected through the existence of, or otherwise in response to, the undentity it is used to establish not the behavioral criteria for the undentity itself, but a proof of the existence of the undentity. So while the Rightist will claim, "I am a Rightist by virtue of my behavior", the Leftist will respond, "I am a Leftist by virtue of *your* behavior". So the Leftist exists only as a counter to the Rightist; taking no legitimate position of their own. They form an opposition in practice, but no oppositional theory nor position. They merely claim falsehood in the position of the Rightist with that initial claim of falsehood producing whatever pseudo-positions they must advocate for to justify their opposition which then manifests practically. In other words, the Leftist requires a *position to counter* in order for them to manifest the behavior that typifies them. The Leftist is ultimately geared toward denial and denying reality after all.

So if a Rightist is against gay marriage, the Leftist is for it. If the Rightist is for free speech, the Leftist is

against it. Of course the positions of Rightists aren't nearly as random as they accord with the process of individuation and so reality. This injects survival as a core value which in turn leads Rightists of allsorts toward common particulars. So in spite of their varied preferences and wildly different justifications, Rightists share common themes not only in the construction of their respective ideologies but even in their most superficial tenants. Tenants that even if preferentially based are designed to effect outcomes to facilitate survival. Whose overall purpose is understood regardless that the true mechanism is largely if not entirely unknown. The Rightist merely represents a corporeal manifestation of reality and a societal vector for the truths of it. Does this mean that the Leftist isn't able to develop any truths and so knowledge of their own? Well, insofar as they operate as a Leftist, as one who denies reality and refuses to employ individuation, yes. Only the Rightist makes the attempt to understand reality through individuation. The Leftist is only 'right' should their opposition to the Rightist have them take a pseudo-position that is, in truth, the truth. Serendipity is their only means of achieving demonstrable truth but even then it's a conclusion operating without regard to how it is true. It's just self-righteous belief and acting on it is a form of zealotry; only coincidentally aligned with the truth. Though as ever, acting in ignorance is regrettable.

#### Down With Establishment: Rebels without Cause

Given that Rightism is the result of standardization it produces many different ideologies albeit sharing the same fundamental process in common. Christians, Muslims, Jews, Hindus, Libertarians, Republicans, Conservatives, etc. All different at a superficial level and all the same at a foundational one. The predictions necessary to establishing the particular standards of an ideological identity allow for as many ideologies as there are predictions, as there are people to make such predictions. Ergo standardization produces many seemingly disparate and oppositional ideologies that are nevertheless bound to the same process. A process that isn't necessarily right or wrong but whose ultimate purpose of legitimizing one's identity through reason, through interaction with reality, can result in objective truths. Truths obscured by incorrect and often religiously fantastical justifications, but truths nonetheless. No true or pure Rightism exists since it is only the attempt to produce truth rather than a perfect possession and understanding of it. That said, it is the efficacy of the process and probability of the truth of its results that are used to establish a hierarchy between different Rightist ideologies, between different

approaches. A combination of science and philosophy, a scientific philosophy mind you, would likely bear the greatest results in this matter. Since it's impossible to entirely relinquish our self-righteousness and the undentity it produces, even science as we perform it is marred by fault through intention rather than detached observation and reasoned conclusion. Simply put, no matter what truth we seek we're always trying to justify our undentity in some fashion no matter how slight and no matter how small its influence to begin with. It's the reasoning behind adopting humility and agnosticism both in science and in life itself. Also for adopting diversity if only to limit the effects of shared group intentions. It is little wonder then that so many Rightist ideologies, in particular Christianity, hold humility as a great virtue. In fact, it holds it as *the root of all virtue* given its opposition to pride, to self-righteousness. The supposed root of all evil.

Leftism is another matter entirely. Given that Leftism requires standards established by Rightism in order to nebulize them, nebulization doesn't result in disparate ideologies. Rather it is representative of a singular process: the dissolution of any and all standards. This is its 'pure' form. Though I hear you protest, citing the differences between Marxism, Socialism, Democratic Socialism, Communism, Progressivism, and so on. These differences aren't entirely what you think them to be. Remember that only Rightist ideology produces legitimate positions that may then conflict with other Rightist ideologies. The same isn't true of Leftist ideologies. Rather Leftist ideologies exist in response to some standard established by a Rightist that the Leftist then nebulizes thus forming a pseudo-position. In essence, the impetus to Marxism was some Rightist standard while the impetus to Communism was a different Rightist standard while the impetus to Socialism was yet another different Rightist standard and so on. Every Leftist ideology is merely the result of a different standard that has been nebulized. A process that itself determines the Leftist's opposition, the 'other' that they require to maintain their ideological identity as non-criterial. Simply put, the 'other' present in every Leftist ideology are those who represent the standard the Leftist has chosen to nebulize. So think of Leftism, think of nebulization as a universal solvent. Pour it on anything and it begins to dissolve. While what it dissolves is different, that it dissolves and in the same fashion is recognized. This is what forms the observable differences in what are nevertheless recognized as Leftist ideologies. They are the differences between a dissolving chair, a dissolving table, a dissolving lamp, a dissolving television, etc.

That the Left shares this same dissolution in common is what allows for congruity and indeed swift amalgamation into a singular ideology. In their efforts to nebulize any and all standards, they're quick to combine their efforts to do so. So for example, communists and feminists fuse their respective efforts to

dissolve the patriarchy and capitalism into a singular purpose. Since communists and feminists are antithesists who share their opposition of standardization in common, and with capitalism and the patriarchy as feminists mistakenly understand it representing standardization, they're eager to combine their efforts to dissolve them both. With each and every standard that a Leftist seeks to nebulize they take for themselves a new title to communicate this purpose. So you have the advent of the feminist communist or the anarcho-communist feminist or the anarcho-communist trans-feminist and so on. Truly just an antithesist, their ignorance of their true motivations has them affix to their undentity restatements of this underlying purpose in new particulars. This results in an ever-increasing specificity for their undentity whilst ironically avoiding the one term that perfectly defines them: antithesist or at least, nebulizer. It's akin to someone describing themselves as a 'destroyer of rocks, destroyer of trees, destroyer of mahogany furniture, etc.,' rather than merely a destroyer which they are in full.

With this reliance on the 'other' for defining their undentity, they must necessarily define themselves by literally everything they are not, rather than what they are. So for everything they are not they select a title to define themselves as oppositional, as the antithesis, rather than using a single umbrella term. A single self as defined through their own actions rather than everyone else's. Again theirs is a trend that logically concludes that they are nothing or rather that their undentity is nothing. That their undentity doesn't exist. Which is true of course.

Nebulization: Means without End

With all we know now, consider the following traits common to the Leftist both as they are defined reasonably and how they are used merely as tools to erode our language and so understanding of reality.

First is a sense of victimhood and of the perception of self as reactive rather than active. Though to explore this in much more depth is really to beat a dead horse given our exploration of feminism and antithesism. But to touch on the aspects more particular to Leftism as a strictly political ideology, there is it's the championing of the supposed victim and the perpetual pursuit of the liberation of undentities of most any sort. That is, they only champion undentities for which behavioral criteria are denied. Naturally to accept such criteria is antithetical not just to their own undentity but their perception of

identity itself. See, Leftists don't only preserve non-criterial identity for themselves but rather view all identities as non-criterial. Those who claim, establish, or enforce any such criteria are deemed irrational, discriminatory, and the act itself a form of bigotry. Fact is, it's a literal act of discrimination for which Leftists are correct in some sense.

For example, it certainly would be racist to ascribe to all blacks a particular behavior. Yet the attempt to do so is a result of standardization which is the more objective perception of identity, even if it's being used to generalize and even to stereotype. But fundamentally it's standardization that Leftists are really opposing. The result of any attempt at standardization is moot as can be observed when one attempts to describe say blacks as something positive. Traits such as 'hard-working' or 'athletic' or 'sociable' are seen as bigoted. Only nebulous terms that can benefit from Allied Projection will work. Terms such as 'good' or 'worthy' or 'matter' will be met with praise given that the purpose and so standard such terms reference is left to the Leftist to interpret positively. To attribute to them whatever subjective identity that accords with those descriptions. Essentially, one must only offer hollow words to appease the Leftist. Consider the slogan 'Black Lives Matter' whose matter of mattering, whose causal relationship established through the use of the term 'matter', is left entirely ambiguous.

Individuation and the nature of identity also compounds this matter. See, when Leftists claim that black is an *identity* rather than a mere category, a race, Rightists therefore attempt to ascribe some behavior to it because as an identity, as a description of an agent, it by definition requires some exercise of agency to describe. It requires a purpose to describe and a means to achieve it. So naturally the Rightist attempts to attribute some behavior and so purpose to the 'black identity' thereby appearing the bigot to everyone ignorant of the necessary criteria for establishing identity. Which is near everyone. In reality it is a failure of reason on behalf of the Leftist in presenting the black race as an identity and a failure of the Rightist to accept this proposition. The Leftist also claims a nebulous 'black experience' which governs what 'black' is insofar as it affects the lives of blacks; how 'black' alters someone's life. Naturally this is merely a defining of one's identity through circumstance and the 'other'. See, it is what happens to blacks, their experience rather than their actions, their experience of reality rather than their shaping of it, that determines what 'black' really is. A victim. A non-agent. An object.

This cult of victimhood is where the Leftist's advocacy of liberty really comes from. To act without restriction is to operate without standard, without any imposition of the preferences of others on your person. Liberty in its definition includes the existence of some other, naturally some other to liberate oneself from. In this way their advocacy for liberty is only to label themselves as oppressed and with

that the other as their oppressor. Using their corrupted version of identity to do so, they make themselves out to be the advocates of most everyone whilst inflicting on them an undentity. An undentity that, should they accept it, they will lose their sense of personal agency and so the identity the Leftist ironically claims to advocate for; to protect and champion.

Second is Leftism's rank anti-traditionalism. Now this has been chalked up to youth rebellion wherein the younger generations reject the traditions and even values of the old. Though it must be stated that this is actually a recent phenomenon and hardly a long-standing historical one. Regardless, whether or not youth rebellion assists in this process it is not the ultimate cause of it. With schism the mechanism of Rightist evolution, nebulization is of course the mechanism of Leftist evolution. Naturally this requires something to nebulize so it targets the traditions, values, culture, etc., as established by the Rightist. Again, demonstrating their reliance on Rightism. Essentially what you have through the rejection of past traditions, values, and the like is the process of nebulization itself. Every value and tradition extolled or enforced is perceived, correctly so, as predicated on a belief that invariably establishes behavioral criteria for their undentity. Given that Leftism is founded on the rejection of any such behavioral criteria, the traditions and values of the old generation or even those remaining after the last iteration of nebulization are similarly rejected. This leaves the core of Leftism forever existing as a singular ideology with any past iterations of the ideology, necessarily established through schism, considered not coincidentally nor merely disparagingly as 'more conservative' or 'centralist'. They recognize albeit subconsciously that previous iterations of Leftist ideology possessed some standards which, in their adherence to nebulization, they must rectify. This is why Leftism on the whole is seen to evolve with every generation, hell even within a few years of its last iteration. Leftism only becomes more and more nebulized while iterations it leaves in its wake, those who have necessarily adopted some standard, have succumbed to Objectivity Creep and begin trending toward Rightism. They are the Leftist version of traditionalists and reformers. A far-cry from their Rightist counterparts but sharing the same mechanism in common. This phenomenon within feminist ideology has been recognized and categorized as waves. First Wave, Second Wave, and Third Wave feminism respectively. It comes as no surprise then that this latest iteration of sex-specific Leftist ideology has further nebulized the identity of 'woman' but has also amalgamated several other attempts at nebulization from previously distinct Leftist ideological camps. This ever-increasing nebulization, this march to nowhere, is what they call progress. Yet remember that their use of the term is not with regard to the creation of anything new but in the dissolution and removal of perceived past 'hindrances' i.e. behavioral criteria for identity. Recall my observation that so-

called 'Women's Liberation' is merely the attempt to liberate the term 'woman' from any behavioral criteria. This understanding of liberation is what a Leftist evokes when referring to progress. A progressive nebulization. With this definition of progress the means by which Leftism grows is fairly obvious. Given that Leftism is fundamentally based on undentity, all it can do is to include progressively more and more identities and 'liberate' them from any behavioral criteria. You have observed this certainly. Leftists target any and every identity they can and attempt to bring them into the fold. This is why there is always and forever some new Leftist campaign for the poor victimized somebody.

Now as established many times, Leftists define themselves through the actions of others which creates a sense of victimization. Yet their ascription of victimhood to the identities they target is actually more nefarious and, I can barely believe it myself, rarely calculated. See, when one understands the relationship between their identity and behavior they accept both that their behaviors define who they are but also that these behaviors have consequences; namely interpretation according to the standard of some other that may or may not be preferable. Fundamentally they understand that even if it isn't necessarily warranted, their behavior will always create some reaction on behalf of others. Ah, but when defined as a victim first and foremost this connection between one's identity, behaviors, and the reaction to these behaviors is severed. In being described as a 'victim' there is a reversal made to cause and effect, to the causal relationship their identity once described.

So rather than their behaviors defining themselves and engendering a response in some other, said other is now perceived as acting without regard to any behavior on the part of the so-called victim. The only criteria upon which this victimizing action is taken, this action taken by virtue of no behavior on the part of the 'victim', is simply left to the victim's identity. But, and this is a big but, an identity that is no longer based in any behavioral criteria. So essentially when a Leftist is able to convince someone that they are a victim it results in a rewiring of that person's brain. In order to accept that they are victimized is to implicitly accept that their identity is based on no criteria. To be victimized because of *what* you are rather than *how* you are.

Taken to extremes this allows Leftists to entirely excuse their own behaviors believing that nothing they do warrants response or that any action on their part is reactive rather than active. This also works for Leftists who claim to be victimizing other Leftists through nonsensical concepts like patriarchal oppression, microaggressions, and privilege when used in this context. With all that said if you ever wondered how and why a skeptic, critic, or otherwise non-Leftist can so quickly reverse stance, to do an about-face on their previously held position, well now you know why. The moment one accepts that an

identity can be victimized merely for existing and not for the characteristics it describes, that it can be hated axiomatically as opposed to the causality it describes, they will divorce that identity from any and all characteristics, especially behaviors. As a victim, the perpetrators of their victimization mustn't be seen as reactive but as active. As the cause rather than the effect. This is what happens when you equate any identity with victimhood. When you equate one's exercise of agency with reaction. When you equate their responsibility with irresponsibility. When you multiply by 0.

Naturally I must make the caveat that some behaviors in reaction to others are certainly victimizing; violence essentially. Yet with that said the so-called victimization of these identities is most often a matter of acting according to one's innocuous preferences. That is, not baking a cake for a homosexual wedding or submitting to one's preferred pronouns. Certainly this is discrimination but only literal. Such discrimination is simply the exercise of preference through choice. To treat it as some nefarious action or always with reference to some malicious intention, brands negative connotations upon what is the very bedrock of freedom itself: choice. The victimization described by Leftists is merely some other's reaction to the behaviors of the so-called victim. It hasn't anything to do with their identity but their characteristics, most often behavioral. We may not perceive such actions as warranted, but that in and of itself is our exercise of preference and so discrimination. So by what right does the Leftist exercise their preferences over all others?

Third is the championing of equality. Equality is actually the attempt to enforce a particular response to particular behaviors or even all behaviors. Though within the Leftist paradigm it is perceived as the enforcement of a consistent response to all identities regardless of the behavior that characterizes that identity. Which they deny exists anyway. So really it's a universalized system of reaction which is typical given that Leftists forever perceive themselves as reactive rather than active. In doing so they're able to erode the behavioral characteristics of one's identity, limit one's exercise of choice and even limit their scope of understanding of their preferences. Without discrimination one loses their grip on reality but first and foremost their recognition of their own values. It is an atrophy of sorts. The less you exercise your preferences the more you forget them or lose them altogether. Equality is the means through which the Leftist hivemind, the Borg, is created.

Anyway, equality as a concept can be meritorious but not when applied according to the Leftist paradigm. So that said, what is the meritorious version of equality? Well, the meritorious version essentially states that one should react to others only with regard to the behavior which generated your reaction and not with regard to any non-behavioral criteria such as the color of their skin. So basically

one should attribute to another what is their responsibility, rather than what is not, and then act or react accordingly. So it becomes entirely a matter of one's behaviors.

Frankly I take no issue with this as it is merely a rational position: one that only considers the relevant variables. However the concept of equality can be repurposed with just that, a purpose. In so doing one isn't simply tasked with behaving the same way with regard to equivalent behaviors from disparate individuals but also in a particular way in order to achieve a desired outcome. Say, always being appreciative of charity in order to encourage the charitable acts of others. Now, without a purpose one could just as easily deride every charitable act on their behalf. So long as they are consistent they would be adhering to the version of equality that I endorse. The issue with the repurposed or just 'purposed' version is that it necessarily becomes a commandment for our behavior rather than a mere consistent behavior on our part. In this way the purposed version is restrictive because it limits all of our responses to one. One in which we are all to remain consistent in rather than the myriad of responses that each of us are to remain consistent in individually. But the Leftist version is far worse than even that.

While it is a commandment on our behavior and thus restrictive by its very nature, these commandments are made with regard to non-criterial identity, with regard to nothing, to no behaviors whatsoever. Therefore it isn't the attempt to enforce a particular response to a behavior, but a particular response to an undentity and even to all undentities. It becomes a response without regard to any prior behavior, a reaction for which there was no prior action. So while it is irrational enough to respond to everyone in the same fashion regardless of their behaviors, it is further compounded by the fact that ours is no longer a response to a behavior, a reaction to a prior action but instead an action in and of itself. See, without any criteria for which it can be claimed to be reacting or responding to, this commandment to *respond* in a particular fashion becomes a commandment to *act* in a particular fashion. This transforms equality from a system of universal reaction to a system of universal action and so manifests as an obligation. This is where the quota systems with regard to the hiring of undentities comes from. It isn't enough to merely respond to everyone equally regardless of their behaviors. We must now seek to manifest such actions that themselves result in treating everyone equally. This is understood as 'equality of outcome' as opposed to 'equality of opportunity'.

So where once an entrepreneur was commanded to hire regardless of the behavior that so constituted the identity of the individual, now they must also seek out such individuals in order to hire them. So now it's not enough to have to hire every black man or lesbian with blue hair that comes your way, you must now actively seek them out in order to meet their quota. In effect, they must bring opportunity to

potential employees rather than potential employees coming to them for an opportunity. It's like a grocery store forced to come to you rather than you choosing to come to it. This insanity has resulted in an ever increasing list of undentities of which the entrepreneur is commanded to hire. I'm certain you have noticed this and questioned the logic yourself. Given the finite number of employees and infinite number of undentities, it is objectively impossible to amass a population of employees that would allow for the equal outcome of 'employment' for each undentity. That is, there aren't enough black-Hispanic, blind, multi-lingual, transsexual, lesbian, wheelchair-bound, poor people with superfluous third nipples to fill any such hiring quotas. So at its most basic, the Leftist version of equality results in an obligation to act rather than a consistency of our reactions. Again, inversion invariably results from the Leftist corruption of any dichotomy.

This quota system has been dubbed 'Affirmative Action'. Again a feature of Leftism, they're often far more literal than they intend. In treating an undentity as inherently valuable, so valuable that it should be sought out for potential employment and not by virtue of its own merits, it *affirms* the undentity. It acts as though the undentity produces an effect when it doesn't. It treats it as though it has purpose and matters to something, that it has a causal relationship to reality. It is thus an act of affirmation as we've discussed it. So Affirmative Action is just that, an action that affirms an undentity regardless of its non-criterial nature.

Perhaps controversial, should one wish to exercise their preferences in some fashion, such as treating blacks worse than Latinos, this ought to be preserved. It's hardly in keeping with equality with regard to matters of personal responsibility, but it is nevertheless a matter of personal preference and one that needs to be maintained apart from equality lest all preferences be replaced with obligations. Whatever someone's purpose for this exercise of preference, one need only refuse to subsidize it in order to exercise resistance to it. No force is required. All that is needed is your omission, your absence, your refusal to reward this preference by assisting in its purpose. So long as we recognize equality as a matter strictly of one's responsibility and so one's true identity, we can recognize and maintain both the distinction and necessity of preference and equality. Equality must forever remain a methodology and with that a choice to adhere to it or not. Otherwise it supplants all other possible purposes and so intentions for our actions, replacing them with a singular goal. In essence, it morphs a methodology into a moral absolute. It's a trait more commonly associated with Rightism but can nevertheless manifest in Leftism. Another demonstration of their ideological congruity postulated in Horseshoe Theory.

Fourth is moral relativity. As ever it is the result of the Leftist's relationship, or rather lack thereof, to

behavioral criteria for their identity. Recall how morality is assumed by virtue of the rightness axiom and how Rightists, in defining their undentity ex post facto through their behaviors, claim that their behaviors are themselves moral or 'good'. Naturally the Leftist cannot operate in exactly the same fashion but it is little different. But first I'll address the oft purported reason moral relativity is more pronounced in Leftists.

It is claimed that Leftists are morally relativistic because they recognize that everyone believes that they are a 'good' person, that the understanding and so standard for 'good' changes between cultures, and furthermore that few can agree on what morality actually is. They therefore conclude that morality is based entirely on the individual and by extension one's socialization. So morality is relative to one's society and thus culture. This reasoning isn't at all false but is hardly the origin of their moral relativity. See, Rightists view morality in exactly the same way. They too recognize that everyone believes that they are moral and that what they do, perceived transgressions aside, is purported to be basically good. But unlike the Leftist Rightists have some criteria upon which they base their own identity and thus their morality. Through this they are able to state that regardless that everyone else believes that they are moral, everyone else is wrong. See, in possessing some standard for morality they cannot claim it to be relative even if everyone else claims to be moral. With morality fused with a set of behaviors and ultimately an overall intention, Rightists can objectively observe others not adhering to these behaviors and overall intention. With this observation the Rightist demonstrates that said others do not meet their standard for morality. Basically, morality is equal to their own identity. So parsing those who are moral from those who are immoral is as simple as parsing those who share in their ideological identity from those who don't. More often than not it's all a matter of recognizing shared intentions. So you can guess now where the true moral relativity of the Leftist comes from.

Since the Leftist doesn't base their identity in any behaviors, that they essentially exist apart from any behavioral criteria, so too does their morality. They don't only observe morality as being claimed by each individual, but that it is being claimed by virtue of nothing other than the individual. Viewing identity as non-criterial of course they can't link morality to any such criteria. To the Leftist, morality isn't merely a matter of self-righteousness but entirely self-righteous. To them, it's really just another word for it not unlike their undentity; both claimed without any criteria. Now morality as a standard is certainly something the Leftist wishes to dissolve, but their self-righteousness has them hold to it regardless. Not hold to it as true but to recognize that they and everyone else believe in it. Not even believe that it exists, but believe that they believe it exists. An uncharacteristic recognition of their own

self-righteousness.

So without any standard by which to determine what is and is not moral, a Leftist shouldn't even be able to perceive morality. Yet they can and this is due to the 'I am right' axiom and their denial employed to protect it. See, while they may claim that morality doesn't exist the axiom ensures that no matter what they claim or their actual perspective, that axiom will apply itself thereby imbuing the individual with a sense of righteousness. Of what is good and evil. Their recognition of a universally shared sense of self-righteousness actually threatens their undentity. For this reason it requires the Leftist to deny the existence of a universal morality as it threatens to expose that they have indeed selected personal criteria for their identity. To reveal that their self-righteousness has applied itself to their beliefs and behaviors and so standardized what it means to be a 'woman' or 'black' or whatever undentity they've adopted as a proxy for the self. In essence, this recognition of personal self-righteousness threatens to sever the false bonds created through Allied Projection.

"After all, it's a recognition of their individualistic beliefs. It's them perceiving each other as dabbling ducks eating where they do because they believe it's the best spot to eat. But in this instance the standard that has been dissolved to allow for this relativity and its recognition ensures that such schism cannot take place. In the example of the ducks, the standard for 'best' is dissolved. Now there is no 'best'. There is no means of determining it and so no means of claiming it in truth. 'Best' is something they all merely advocate exists but as a hollow term. It is a shared belief but in nothing, in a noncept, a non-criterion and the undentity generated from it. So 'best' as a pseudo-standard becomes entirely relative."

This is the fate of morality in the Leftist paradigm. In fact, morality acts as a scapegoat or sacrificial lamb in this regard. Instead of the whole of their identity being threatened through the recognition of their shared self-righteousness, only morality is scrutinized and eliminated, at least conceptually. Yet as ever, with 'good' operating relative to whatever purpose one compares it to, eliminating the concept of morality and so what is 'good' invariably results in the elimination of whatever purposes one may compare anything to. It eliminates the prediction inherent to attributing subjective identity and so eliminates the preferences that guide such attributions. In essence, choice and its exercise are dissolved into nothing.

Recognize that the concept of 'good' is necessarily subjective and preferential. To eliminate it is to eliminate your exercise and recognition of choice. This is why moral relativity, despite its seemingly

relativistic nature, doesn't result in myriad different perspectives but a singular one. Another hivemind bound not through purpose, but through the elimination of purpose. The concept of 'good', a pillar of Rightism and rightly so, is the main defense against antithesism. 'Good' is a result of individuation and creates the distinctions that form individuality. Another reason the Christian religion should be lauded. Not for what it claims to be, but for what it is. Our defense.

### Spontaneous Corruption: There Can Only Be One

The propensity for amalgamation as well as the underlying process of nebulization has formed a conspiracy theory amongst Rightists. They label this phenomenon 'Cultural Marxism' and advocate that it is an effect of propaganda and socialization. A Marxist conspiracy to corrupt and destroy society in order to replace it with, of course, Marxism. Naturally some Rightists maintain that this conspiracy isn't so intentional but nevertheless advocate for its Marxist influences. This is wrong. Certainly true in some instances but on the whole there is no conspiracy. Neither is Marx involved. As an observer of nebulization and a proponent of it himself, he only catalogued the phenomenon and how he understood it, how it affected him, rather than being its progenitor. Rightists label it Marxist only because Marxism is the earliest iteration of this phenomenon that they both recognize and understand. They're not nearly as informed to recognize it as antithesism.

Understand of course that nebulization was never invented. It just exists as an effect of self-righteousness and as discussed, nebulization can occur in any of instance schism. Ergo any instance of schism wherein one nebulizes one is able to manifest Leftist ideology and thus develop Leftism seemingly spontaneously. They develop it in the same way their denial must further develop in order to maintain their identity as non-criterial; the infinite regress that denial necessitates. Simply put, it is nebulization. There are influencing factors that catalyze this process which will be covered in the next chapter, but suffice it to say it's an individual process. Nobody requires convincing to become a Leftist. They need only adopt an undentity and maintain that it is non-criterial. That's it. This process is spontaneous. Call it spontaneous corruption.

Should Leftist ideologies not fuse together despite the opportunity to do so, especially if disagreement is fostered between them, it is actually and thankfully an act of standardization. Think about it. If the core

of antithesis represents nothing and its practice the act of nebulization itself, then disparate Leftist ideologies that refuse to congeal together, to combine their efforts to nebulize, are in effect creating a schism or rather recognizing one after the fact. See, the Rightist is prone to developing schism and splitting the ideology and host of ideologues into traditionalists and reformers alike, though of course with some nebulizers left over. So the Leftist in their position as the antithesis to standardization is thus prone to fusion as opposed to schism. Prone to bind ideologues through the purpose they truthfully share in common. Ergo different Leftist ideologies, formed independently of each other, should fuse together. But sometimes they don't and as stated this is an effect of standardization. Such Leftist ideologues have forgone the core of what forms their ideology, which is frankly an easy thing to do given their ignorance of it. By setting a single standard, a means to succeed and to fail and so a behavior that must be adhered to that isn't simply an act of nebulization itself, a Leftist ideology can become incompatible not just with Rightist ideologies but other Leftist ideologies too. Truly, the Leftist ideology has begun to become a Rightist one.

At what point a Leftist ideology becomes a Rightist one isn't something entirely determinable. Sharing undentity in common they are both ideologies, differing only in their means to justify it. Even then the Rightist is often possessed of his own Leftist tendencies and acts of nebulization; false claims of matters irrelevant to his undentity. The Leftist shares in some Rightist tendencies too, possessing their own, often secret standards. Though again as I've said, neither is pure. Regardless of this impurity, the presence of standards within a Leftist ideology and the demonstrable conflict it can generate with other Leftist ideologies let alone within itself is an effect of Objectivity Creep. As such it affords the Leftist an opportunity to gain a more truthful understanding of their self and a perception that aligns more with reality as opposed to operating to deny it.

Funnily the accusations and slander directed at Leftists who hold to some standard(s) mirror their accusations against Rightists. Through accusations of discrimination, bigotry, conservatism, etc., they demonstrate their unconscious recognition of the mechanism of individuation as expressed through the individuals they slander. While individuation is what they fundamentally oppose they don't know how to communicate it other than through, well, the 'other'. So they attribute to them oppositional identities and actions antithetical to nebulization without consciously recognizing the core mechanisms involved.

Through Objectivity Creep Leftists are able to convert to Rightism as it were, but only through the mechanism of schism. Thus conflict is necessary to their conversion. Conflict that, I'm sure you've noticed, the Leftist seeks to avoid within their own ranks and for this very reason. This is their fear of

causing offense, of expressing a standard and so engendering schism through affirmation. Everything that Leftists have allowed themselves to say, all the affirmation and nebulization that is currently deemed kosher within their ideological ranks, is known as Political Correctness.

Conflict reveals to them their disparate standards and so triggers schism if left to fester and intensify. However, given that nebulization can and often does occur in any instance of schism, even a schism that occurs within a Leftist ideology, those who nebulize are measurably more Leftist than all the others. This allows Leftism to grow in its intensity, its breadth of targets for nebulization, and thus grow in purity. So while schism certainly does allow for the Leftist to convert to Rightism, it has the added danger of developing an even more pure and thus more dangerous Leftist ideology. One that nebulizes more standards and to a greater degree. The vast communication network of the internet offered greater opportunity to recognize conflict as well as to speed the inevitable effects of nebulization. A communication network the Rightist used mainly to become more entrenched. With this Leftists have been able to metastasize a form of Leftism that the world has never seen before. One that is far more dangerous than anyone realizes. One that you know all too well and one that nearly epitomizes Leftism and so antithesisism as I've defined it.

And one it is because when it comes to Leftism, to true Leftist ideology, there is only one. It is one long march toward nothing, toward complete nebulization and so ideological purity; granting it greater power of appeal and greater ability to catalyze the zealotry inherent to denial, making it the most powerful and dangerous ideology. It seeks to destroy any and all standards we've created. Seeks to destroy every other ideology, every other identity and undentity alike until only a singular belief in self-righteousness remains. Until a singular undentity remains, one that we all must share and all must be. One that represents the complete inversion of reality, borne from the dichotomy of truth and falsehood. One that is believed to be the truth, the whole truth. A nothing, but the truth. To know all and see all and indeed be all. For all to be one because there can be only one.

This is Social Justice.

CHAPTER 9 - Ideology in Practice Part 2:  
Social Justice

Introduction:

The definition of social justice according to Wikipedia:

‘Social justice is "justice in terms of the distribution of wealth, opportunities, and privileges within a society". Classically, "justice" (especially corrective justice or distributive justice) ensured that individuals both fulfilled their societal roles and received what was their due from society.

Social justice assigns rights and duties in the institutions of society, which enables people to receive the basic benefits and burdens of cooperation. The relevant institutions can include education, health care, social security, labour rights, as well as a broader system of public services, progressive taxation and regulation of markets, to ensure fair distribution of wealth, equal opportunity, equality of outcome, and no gross social injustice.’

This definition of social justice is convoluted. Through its appeals to loftier notions of cooperation, dues, and indeed justice itself, it relies heavily upon one’s definition of these terms and so is an attempt at Allied Projection. Though really, an objective understanding of these terms can and does eliminate them from the concept of social justice altogether but we’ll get to that. In the interim, I’d like to call attention to this definition which is, again depending on your understanding of these terms, a damning definition of social justice.

‘The distribution of advantages and disadvantages within a society.’

I very much like the lack of minced words. Instead of presenting the distribution of disadvantages as some lofty appeal to greater ideals such as a moral obligation, it is entirely frank. It is the distribution of disadvantage or at least the effects of disadvantage which is a disadvantage in and of itself. Notice that in this definition there is no explanation as to why such advantages and disadvantages exist which leaves one to wonder why they ought to be distributed and furthermore no mention of any reason as to what such distribution is designed to achieve. In this way it describes social justice as a behavior without reason, motivation, or goals. Whether intentional or not, kudos to whomever penned this definition as it defines social justice in an objective fashion. Objective insofar as it is an apt and rational observation of the behaviors of social justice warriors hereby referred to as social justice warriors.

The definition from Wikipedia certainly invokes curiosity on the topic, but is so mired in ideological vague-speak that said curiosity does more to damn the concept than create interest. That is to say, rather than defining social justice it makes even more claims of which it must attempt to explain. Of

course all definitions reference other concepts, but rather than attempting to engender understanding this definition appears to proselytize more than anything. Consider in order all the claims it must first demonstrate before it can even establish its own definition:

- 1) Wealth isn't a measure of societal worth and therefore is not justified in its accrument.
- 2) Opportunities, that is avenues to *all* human experience, must be made universally accessible.
- 3) Privilege isn't earned or an effect of others' preferences. It exists only by chance or through nefarious efforts. Though this begs the question as to how it can't be virtuously earned if it can nevertheless be nefariously attained.
- 4) People have societal roles – obligations that must be adhered to. Yet though an obligation it is nevertheless rewarded in the form of 'societal dues'.
- 5) Societal institutions control the ability for people to benefit from cooperation.
- 6) Cooperation is simultaneously beneficial and burdensome. Naturally this can be true, but if the benefit doesn't outweigh the burden then such cooperation ought not to be participated in. Furthermore, if treated as an obligation it becomes an obligation to burden yourself for no reason other than to advantage others who, by all rights, do nothing to benefit you.
- 7) No definition as to what standard 'fairness' operates on.

In reality, this definition operates on an assumed human non-agency. It does away with any concept of merit and individuality and treats all of humanity as a singular entity. From Chapter 1:

“Regarding generalizations, this false dichotomy created by the ‘I am right’ axiom is why it’s harder if not impossible to apply such generalizations to individuals. When we change the other into Bertrand or Sally Sue we break the dichotomy. A belief about ourselves no longer informs our beliefs about these people as they have become individuals in their own right rather than a corollary of any belief about ourselves. In other words, what is true of myself doesn’t inform me of the truth about Bertrand even though it does inform me of the truth about others in general and even though Bertrand is a part of that other. Basically once Bertrand is made a subset of the whole our generalization of the whole no longer applies to him. In more mathematical terms, we simply cannot apply a trend to a single data point. This very fact, that of being unable to apply a trend to a single data point, is integral in the fight against such irrationality and will be discussed later.”

Prepared as we are with the knowledge of the phenomenon of undentity, we can now fully explore this propensity or rather necessity social justice warriors have to generalize not only their opposition but also themselves. Having said that, let us define social justice to accord with everything we've explored thus far:

Social Justice:

The application of undentity - non-criterial existence to all individuals, human and otherwise, and through this the elimination of human agency, objectivity, knowledge, and truth insofar as such undentities are purported to exist.

Technically and more fundamentally this is antithesism, that is the elimination of standards as an oppositional behavior to individuation and the inversion of reality that it creates. But given that the social justice warrior operates at the level of identity I believe a distinction must be made in order to account for their ignorance and lack of scope. Social Justice, while the most pure form of antithesism, is yet still a superficial manifestation of it.

Remember that without any means to objectively substantiate these undentities they are, in truth, axiomatic. Transgender, transracial, other-kin, etc. Yet consider that without any such link to one's identity, taken merely at face value, these 'identities' are simply claims in and of themselves. That there exist male-females, black-whites, wolf-humans, etc. They have merely been fused with and claimed as an identity. When presented on their own merit these claims are readily scrutinized and rebutted for the hogwash that they are. Ah, but shield them in the sacred notion of personal identity and now any such challenge becomes, what dear reader? Discrimination! Oh and honestly, how fitting that a term that defines the ability to differentiate reality, to observe and establish distinction, would become a disparaging term. Especially in this instance wherein identities are being linked to truth claims without any objective substantiation. In these situations accusations of 'discriminating' are little more than observations that the accused has employed reason to develop distinctions. It is here that we truly see the manifestation of the 'thought crime' wherein it is not merely an objectionable or spurned thought that is made criminal but the very act of the correct application of logic and reason; of objectivity itself. Social justice is anti-objectivity as a social movement. It is unthought incarnate. social justice warriors are the zombies, the pod people, and the death of the enlightenment.

Though this was inevitable dear reader. As ever, ideology is first and foremost based on denial and with all its subsequent behaviors designed to maintain it, is it any wonder that it would eventually manifest

as pure anti-objectivity? Truthfully, social justice's relationship to all ideologies is through their shared adherence to the 'I am right' axiom. But where other ideologies sought to erect some particular belief or identity like Aryanism with regard to Nazism, Christianity with regard to Christians and so on, social justice seeks to erect nothing. Instead in treating the ascription of undentity as a principle, it allows for only that which cannot be objectively substantiated. Feminism sought to dissolve 'woman' as an identity and was thus integrated into social justice. So too with transgenderism and socialism in their efforts to dissolve their respective targeted standards. All attempts at nebulization have coalesced into the monster that is social justice. To put it bluntly, social justice champions only that which *cannot* be substantiated one way or the other. Not that which *is not*, but that which *cannot*. There is no particular replacement for reality, nothing to erect in its place, just a goal to dissolve it; to do away with truth and objectivity altogether.

Recall what the addition of a dichotomy does in situations involving such adamant denial. It turns the victim into the perpetrator. It transforms help into harm. This situation is no different and forms a dichotomy of what is real versus what cannot be real: reality vs unreality. The inversion of reality that social justice warriors seek is no different. Yet this anti-objectivity, this fusion of identity with axiom, and this phenomenon of undentity were inevitable and entirely predictable and through what? Why, through the axiom all ideology is based on. Through the very first claim I made in this book. That small, seemingly insignificant observation of human knowledge:

The 'I am right' axiom.

After all this time spent expounding on and exploring this one axiom. The literal hundreds of pages of argumentation linking each subsequent belief and behavior formed through it. The damning examination of ideology through feminism and antithesisism and all that I've attempted to establish through this axiom. Can you believe that such grand and complicated conclusions can be so simply and easily established through the axiom all on its own? That there is nothing to point to, nothing else working in tandem with it. It is alone and so everything I've done to make my case can be observed in a simple examination of the axiom itself. The very moment I established the 'I am right' axiom and chose just the right words to communicate it, I established the entirety of this treatise. I established all the argumentation I would employ, whatever truth there exists in my conclusions and, if entirely legitimate, the truth of your mind and mine.

## Social Justice: An End to All Things

Social justice is the most pure form of antithesism that I have observed and probably the most pure form to ever exist. It is the result of the amalgamation of several Leftist ideologies into a single cohesive whole certainly, but its greater propensity for amalgamation is directly linked to its greater ability to nebulize and to maintain this nebulization in the face of reality. To maintain it in spite of Objectivity Creep. For this reason social justice warriors are Leftists possessed of a greater denial than any other before them. So grand and sweeping in its depth and breadth that it has applied itself to seemingly everything and what it hasn't yet, it seeks to. This is well-demonstrated in their propensity for seeking out more and more identities to nebulize through false attributions of victimhood. This in turn transforms identities into undentities which makes necessary denial in order to maintain them as non-criterial. Thus the behavior of nebulization is made manifest and another antithesist, in everything but name and cognizance, is born. Though as I've said this is how they spread their anti-objectivity. Hardly a conscious targeting of individuals, it is merely an effect of the act of nebulization i.e. dissolving standards. If anything, that Leftists' belief that the 'other' is always wrong with regard to their standards is the driving force behind Leftists active interaction with them and goal to dissolve their standards and so identities. Again, there is truly no conscious recognition of this process nor the ultimate goal it seeks to achieve. They are drones, robots, useful idiots to this unconscious aggregate behavior. What is often called a culture or cult of victimhood.

The most notable, or at least well-established, targets of this nebulization have been atheists and video gamers. Social justice was attracted to atheism due to their shared skepticism or outright disbelief in religions and gods, but it was really the ambiguous identity of atheist that prompted and facilitated their dissolution. Atheist is defined only as one who doesn't believe in a god. They do not claim any truths in its place however. They claim no truths at all, albeit some hold to beliefs which only address and disprove the theists' ex post facto justifications. See, atheist is only a claim of personal disbelief and therein lies the problem. Without offering a corollary, a position counter to that of the theist other than one that exists only in opposition to it, it leaves an insidious window of opportunity. It is, in effect, a form of nebulization. It claims only that which is not rather than offering what is. In effect, an atheist becomes 'not a theist' and so distinct from the 'other' but without any criteria of its own. For this reason once atheist is claimed as an identity, which it came to be, atheist became an undentity and succumbed to nebulization. It was here that the social justice warriors within its ranks attempted to take it over and,

whether successful or not, dissolved what power the group had. At the very least they halted much of their momentum as a social force in America. Those who did not succumb were often a self-proclaimed skeptic or hardline atheist, both recognizing that 'atheist' did not represent a position of its own and so denied it as an identity. A belief or rather disbelief yes, but not an identity. The skeptic defined himself by his actions, his efforts to manifest his skepticism through his actions. The hardline atheist was able to maintain his identity through philosophical argumentation. An argument that claims to entirely disprove god(s) rather than merely disbelieve them. Thus it avoided the agnosticism that most atheists cling to and the lack of position it engendered. Truly a culling of the herd, recognize that this was yet another schism and subsequent nebulization.

After this schism, social justice warriors attempted to craft a bastardized identity dubbed 'Atheism Plus' or Atheism+. This was really just an attempt to fuse social justice and atheism as a means to slowly and incrementally ingratiate people into social justice. The 'plus' stood for social justice or rather their claimed beliefs and principles they stood for. So they were atheists *plus* they were feminists, cared about gender equality, etc. This was a tactic that many atheists did not resist as it granted them something that atheism as an identity could not: purpose. Sure it's to dissolve reality and all their positions are pseudo-positions existing only in opposition to and in the attempt to dissolve Rightist standards, so perhaps not technically a purpose it was at least purposeful. There was something to *create* as a result of their identity and a means through which to achieve it. The creation of destruction. So devoid of purpose and already used to claiming for themselves a non-criterial identity, Atheism+ corrupted atheists in great numbers.

Gamers were similarly targeted given that what constituted a 'gamer' wasn't ever defined nor widely accepted. Compounding this was an emerging hierarchy of so-called 'hardcore gamers' and 'casual gamers' or 'casuals'. This led to infighting and the creation of different classes and hierarchies, none of which were widely dismissed or accepted. So rife for a schism, nebulization began to emerge as an unconscious phenomenon – like it always does. From there social justice warriors began to foment what discord they could, setting gamers against each other. Unrecognized still to this writing, the dismissal and downright hatred of the Call of Duty fandom and other multiplayer online communities was the first such instigation. The means through which most console gamers at the time communicated and congregated was through this platform. So whether or not such criticism was warranted, it was representative not only of the attitudes of the community but the community itself. Whether some liked it or not, whether they wished to recognize it or not, this was gaming and gamers writ large. This was

their zeitgeist. They were unfiltered, uncensored, and unapologetic. The only thing that mattered to them was skill, ability, and success. In essence, they had formed a meritocracy. What was said didn't matter because the system in which they operated didn't account for it. How could it? It's just a game after all. Only what was done i.e. whether or not you won the game, mattered.

The incursion into this community by social justice warriors took the form of special pleading for the sake of 'women'. Not women as they actually exist but 'women' as an undentity, as a victim. So in spite of the equal opportunity gamers took to insult and denigrate each other, whenever directed at 'women' social justice warriors transmogrified it into misogyny – even if it was another woman directing these insults. Through this nefarious intentions and motivations were attributed to the gaming collective as a whole. Claims of keeping women away to protect an all-boys club. Claims of misrepresenting women in games. It went on and has continued in this fashion for some time. Essentially through the undentity of 'woman' social justice warriors sought to cry victim and so manipulate the behavior of the community to cater to 'woman' and by extension their goal of nebulization. As we've seen before, this is merely establishing one's identity through the 'other' rather than through the self. So the actions of the 'other' must be made to change in order to generate the identity one wishes for themselves rather than having command over their identity by virtue of their own actions. Such is the non-agency created by non-criterial identity and the narcissism inherent to self-righteousness. Ergo it was gamers that had to change their community, themselves, and with that their entire zeitgeist for the sake of 'women'. They dubbed this inclusivity; an act to include and be inclusive of 'women'. Naturally all that was being included was social justice and the antithesism it represented. Here, to be inclusive was to let your guard down. To temper your skepticism, criticism, and incredulity for the sake of 'women': the corporeal vessel operating as the vector for this mind-virus. Using sentimentality, phony guilt, and frankly hormones to effect a quiet coup.

All was going well for the social justice warrior for some time. Publishers, producers, and developers alike began to cater to their whims and censorship became rampant. The 'women' had begun to take over gaming culture. That is, until they overplayed their hand. Gaming media and self-proclaimed journalists did the one thing you cannot and must not do when nebulizing an identity. They said in no uncertain terms regarding the entirety of gamers' identity and invariably the axiom it is linked to, that gamers were wrong.

"Gamers" are Over – Leigh Alexander

We Might Be Witnessing The “Death of An Identity” – Luke Plunkett

The End of Gamers – Dan Golding

There are gamers at the gate, but they may already be dead – Jonathan Holmes

Dear reader the axiom seeks to protect itself in all ways at all times. That core of self-righteousness must remain forever unmolested; free from criticism. But these social justice warriors went even beyond that. They claimed it was false. That ‘gamer’ was over. That it was dead. That it was no more. They engaged in a direct assault, a scorched earth campaign against the ‘gamer’ identity and thus the axiom it represented. In their pride and ignorance, in their arrogance they took aim at the fundamental belief structure of all mankind, thinking they could supplant it with nothing. That they could nebulize it instantly. Something they cannot do even within their own ranks; their self-righteousness being core to their antithesis. Ironically they broke the seal on the proverbial Pandora’s Box and so sealed their own doom. All holy hell broke loose and Gamergate had begun.

Gamergate: Gamer’s Never Die, They Only Respawn

Gamergate was a consumer revolt against gaming media and gaming journalism. Through nonstop internet sleuthing gamers uncovered collusion between journalists, publishers, producers, and developers. A collusion that was widely suspected but never proven but whose widespread interest was sparked by the frankly obvious collusion between gaming journalists themselves. This culminated in an organized consumer boycott of their products and services until their demands were met and they were, to some extent. An uneasy truce exists to this day between the gaming media and their consumers, one maintained through the vigilance of gamers themselves still wary of the legitimacy of the corporate gaming sphere including its media branch.

So gamers were able to successfully reject nebulization and repel their social justice warrior invaders. Their influence remains however in the form of new censorship policies and codes of conduct along with the pervasive Tandem Narrative they erected to excuse their actions. A narrative that would have you believe that gamers are everything from racist white-nationalist rapists to misogynistic virgin pedophiles or all of the above; contradictions notwithstanding. Furthermore gaming media still presents social justice ideological tripe as news and gaming news at that, hand-waved away as mere editorials.

In spite of social justice warriors grave misstep of attacking the 'gamer' identity directly, that gaming represented a near-pure meritocracy made it a formidable and perhaps impossible opponent to divide and conquer. A meritocracy borne through competence alone and often respective to particular games within particular communities, there was simply no way to claim that the 'gamer' identity didn't represent something. Something tangible, purposeful, and demonstrable: a gamer played video games. Never mind that it is only with regard to a game, often only a pleasurable pastime. The relationship described by the identity was real and this obvious reality proved too great a wall for the social justice warrior to mount and the gamer himself to undermine. It just couldn't be rejected as unreal. So as a community based in meritocracy and prone to make a game of anything, they fought back against social justice with obsessive dedication and legitimate enjoyment. They made a game of it. So Gamergate fought, won, and kept winning over and over again.

The beauty of this victory doesn't lie in the defeat of social justice but in the awareness it generated. Gamergate had created a contingent of anti-social justice all-stars. A group both committed to fighting social justice and competent in their efforts to do so. This has sparked an unprecedented popular uprising against social justice to the point where its minority status is now recognized, rather than claiming to represent the moral high ground of the majority. As it stands, their only *growing* recognition is their obvious link to and exemplification of mental illness.

Now granted, antithesism has always existed along with the behavior of nebulization that it engenders. Mental illness certainly isn't the cause of it but given the self-righteousness, denial, and so inevitable delusion that characterizes antithesism, it's logical to suspect it. Not necessarily as the cause of some mental illnesses but that those with mental illness are susceptible to it.

Be that as it may there exist means of inflicting antithesism on one another. Tried, tested, and true methods. Yes, nebulization forms the core of this infliction regardless the methodology, but this isn't always so obvious. Fact is, these methods have found their way into the West's educational institutions in what are seen as misguided though innocuous teachings, yet far from it. Credit where it's due, Rightists of all sorts have pinpointed some of them but as is so often the case with the Rightist, the result is correctly understood but the means is left open to interpretation. An interpretation they fill with false and often fantastical justifications which erodes the legitimacy of their claims. The main teaching the Left has inflicted on our children is very well-known and has become a part of common parlance, often used to disparage one another. To evoke it brings with it an almost immediate understanding of its implications, though superficially. Again its result is mostly understood while its

mechanism is left unexplored, until now. This will be an exploration that is sure to be somewhat challenging; if not to your rational mind then at least to your ego. You must approach this with humility. Remember dear reader, *how* you are matters. *What* you are does not.

### The Self-Esteem Movement: The Catalyst for Social Justice

Dubbed the 'Self-Esteem Movement', public education along with various other institutions engaged in a campaign designed to protect and bolster the self-esteem of children. This took the form of excessively championing one's individuality as well as rewarding one's efforts irrespective of their outcome. Regardless its excess, it seemed all well and good. What's the harm in encouragement, right? Well, everything. This mollycoddling of children proved to be a catalyst for the rise of social justice and antithesism. But how? The issue doesn't lie in what was being done nor the excess of its application. Rather the means in which it was inflicted on our children proved to be the downfall of this approach.

### Everyone's a Winner: Eroding Individuality through Equality

What the Self-Esteem Movement failed to do was to reward and so recognize what characterized a child's individuality. Instead it championed the value of individuality itself. They claimed it existed, that it was important and valuable and made you who you were, but it lacked specificity. Without any particulars this trait of individuality, while keeping its meaning at a group level, became hollow at the level of the individual. How someone was an individual and to whom that mattered to failed to be established. Thus individuality became nebulized and formed an ideology. So everyone became an 'individual' in the same vein as everyone could become a 'Christian'. This individuality made them distinct, unique, a 'Special Snowflake' as it came to be known. Like any ideology borne through Allied Projection based in some hollowed term, that term had to be respected and maintained. So no matter what a person presented themselves as, real or imaginary, their 'individuality' deserved respect and support because it was a part of this ideology and they a part of this ideological community.

So that said, where can one express preference in this paradigm? If uniqueness is itself valued, then how can one possibly manifest a hierarchy of their various tastes let alone distastes? Does it matter who values them? How do they judge the merit of an opinion – hell a preference? Well fact is they can't, not without generating a schism in this cult. Sure there may be some room for the expression of preference but not at the level of another's identity. To say that another person's individuality, hell their individual is 'bad' or disgusting or useless is an affront to the 'virtue' of individuality. This in no small part sowed the seeds of relativity, moral or otherwise. But it gets worse.

In rewarding everyone regardless of their effort and their outcomes, regardless of their merit essentially, they distorted their understanding of value. Remember that an ascription of purpose to some objective criterion, anything from an object to an action to a characteristic, is necessary for establishing its value. In fact, value describes this very thing. The value of something is what it is valued for; how it manifests some outcome. So consider what happens when you attribute value to everything someone is and does. Compound this by valuing it for the same reason you value a better or even antithetical behavior by another person. That you both 'win' regardless the rules of the game. That you both pass regardless your respective grades. This insidious infliction of value severs their connection with reality. It distorts their understanding of value into something inherent, something entirely internal. Instead of value requiring some purpose to reference, it need only reference one's person, one's self. So long as they participate, so long as they experience, they are valuable and to deny this is to deny them their value. Hell, it's to deny them their worth as a person, as a human being. To deny this is to deny their very humanity. In essence, value became something axiomatic; plugged directly into or perhaps acting as a proxy for their self-righteousness.

This mentality also served to protect children from failure. As we know by now, failure is integral to catalyzing a reality-based schism. It uses time as the ultimate arbiter of our self-righteousness; to prove or disprove our predictions accordingly. Failure is an affront to our self-righteousness and one that, should we be rational, we can only accept as legitimate. Thus failure breeds humility by eroding our more fervorous adherence to our own personal ideology, our cult of one. It stems our more zealous actions by crowding our ignorance with memories of deficiency, loss, and embarrassment. As is so often said, it breeds character. It breeds a recognition of one's responsibility, of the scope of our persons. It has us understand and present ourselves as *how* we are rather than *what* we are. By protecting children from failure, Leftists allowed for the ignorance of one's responsibility and so immaturity of character to persist well into adulthood, afflicting such adults with the juvenility that such characteristics

characterize. Thus was born these adult children, these childish, whiny crybabies. No different is their disgust and fear for their failures in their lives as adults than it was when they were children. An adult lamenting her finances and her worthless college degree will cry and cry out and accuse others, will throw a tantrum, no different than a child denied a cookie or losing a treasured toy. Their mind, in that respect, operates the same as when they were six years old. It's truly a case of arrested development, not of being differently abled or neurologically atypical, no. It's a matter of being divorced from reality and subsequently psychologically stunted. As demonstrated through behaviors that invariably contribute to or may even be causal to medically recognized psychological disorders, this is a mental illness. A mental illness born from and demonstrative of delusion.

#### Manufactured Snowflakes: Mass Producing Individuality

So breaking it all down, what happened to our children in order to foment antithesis and its superficial ideological expression as social justice? First their understanding of value was severed from purpose and so preference. With that, recognizing one's responsibility as the means of determining one's worth and identity dissolved into the ether. Without acknowledging one's responsibility as descriptive of their identity it became non-criterial. Non-agency took root, turned to the 'other' to supply the cause of all their experiences, and their sense of victimhood manifested to justify this whole progression of self-righteous denial. Individuality was lost, nebulization became their method of denial and the social justice warrior was born. An entire generation infused, inflicted, and inculcated with an insidious ideological antithesis. In essence the axiomatic status of their identity, its fusion with 'I' that we attempt to distinguish from one another through our interaction with reality and the process of individuation such interaction invariably engenders, was allowed to persist.

One of the first things we ever believe as conscious beings, that of 'I exist' and 'I am right', was allowed not necessarily to mature but rather not to degrade. It persisted into adulthood, having been protected from the Objectivity Creep of reality. Something that to this day forms their sense of personal oppression. Tellingly they blame reality for their failures which just means they blame reality for falsifying their self-righteousness, for disillusioning them, for proving them wrong. Though of course reality is made corporeal through whatever demographic they claim victimized them or is attributed agency as some sort of systemic social construct. Straight white men as the primary target.

## The Failure of the Self-Esteem Movement: Insecurity through Lack of Connection

In spite of the rampant narcissism and egomania that typifies the social justice warrior, it is an overcompensation of sorts. They have no real self-esteem. A high sense of personal worth yes, but no understanding of it.

At a loss to determine their true identity and thus their place in the world, they place themselves at the center of everything by claiming that it all affects them in some fashion. They think highly of themselves, enough to 'defend' their person against attacks from the 'other', but possessed of no logical rationale for reasonable validation they remain ungrounded. Again, hence their externalization of their identity into everything. Now, what is their boasting and complaining that characterizes their narcissism if not a means of provoking conflict? For lack of a better word, their bitching attracts detractors who, through their opposition, provide the reasoning that the social justice warrior cannot commit to themselves. This introspection by proxy characterizes what I've dubbed Intellectual Conflict Therapy. That said, think of their bitching as an ugly cry for help. Whether or not they deserve any assistance is left to your discretion, but see it for what it is rather than what it presents itself as. If done so you'll see the desperation behind their ugly nastiness. A desperation that should help in your decision, if not through pity then for, as I see it, the beauty of what it is. A fragile kernel of honesty. An earnest yearning for our help in something they simply can't do themselves. Literally, *that they cannot do for themselves*. Not anymore. Not since their power was hidden from them. Still there, but unrecognized and unrecognizable. Locked away and guarded by an ego, guarded by a self-righteousness they must slay in order to realize this power. It's an impossible task for even the best of us. So inside there still exists this genuine, sincere person. This true person and the truth of who they really are. This single 'good'. The good in them that is them, their true self. It's something I believe is worth fighting for. If not because they didn't deserve to have it hidden away. If not because I believe it to be a worthy cause. If only because this mind-virus isn't something we can destroy. It's only something we can cure and if we don't try we condemn these people, these children, to a preventable fate.

## The Beneficiaries of Sin: Accomplices to Everything

We know what the social justice warrior and by extension the antithesist makes of their legitimate failures, but what do they make of the success of others? That is, what do they believe is causal to the achievements of those who refuse their paradigm? Naturally they view them as oppressive certainly, themselves always the victim. But in their belief that all identity is non-criterial, even that of their purported oppressors, how do they explain away the effects of their oppressors' responsibility as they pertain to their success? In other words, how do they sever their success from the actions that created it? That earned it? How do they claim one's identity as a CEO as something unearned? As something undeserved? How do they delegitimize their efforts? How do they remove their responsibility and with that the objectively demonstrable means through which it is achieved?

“The black and white nature of responsibility is due to its nature as an objective criterion. As a matter of fact it is therefore either true or false. Responsibility can best be understood as one's 'legacy of effect on reality' or as one's 'legacy of affecting reality'. Consider the reality in which you exist, obviously this one. Now consider a reality in which you did not. The difference between these realities is your legacy. All of reality that changes due to your existence is that which you are responsible for. Naturally this seems absurd given that one's existence especially as an infant or child can have innumerable consequences all of which we wouldn't normally claim as one's responsibility. This absurdity is of our own making however. It's created through yet another false equivalency, another conflation. We're conflating blame with responsibility. Blame is our application of subjective standards to objective reality. It's the subjective aspect of identity crafting, typically associated with guilt. It has no bearing on what one is objectively responsible for insofar as their identity is concerned. Though granted this doesn't stop us from applying our own standards to that which one is responsible for, which is why blame and the subjective identity crafted through its application must be determined through one's exercise of agency rather than their mere existence. In other words, one's identity must describe one's responsibility, but only with regard to their exercise of agency. Otherwise according to the Butterfly Effect we'd all be technically to blame for everything that occurs. Only able to divvy up our respective guilt rather than to dismiss it or accept it completely. Some call that sin. Others call it privilege.”

As just another mechanism for denial, privilege is the means through which social justice warriors sever action from outcome, essentially delegitimizing responsibility as anything integral to one's achievements and subsequent identity. Even they are subject to it, claiming all their 'advantages' as a matter of their privilege, not their own actions and so responsibility. Within Social Justice, the religion of Antithesism, responsibility itself is Original Sin which makes privilege, or rather one's privilege, an effect of the sins of others. Essentially your privilege, necessarily severed from any actions of your own, any of your own responsibility, is of another's making. Thus as sin, as evil, it is something that granted you didn't create on your own but nevertheless do not deserve. It's like being gifted something stolen from another. It's benefitting from another's suffering without having inflicted that suffering on said other. In essence reality, this ultimate arbiter of the effects of our actions, is the Devil. This is why social justice warriors make commandments on others to 'check their privilege' i.e. to repent as beneficiaries of evil. Of course this is all nonsense. Even a cursory glance reveals the nature of what it is they lambaste. It is of course responsibility and by extension reality itself. For example, they claim the existence of 'thin privilege' by denying that one's weight and health is in their power to control. They claim the existence of 'rich and powerful privilege' by denying one's finances and social influence is in their power to control. Insofar as any causal relationship can be established, by definition insofar as one's responsibility can be determined, social justice warriors will deny it through the construct of 'privilege'.

It's about time then that I explain the origin of what social justice warriors consider to be the ultimate privileged class. This evil incarnate who benefits from all the sin in the world and uses this power to oppress everyone. It's time to discuss the hatred of the straight white male.

### Straight White Male: Hatred as the Inversion of Compliment

As a layman, one of the first things I noticed was the implicit complimentary nature of the denigration of the straight white male. That is, the claims of their success and power and control speak to their quality regardless the means through which such things are then used. In essence, straight white men are top-tier success machines. They have influence over everything and a seemingly unlimited ability to effect their will, good or ill, on everyone. Sounds like the patriarchy as feminists understand it and naturally they sought to fuse them together into the Straight White Male Patriarchy. Of course it sounds like the patriarchy because it's developed through the same process. Recall that the patriarchy as feminist

employ and understand it isn't as some social hierarchy of male dominance. That is merely their ex post facto justification for it. Rather it's merely a non-woman agent that they use to fill the void in their responsibility that they refuse to recognize. Everything that isn't their fault 'as a woman' becomes the fault of the patriarchy. The straight white male suffers from this same denial and projection. See, the mechanism is the same regardless the characteristic one uses to develop an undentity. So if a 'woman', they require a non-woman agent to blame. If a 'black', they require a non-black agent to blame. Finally if anything but heterosexual they require, well, a heterosexual agent to blame. Thus the hatred of the straight white male is born. Not out of any particular targeting of them though. Remember,

“A belief about one's self is the root of projection, not a belief about others.”

So egotistic and narcissistic is the social justice warrior that even the targets of their hatred aren't consciously chosen but an effect of their own selves; chosen only insofar as they represent a perceived opposite to their person. Though what do we expect from ideologues given their self-righteous foundation?

So if it's a sexual non-agency one seeks to claim, be it through 'woman' or some other undentity, they need a sexual agent to project their responsibility onto. So too with race, sexuality, really any identity that can be nebulized. Despite the fact the straight white male wasn't consciously targeted the reason the straight white male scapegoat came about wasn't entirely by dichotomy. Naturally race and sexuality don't exist as a dichotomy. Neither was it entirely due to chance. Indeed there was another factor at play and one that most certainly compliments the nature of the SWM, that is if we can claim any nature for him at all.

The SWM is possessed of no or very little sense of his identity as it pertains to those three categories. While he describes himself as straight, white, and male, he doesn't form an identity through these alone. For the most part, he doesn't do anything or believe anything 'as a straight' or 'as a white' or 'as a male'. He recognizes these as categories, not as identities and any identity that he does form through these categories, albeit minor, is standardized. That is, he attributes purpose to them and so engages in behaviors designed to achieve the purposes that he recognizes as causal to these identities. Basically, he thinks he acts like a straight white guy though any standardization of his identity is mostly true with regard to his heterosexuality and masculinity and not his race. Naturally his sex and sexuality lends itself to standardization given their utility in attraction and sexual reproduction, but SWM don't do or believe much as a 'white guy'. Instead they see themselves as the default. Not 'white as the default' but that

there is essentially no content, no identity to be found in race. That their 'default' is a lack of racial identity altogether. This is a key factor to be explored shortly.

So whether the SWM ignores these categories outright or standardizes them, regardless the SWM has steadfastly refused to nebulize them. So fundamentally the SWM has avoided the nebulization that plagues the categories of race, sex, and sexuality which puts him in a prime position for the projection of others who engage in such nebulization. At the most superficial level, that SWM are the only people not denying their responsibility using these categories has them become the target of all the projected responsibility of others by virtue of a lack of alternatives. SWM are the only vessel in this regard and so have a monopoly as an outlet for social justice warrior projection. Simply put, all the 'victims' in the room blame the only one not claiming to be a victim. Of course it's more complicated though. Given the SWM's propensity to maintain a greater sense of his responsibility and with it a greater sense and understanding of reality i.e. causal relationships, he's often more successful than those who nebulize. By operating in reality rather than in denial of it, the SWM is able to accrue the success, power, and control the social justice warrior accuses them of having sinfully attained. Sinfully attained through what? The Original Sin of *responsibility*. Of course as is the case, the act of accusing the SWM and deriding his more responsible nature is what results in the abject failure of social justice warriors. Their resistance to any recognition of their own responsibility dooms the social justice warrior to a perceptual unreality where they effect nothing. So the SWM is merely a corporeal manifestation of reality and all causal relationships therein that the social justice warrior denies exists.

Now it must be said that there are demographics in the West that outperform the SWM. So why aren't they lambasted with projection from social justice warriors? It's for two reasons; the second of which has an entire chapter dedicated to it. So what's the first reason? Well it's really just because the demographics that outperform the SWM maintain a racial identity. That is, they do things 'as an Asian' or 'as an Indian', etc. It may mask itself in culture but it nevertheless references their race. Such standardization acts as a bulwark against the nebulization of social justice warriors certainly, but isn't why the social justice warrior leaves them mostly alone. It's because any racial identity is fundamentally irrational and non-criterial. Sure one can select any number of purposes and attribute them to their race that then form a subjective identity, but nothing is produced as an effect of their race. In truth, their racial identity is never descriptive of their responsibility in any fashion and so has no purpose. Their race is entirely out of the realm of their ability to affect reality. So in creating an identity severed from their responsibility, it may not be a non-criterial identity but nevertheless functions as one. Essentially they're

always going to be their race regardless their actions. Attributing purpose and subsequent behaviors to their racial identity is only ex post facto justification. It is only the *attempt* to make it purposeful and it's never a successful one. Basically there is no way to fail. There is no logical grounds for schism. Culturally yes, of course there are grounds for schism, but not with regard to one's race. Ergo it's technically non-criterial. Suffice it to say, the cultural aspect of their racial identity forms a Rightist Ideology while their racial identity alone, devoid of cultural influence and so false attributions of purpose to it, forms a Leftist Ideology. So through this Leftist form they can similarly use their racial identity as a means to claim victimization for themselves. Which they do, though less often than their social justice warrior compatriots. Granted the first of these factors is a soft one. The second factor, again its own dedicated chapter, will explain white SWM are the primary target.

Now all that said, why is the SWM possessed of a lesser propensity to nebulize his identity? Well it likely comes as the result of leftover principles from the Enlightenment, modern-day social shaming, and the distinct evolutionary path of whites as presented through evolutionary psychology. The Enlightenment principles I refer to are namely those of universality such as human rights and natural equality. If all men are created equal, by God or otherwise through perception, then they must be treated equally or rather fairly. There must be established some system of universal human interaction. Now should everyone hold to this perspective or rather this truth as they would perceive it, characteristics that exist separate from responsibility, separate from any means of interaction, would be considered irrelevant. Hence undentity isn't considered nor frankly legitimized within this paradigm.

Social shaming does what it can to deter any means of establishing a white identity, namely 'white pride'. Given all the negative connotations that just sparked in your own mind the effectiveness of this shaming is palpable.

As for the evolutionary path of whites there has been work into establishing why they're more altruistic than other races. Altruism defined as acting toward the benefit of others even to the detriment of oneself. What is commonly referred to as selflessness. Not a term I use. Colder climates and harsher living selects for altruism given that tribal survival and with that genetic survival is of greater import than individual survival. Of course such is true in any tribe, but the harder the living the greater this altruism manifests. I won't go any further into this matter as I'm certainly no authority and don't wish to present myself as one.

Regardless, this triad suppresses the formation of undentity in SWMs. Though worse, SWMs greater altruism has them become quite receptive to the projection of social justice warriors. In essence, SWM listen to and attempt to help the social justice warrior more than any other demographic. This greater propensity to attend to the social justice warrior makes them a prime target for validation and so the social justice warrior only redoubles their efforts, maintaining that the SWM is evil incarnate. Ironically due to his saintly behavior. Basically if SWM told them to shut up and get lost they'd be better off.

All the other victims within the social justice warrior paradigm do much the same, citing their own 'victimization' as grounds for their innocence and, in practice, a shield against the projection of their social justice warrior brethren. It's why apologizing or rather submitting to social justice warriors doesn't work. Apology acts to validate their claims and in doing so advertises oneself as a means of validation for their undentity. 'Sorry' translates to 'you're right', the very external validation by the 'other' that the social justice warrior seeks. Ergo the more 'evil' a social justice warrior can make an apologizer the more of their responsibility they can project onto them. The sorrier you are, the more responsible for the social justice warrior you are. Given a particularly pathetic and sympathetic straight white male, his apologizing to social justice warriors creates a positive feedback loop. The more sorry he is, the more they foist their own responsibility onto him, the more guilt he then feels which has him apologize even more, and the cycle repeats ad infinitum and ad absurdum. Tellingly this 'evil' is, in fact, more and more responsibility heaped onto SWM. That's why social justice warriors act like frenzied sharks around anyone who dare apologize to them. In essence, an empty vessel has been offered to them and they immediately seek to fill it with as much of their own responsibility as they can. This altruism and the positive feedback loop it creates is another means through which the SWM has amassed a level of perceived power and control beyond anything remotely reasonable and rational.

Whether or not the SWM is possessed of these characteristics of his own accord is unknown. Since his propensity for nebulization is being actively suppressed, his greater connection and so operation within reality may be an effect of his having been made the 'other'. In essence, he too is the product of nebulization but as the corporeal manifestation of reality that nebulization seeks to deny. He isn't made of it but rather by it. He is made the Yin to their Yang.

Amusingly, perhaps unbelievably, in order to deny the most basic fundamentals of reality one becomes more and more the inverse of reality. In so doing what they deny becomes more and more the truth of the matter. It's not that they're so wrong the opposite is what's right. Rather they're so *inverted* that what they deny is the truth. I do find it hilarious that this could be, perhaps, another means of discerning

truth; by observing what social justice warriors claim is not. Suffice it to say, the quest for truth and the quest for untruth will uncover both.

As stated in the title of this chapter, the hatred of the SWM represents an inversion of reality. Everything the social justice warrior lambastes the SWM with is nonsense yes, but what they're observing in reality that prompts this denigration compliments the SWM. Whether it be his greater success, his greater power, his greater wealth, whatever. To anyone outside of the social justice warrior paradigm, the social justice warrior is actually heralding the SWM as some sort of Übermensch, as a superman. Whether or not this praise is warranted is unknown, I for one suspect it is, but regardless it is complimentary when presented in reality, without any ideological lens. It's a compliment to SWM that they aren't so ideological. It's a compliment to them that by virtue of a lesser propensity to nebulize their identity, they maintain a greater understanding of and so operation within reality. It's a compliment that SWM are more responsible. It's only a denigration if you think responsibility is sinful and that what they are responsible for, that of one's own society as SWM have crafted it, is some great evil.

Though really, understand that when the infamous SWM is evoked by the social justice warrior, all they're doing is deriding responsibility itself. As you must understand by now, to deny one's responsibility requires another agent, an 'other' to attribute it to. So the SWM is made into the ultimate 'other', the ultimate agent. A superman crafted through widespread denial of personal responsibility. An Übermensch who may even come to exist if only due to the ever-deepening divide between normal men and the catastrophic failure and pissantry of the antithesist. Born of the antithesists' obsolescence, that he would come to exist if only in comparison.

#### Of Particular Disparity: The Quantitative Quality of Privilege

Doubtless in your interactions with social justice warriors you've been treated to the concept of 'privilege'. As ever, their understanding of the term is hardly in keeping with any definition that could be consistently applied to reality. So first, a dictionary definition of the term:

Privilege:

- 1) A right, immunity, or benefit enjoyed only by a person beyond the advantages of most.
- 2) A special right, immunity, or exemption granted to persons in authority or office to free them from certain obligations or liabilities.
- 3) A grant to an individual, corporation, etc., of a special right or immunity, under certain conditions.
- 4) The principle or condition of enjoying special rights or immunities.

Common to these definitions is this notion of exclusivity, of creating two groups; one possessed of something and the other not. But it's not only a matter of difference but operating on a strict dichotomy of those who possess X and those who do not. In this way it is particular, like comparing numbers. Those who have 5 and those who have 3 are separated by 2 and exactly 2. Nothing more, nothing less, nothing different than a number and 2 at that. The strictness of this disparity is naturally the result of a construct rather than anything operating in reality. While it references objective criteria it is a subjective matter. It is subjective insofar as privilege is something granted, protected, and maintained socially. Furthermore it is subjective when considering the concept of advantage.

#### The Road Not Taken: The Paradox of Advantage

Advantage is determined with regard to purpose, always. Of course it is. What operates as an advantage in one purpose may hinder another and vice versa. What factors affect a given purpose is objective, but the selection of this particular purpose is subjective. In this way and as counterintuitive as it may seem, given our choice of purpose we select for ourselves our respective advantages and disadvantages. Nothing exists as purely one or the other. We may bemoan our disadvantages and claim to be a victim of them, but only with regard to the chosen purpose that *transforms them into a hindrance* in the first place. So irrespective of our responsibility for the creation and existence of these factors, their transformation into advantages and disadvantages is of our own making and thus our own responsibility. Suffice it to say, it is we who advantage and disadvantage ourselves.

Furthermore such factors aren't always advantageous nor disadvantageous nor irrelevant. Such is the paradox the concept of advantage presents to us. As just one example of many, consider all the famous

authors possessed of dyslexia. Dyslexia most certainly makes reading and writing and its culmination in authorship more taxing, but is their success hampered by such a barrier or made possible through it? That is to say, is it a hindrance that has forever depreciated the potential quality of their legacy or does it act as a crucible, producing some of the greatest authors in history? It's certainly not irrelevant, so which is it? Is it advantageous or disadvantageous? Perhaps the methodology is objectively harder, but the outcome is subjectively better? But then again, how can we possibly grade the *quality of an outcome* apart from preference? Apart from personal taste? We cannot. Truly, the only individual who can make any determination of the worth of this outcome and the methodology therein is the individual who engaged in them and even he may never really know. Hell, he may regret any product of his actions as well as any path he never took. Such is the absurdity of attempting to objectively claim advantage and disadvantage with regard to subjective, qualitative outcomes.

With that said, quality can't be a factor in determining privilege and with that neither can matters of personal preference and satisfaction. Need I make claim of the miserable millionaire entrepreneur and the joyous Old Order Amish? The empty dictator and the fulfilled laborer? Quality isn't just too subjective an outcome but too personal an outcome to determine; submitting itself to our own individualized standards. Ergo whilst we can make objective claims regarding the advantaging and disadvantaging of the *methodology* one uses to achieve an outcome, we can make no claims regarding the advantaged or disadvantaged state of the *outcome itself*.

For example, there is no benefit to being rich. Now of course many, probably most will claim the advantage of riches as being able to purchase more than those who are not rich. But again, for what purpose? What is being purchased and why? Purchase alone is too nebulous an outcome. Namely it's the result of the methodology of purchasing which, in fact, is what being rich advantages. Being rich advantages purchasing by decreasing its limitation. Though always and forever we must ask, for what purpose? We may claim it makes living 'easier', but this is a qualitative perception of life and living. What is the benchmark for an eased life let alone living itself? Furthermore what factors play into one's being rich, both in their possession of greater riches as well as the means through which it was acquired? We can no more ignore these factors than we can the riches themselves. Such factors are *how* such riches exist and by extension the identity of an individual as 'rich'. Without these factors, there are no riches. Remember, it's never a matter of what but of how. Riches benefit only one's purchasing and with one's purchases a choice, namely a predicted outcome, we can make no objective claims of the

quality such choices may bring to them and their lives. We can only project our own standards and predictions onto the rich and the outcomes of their purchasing. We can only communicate our prediction of how we would respond to such things. Frankly, we can only pine for that which we think will fulfill some purpose of our own design.

Furthermore and not to bemoan the continuous and necessary lamentation of people in our march for ever-greater lives and living, modernity has made matters of personal survival simple and, though a qualitative assessment on my part, easy. Objectively speaking the methodology of mere survival is more advantaged than ever before. Beyond need matters of want, of preference and prediction, of subjectivity, are what most claims of privilege are based on. Thus claims of privilege are or rather have become little more than personal complaint. However it must be said that within a construct such as government and law, systemic privilege can be created and maintained and unfairly so, should such systems claim as their purpose not to produce such privileges. Matters of nanny states and encroaching socialism in the West aside, I don't have any problem with such assessment granted it's reasonably and factually substantiated. Of course the social justice warrior makes such claims of government but only to piggy-back on the, dare I say, sacred legitimacy of criticising government and to use the state as yet another omnipotent 'other' to whom they attribute their denied responsibility. In essence, the government makes for a great target for claims of systemic oppression regardless the legitimacy of the claims themselves. However, note that the social justice warrior doesn't merely make *claims* of privilege, but transforms them into *accusations*.

#### Privilege: Attributions of Quality

So if anything can be said of privilege, it must be presented as either a subjective claim or as an objective claim within some social construct, some system of rules we've created. It's only within this framework that privilege can be determined and graded on a system of worth and worthiness. Remember though that such judgment is only objectively made with regard to the system, itself a subjective creation. Simply put, it can only be 'true' with regard to some subjective ruleset. Not unlike Harry Potter is only a true person, is only real within the eponymous series of novels, not reality. So privilege as it actually exists, or rather as it is observed, is only the recognition of disparity alone. It is just a distinction and

when observed, an act of discrimination like any other. There is no rational means through which we can objectively grade the quality of these distinctions and thus no metric in reality to determine their worth and the worthiness of those who possess them. The only thing we can do is determine how such distinctions were objectively created through causal relationship, through cause and effect. From there we may apply some standard to their creation. Be it a moral standard with regard to some system of ethics, a legal standard with regard to some system of law, a social standard with regard to some cultural system, etc. In essence, the existence of this 'privilege' is the objective criterion forming the objective identity of the individual who possesses it. From this basis we form the subsequent subjective identity for the individual. We craft our narrative to both explain this distinction and how we will choose to interact with the distinguished individual in question. Dear reader this is merely identity crafting and those whom we would consider 'privileged' the Howards to our Watsons. Here the predictive nature of subjectivity takes the form of preference which forms both what we consider to be a privilege and what we consider to be one's worthiness to it.

Collectivizing Value: Nebulizing Quality through Equality

Privilege is the application of our own subjective standards to an observation of some objective and particular disparity between at least two individuals. So long as this application of standards is recognized and recognized as something entirely subjective, privilege is innocuous enough. It's only a communication of personal preference and, perhaps, advocacy for one's own standards. It becomes a matter of worth and worthiness certainly, but such is the domain of perception and preference. It is what is worthy *to you*, not what is objectively worthy. Hardly anything we would condemn but rather champion as key to our personage and individuality. It is, after all, our limitation of scope that creates this disparity and ultimately our respective individualities. However, the use of privilege by the social justice warrior is hardly so innocuous. Rather it contends that its claims of worth and worthiness aren't subjective but rather true. That such qualitative perception is truth. That it is just, righteous, good, moral, and fair. In this way they not only observe and *claim* privilege but *accuse* others of it; submitting it to the concept not only of guilt but of blame. They use the 'truth' of their self-righteousness to judge not necessarily the means through which such privilege is attained, through which such disparity has been created, but the worthiness of the individual to it. They corrupt privilege into an absolute and

wrench advantage itself from its ever-twisting ambiguity and submit it to strict and rigid categorization. So now privilege exists in everyone and in how they say it exists. Race, sex, sexuality, all matters of identity and category submit to a hierarchy of advantage and disadvantage.

Tellingly with matters of subjectivity all but eliminated from this perspective, the ambiguity that typifies prediction is similarly nullified. The rigidity of this system is entirely a product of the elimination of preference with regard to the qualitative assessment of privilege. This is what happens when one attempts to make the subjective objective. When one attempts to replace quality with quantity. This is why privilege as the social justice warrior employs it is characteristic of their tyrant's morality or a tyrannical morality. An *accusation* of privilege is an *imposition* of a subjective preference as a moral absolute. The definitions of privilege by the social justice warrior bear this out:

Privilege:

- 1) **We can define privilege as a set of unearned benefits given to people who fit into a specific social group.**
- 2) Society grants privilege to people because of certain aspects of their identity. Aspects of a person's identity can include race, class, gender, sexual orientation, language, geographical location, ability, and religion, to name a few.
- 3) A group of unearned cultural, legal, social, and institutional rights extended to a group based on their social group membership. Individuals with privilege are considered to be the normative group, leaving those without access to this privilege invisible, unnatural, deviant, or just plain wrong. Most of the time, these privileges are automatic and most individuals in the privileged group are unaware of them. Some people who can "pass" as members of the privileged group might have access to some levels of privilege.
- 4) Privilege is an unearned, special advantage or right that a person is born into or acquires during their lifetime. It is supported by the formal and informal institutions of society and conferred to all members of a dominant group, by virtue of their group membership.

- 5) Privilege is a social theory that special rights or advantages are available only to a particular person or group of people. The term is commonly used in the context of social inequality, particularly in regard to age, disability, ethnic or racial category, gender, sexual orientation, religion and/or social class. Privilege can also be emotional or psychological, regarding comfort and personal self-confidence, or having a sense of belonging or worth in society. Privilege implies that wherever there is a system of oppression (such as capitalism, patriarchy, or white supremacy) there is an oppressed group and also a privileged group, who benefit from the oppressions that this system puts in place. Privilege and power are closely related: privilege often gives a person or group power over others.
  
- 6) According to Systemic Oppression Theory, all people take on one of two roles when engaging with other people in society, privileged or oppressed: (a) Oppressed people are those members of social groups that exploited because of their difference. These social groups are subordinate in society. (b) Privileged people are those members of social groups who gain power, whether or not they want it, because their difference is perceived as more desirable and therefore legitimized or sanctioned by society in cultural and structural ways. These social groups are dominant in society.

The self vs the other dichotomy is pervasive throughout these definitions of privilege by social justice warriors. Here it takes the form of the privileged vs the oppressed, akin to the victim vs perpetrator dichotomy. Note also the use of identity not as a 'how' but as a 'what'. Of course in denying responsibility as the core determinant of one's identity, such oppression isn't claimed as direct but rather indirect through their evocation of 'systems'. Thus it is the system that is mainly responsible for the creation of this dichotomy of privileged and oppressed. Both are claimed to be granted by it, rather than earned by individuals themselves. Though we've discussed the scapegoat that is 'systemic oppression' already. Blaming the aggregate outcome of the culmination of all beliefs and subsequent behaviors within the confines of some arbitrary demographic is, in effect, blaming reality itself. It is all but attributing agency to circumstance. It is confining to moral category any hurdle, any discomfort one may experience in life. Most importantly perhaps, it is treating advantage and disadvantage as something imposed rather than something chosen according to one's choice of purpose. In this way and once again it denies the agency, it infantilizes, it objectifies, it makes a reactionary victim of any who

would claim oppression – for that reason. Their experiences and the advantages and disadvantages therein become a product of external reality or, due to their necessity to blame an agent, everyone else. As opposed to the reality that such experiences, good or ill, are self-inflicted. Truly it's a sad state of affairs that I must make the argument that one's life is lived rather than merely experienced.

Notice how such disparities, such 'privileges' are never framed as a product of one's own responsibility. Neither is their so-called 'oppression'. Naturally this accords with the social justice warrior's denial that responsibility determines identity. Furthermore with such separation of causal relationship from determining identity concepts like worth and value, themselves requiring reference to purpose, are made ambiguous. This results in vague appeals and self-righteous claims regarding what is deserved and what is undeserved, relying on the phenomenon of Allied Projection to fill the void.

Unearned is the oft-cited term in their employ but so too is the idea of society, or some other aggregate of human behavior, 'granting' such privileges as though, you guessed it, it were an agent. Tellingly nothing is truly earned within this paradigm. Neither is anyone 'worthy' of anything in the same way no one is truly responsible for anything. They are just more or less worthy or rather more or less deserving than others. Never wholly worthy, never wholly deserving, never truly responsible for anything.

“...one's identity must describe one's responsibility, but only with regard to their exercise of agency. Otherwise according to the Butterfly Effect we'd all be technically to blame for everything that occurs. Only able to divvy up our respective guilt rather than to dismiss it or accept it completely.”

See dear reader, nothing can be earned in this paradigm because value doesn't submit itself to a standard. Not even preference. So it takes on a bizarre operation, one that mirrors the parasitic relationship between nebulization and individuation. In this antithesist system, one can only deserve something less than another, never more. As no link can ever be established between one's actions and their outcomes, linking one's actions to any outcome is viewed as a non sequitur. The greater the causal link one attempts to establish the greater the non sequitur, thus the less deserving they are to that outcome. Think of it like math. With regard to an outcome, say the number 1, we all begin at 0. Now anything we do, be it an attempt to reach 1 or 0.5 or anything at all, is always negative. No one ever reaches 1. No one is even able to approach it through anything they do. No one is ever able to link themselves to this outcome. The only thing they can do is move further from it by becoming increasingly

negative. There is no positive movement, no demonstration of worth i.e. no earning. However, the *less negative* one is compared to everyone else the closer to 1 they are and so the 'more deserving' they are to the outcome represented by 1. But as I said, in this paradigm there is no such thing as earning and thus no such thing as being 'more deserving'. So as strange as it sounds, such people are actually seen as *less less* deserving. It's a double negative. To put it in mathematical terms once again, they are *less negative*. This creates a scaling hierarchy of less worth, of negative worth or negative value. In essence, a scaling hierarchy of an ever-greater denied personal responsibility. No one can ever take responsibility. They can only deny it more or less.

Note here that with the elimination of any standardization of value, even the standard of constructing the concept of value with regard to subjective personal preferences, a dichotomy is entirely destroyed rather than inverted. See, instead of something being earned and unearned, respectively us as worthy and unworthy to said something, it is only ever unearned and we never worthy. Again, it's become a scale as opposed to a dichotomy. Now given that this dichotomy of that which we believe is valuable or not and for what reasons is necessarily based in our preferences, of course the elimination of preference from value destroys this dichotomy. Basically everything in the universe, all that we could value or not, exists. Period. The *categorization* inherent to the act of *valuation* puts them into either category. We *choose* to value something or not. One or the other. Hence the dichotomy we create through it. Yes, this is once again merely individuation.

The antithesists' perception of value destroys the concepts of valuing, earning, and thus responsibility itself, and leaves us with only unearning. It removes preference from value. It removes choice itself. It eliminates one half of the categories for value thus making everything in the universe impossible to value subjectively and earn objectively. So we're left only with the negatives. We're left only with the inability to link action with outcome, the inability to determine what one has created and therefore what they've earned and deserved. It's similar to the nebulization of gender, but rather than a full nebulization it's only partial. This is likely due to the fact that non-agency, one of the only claims antithesists will make for themselves, is paralleled here and hence they act to preserve it. The non-agent, the victim, never creates, never earns anything.

Now since nothing is said to be earned, only unearned, all matters of 'privilege' and the disparity it describes becomes a matter of reallocation and redistribution. Not to give to those who deserve it, but

to give to those who deserve it *less* less than others. Now such matters could continue forever down the near-infinite regress of the Reverse Butterfly Effect, of determining who deserves something the less least, but we have Objectivity Creep to thank for providing a swift bottom to this plunge into madness. Reality provides us with the knowledge of the necessities for survival which transforms this redistributive effort into a matter of triage. Need is thus granted as the only legitimate determinant of deservedness with no recourse to supplant and usurp need as the ultimate arbiter of reallocation.

So in the end, there is nothing you can do to increase your deservedness - but *nothing* itself. You can only *do nothing* to deserve something. See, only through self-destructive action can one increase their need. Thus the stupid, the diseased, the infirm, the insane, even the lazy, these people are given greater precedence. Worse still, the less you earn something by virtue of the greater reasons you cannot achieve it, or even the greater actions taken to achieve its inverse, the more likely you'll *be given it* as such represents a 'greater' act of charity i.e. eliminating a much greater disparity. So while the dichotomy of value is eliminated rather than inverted, the concept of charity that stems from it is most certainly inverted.

"From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs."

When value is severed from matters of purpose, matters of deservedness and worth resort to the most fundamental, rank, base human desire: survival. Not coincidentally, such becomes the only desire one can subsidize and pursue given the austerity and poverty such a system invariably engenders. Now this desire isn't treated as a desire and neither is one made responsible for their survival. After all no one is responsible for anything within this paradigm. Rather the phenomenon of 'Special Snowflake', the championing of an ambiguous, nebulous, and collective sense of valued individuality, along with the distortion of value through the 'Everyone's a Winner' paradigm, results in a requirement to secure the lives of fellow ideologues; but only insofar as their person, their individuality as part of the collective, must be preserved as a corporeal manifestation of their ideology.

Consider that where *we* are free to help them or not, to try to save their lives or let them suffer their self-inflicted demise, the *antithesist* is not. To us it is a value judgment and necessarily a matter of purpose and so choice. To the antithesist it's a matter of all antithesists being 'valuable' and for the same reasons. That is to say, they are 'valuable' for *all reasons* and so really, no reasons due to no

discrimination of purpose. It is merely axiomatic. Fundamentally there is no individuation but instead an absolutism of necessity itself. Not a necessity *to* anything. Just necessity. Ergo their sense of value is ambiguous and is acted upon without any recognition of, nor reference to, purpose. Everything, like everyone, is just 'important'. It is an ironic form of preservation wherein all that isn't, all that has no definition is sought to be preserved. An impossible task and an externalization of their own quest to maintain their respective non-criterial identities. So they give to the least of them to preserve their undentity and with it their denial of the mechanism of causal relationship; ultimately of reality itself.

When everyone is a 'Special Snowflake' and 'Everyone is a Winner', purpose is eliminated from preference. 'Specialness', better understood as value, becomes axiomatic. It 'just is'. Furthermore this 'winning', better understood as earning, isn't particular but shared collectively.

This is, of course, the origin of Communism.

#### Choice: An Unlimited Opportunity to Limited Potential

Tell me dear reader, who is the arbiter of worth and deservedness? Who determines what one deserves? Why, it is you and I and in whatever capacity we can exercise such arbitration and how? Though our choices of course. We choose who deserves our wealth, our time, our energy, our attention, etc. When someone claims that you do not deserve something they are claiming that the choices of others to provide that thing for you were somehow wrong or not in keeping with some standard. Yet what standard would we hold above human preferences and their subsequent exercise through choice? By what standard can we limit or entirely restrict such behavior?

Naturally the concept of a universal system of human interaction i.e. morality comes to mind. That is to say, my exercise of agency should not limit another's *ability* to exercise theirs. Of course by inevitable consequence my choices can invariably limit another's choices, such as my choice to pay more for an item in auction excluding all other potential buyers or my choice to study harder than another, thereby earning myself a higher grade, them a lower grade, when graded along a bell curve. Yet this does

nothing to limit their ability to choose. It only limits the potential of the choice they had made yet even still, such limitation is necessarily self-inflicted. They could have paid more for that item or studied harder or even chosen not to participate in either course of action. There is a complete fairness in such a system. Call it an equality not of outcome, but of opportunity to exercise one's agency. A system wherein I may not limit your ability to choose but can, by virtue of the exercise of my agency, limit your choices and their potential. A system of equal participation, just without those absurd participation awards.

Of course it sounds like a necessary evil, to have to live with limited choices, but really it isn't; if only because such is the nature of reality. Yet constraint breeds ingenuity and creates a need to circumvent their limitation; a new preference in and of itself. When this preference is met through invention, it broadens the range of those who can now choose without any need to dilute the effects – the rewards of this choice. Thus the constraint is not only overcome by a single individual but trivialized for the entire collective. To name just one example, the invention of eyeglasses.

Were we to apply an equality of outcome to such situations, what was sought by all parties would have been evenly distributed and necessarily diluted as a means of making it available. So for example, equality of opportunity allows for most everyone to receive X, but there is a period in which the means of making it available needs to be established. Equality of outcome allows for everyone to receive X-Y presently, with Y representing the necessary subtraction in quality of X through the cost of distributing it. As such, equality of outcome is quasi-true in its ability to provide X to everyone. Though it depreciates X to the point that X as it was desired doesn't exist anymore and its new form,  $X_1$  has become the new standard for X. As it had been desired, X is now said to represent some fantasy or unattainable impossibility with  $X_1$  presented as the only 'realistic' manifestation of their desire for X. Of course, this is only true or 'realistic' insofar as any system of enforced equality of outcome can provide. Hence why equality of outcome demonstrably lowers the quality of whatever it claims it can provide for everyone. Though what's worse is that taken as a principle it doesn't simply depreciate everything once but continuously. Consider that if everything provided is never better than what is sought, then nothing can ever get better, only worse. So everything is an  $X_1$  rather than an X. Thus when  $X_1$  is sought, when it becomes the new standard, it will depreciate all the more into an  $X_2$ .

This ever trends toward though never reaches 0, given the relative nature of pricing within the market. This is why the German mark was worth less than a *trillionth* of what a single American dollar was worth in the time of the Weimar Republic, rather than simply 0. That economics will come to be understood as a merger of provable mathematics and scientifically grounded psychology I have little doubt, but not whilst the barrier of ideological politics bars its way. The ever-present roadblock of 'ought' and 'should' as opposed to 'is' and 'will'.

If you wish to understand more of this, communism essentially, there are myriad books that catalogue and analyze its collapse. Yet regardless of the generations long failed experiment of communism, the fact remains that any standard by which one limits the *ability* of another to choose is a means to limit another's exercise of agency. It is therefore dehumanizing in its application; robbing others of their means of establishing and maintaining their identity through their actions. Thus it oppresses them by definition. Yet with a strangeness we should expect of antithesis, it most certainly affects everyone but targets no one. Through its absolutism you can hardly blame it for singling out an individual but rather dragging everyone down to some ever-decreasing common denominator. So with that universality in mind, why does communism, antithesis really, culminate in dictatorship? Well because this dragging down has to start somewhere and with someone. Not at all once and never as a personal pursuit but a collective obligation. To borrow a famous phrase:

"If I'm going down I'm taking you with me."

### The Tyrant's Morality: Accusations of Privilege

What is most damning with regard to privilege, insofar as it is treated as an accusation, is its implicit denigration of choice. Not of a particular choice but, when taken to its logical conclusion, choice itself. As we explored, privilege and fundamentally antithesis removes choice from value resulting in the double negative phenomenon, of being *less* less worthy as opposed to any means of actually earning something, of being responsible for something. When confined to those that would subscribe to this nonsense it's relatively innocuous; they the only ones who suffer it. But since it is treated as a universal,

as an absolute and an obligatory one given the 'moral duty' of redistribution according to need, it imposes itself on all others. It becomes an attacker, a perpetrator of violence in its own right. It forces all others to subscribe to this notion of the double negative and the subsequent 'moral duty' it produces.

*"An accusation of privilege is an imposition of a subjective preference as a moral absolute."*

I've said as much, but what I didn't say was that this imposed preference was nebulization itself. Sure the antithesist may steal from the rich to give to the poor, but it's not the *outcome* that they desire to make manifest. It's engaging in the *process* of nebulization that drives them. Again I hesitate to even call this a preference given nebulization is the means through which standards are dissolved; the paradox of acting to eliminate purpose. By seeking to eliminate any and all disparity they are of course seeking to eliminate any and all means of discrimination. Suffice it to say, there is no disparity amongst the Borg, amongst a hivemind of indistinguishable 'individuals'. This is why choice itself, not just particular choices but the ability to even choose must be eliminated. Through choice we take action. Through action we create effect. Through effect we create purpose. Through purpose we craft identity. So choice itself becomes a target of the antithesists' nebulization.

Now as I've said the antithesist must start somewhere, must drag down others to her own level before they all plunge further into the ether, into this indiscriminate oblivion. Unable to impose her own standards, themselves only pseudo-positions ever-trending toward complete nebulization, she instead appeals to universality, her vaunted 'moral duty' or the 'greater good' as it's called. This is only an invitation into the religion of antithesism using our morality and altruism as its foothold. As such it's not always successful and given that it is a pleading of sorts, hardly an imposition. No, the imposition comes in claims, and their eventual actualization through theft, of the unworthiness of the individual to that which 'privileges' them. Again there is no standard of determining worth and worthiness but rather the phenomenon of the double negative. With all unearned and thus undeserved, the accusation is easily made and in any circumstance. As in any denial of responsibility. So the 'privileged' individual is met with *accusations* of privilege. That the disparity between them and others doesn't merely exist but ought not to and that they should surrender it for the 'good' of the collective.

Yet with all this in mind, where is the denigration of choice? Certainly the 'privileged' individual's choice not to surrender to the antithesist is being denigrated as immoral, but that's only a single individual. It's only when we step back from the narrow perspective of the antithesist and view this exchange in reality,

through reason, that we see the denigration of choice. For we may make any claim regarding the deservedness of an individual to something, but it is only that which we choose to grant them – or not, that we are in the power to control. Though not just to control, to *determine*. So who are we to make such claims of another's power to control? Of another's power to determine? To *choose* what they value? To claim that such a determination, that valuation itself is always in error is to claim that such power should be surrendered. That this power shouldn't be used at all. Thus control over our own destinies, choice itself, shouldn't. Not that a choice should be made not to choose. Such is itself a choice. Rather choice, as it exists, as it is understood, should not be. Ergo, 'choice shouldn't'. In truth in the antithesists' paradigm, choice *cannot* be. That is the crux of it. Let's explore an example.

#### Subjugating Subjectivity: Forcing an Abstraction

Should we compare ourselves to another there arises observable and demonstrable disparities, varying in their magnitude of course. Though really, it's always a matter of magnitude through which we observe disparity. That is, how much of something one has or one is when compared to another. Even that which an individual entirely lacks is a magnitude of zero, of nothing. This is one of a few reasons why an 'all or nothing' approach to one's *perception* of privilege is realistically absurd, that one is *definitely* privileged while another is not, but such is the nature of privilege; that it is a matter of standardization and so creates absolutes and dichotomies therein.

We take as our example a young, beautiful, talented man born into riches and social status. Now given the disparity between him and others, let's define his privilege in an all or nothing fashion in accordance with our own standards. So for example, instead of comparing the magnitude of his wealth to others, we can use our standard for 'rich' and 'poor' to claim that he is rich while others are poor. Again, all or nothing. So he is young while others are not. Beautiful while others are not. He has talent, riches, and has social status while others do not. To the social justice warrior he is privileged; given, granted, or otherwise having provided for him that which advantages his life above others. Again, never having

earned it himself or if acknowledged that he has, it is earned within an unjust system. Any excuse to sever any deservedness on his part.

So is this man privileged? No. Our exploration regarding the paradoxical nature of advantage is cause enough to never claim that his is a privileged existence. Furthermore that which he possesses physically, in capacity, and in potential submits itself to subjective valuation. We could have no need nor any cause to want his beauty, talent, nor even the effects of these things. Though more importantly, to want them is to pine for an abstraction.

Consider that the social status and popularity in possession of this man, one that should you wish for yourself, is a product of that individual; of *his* character and characteristics, not your own. You could no more have it than you could have the outcome of something you never effected. In truth, you want it for who *you* are and for what *you've* done. But no such social status nor popularity exists for you, at least not in the magnitude in which you desire it. So what you want is popularity in the abstract. Not *his* popularity nor that which created it in the first place. Rather you want yourself and that which you effect to make *you* popular, to earn *you* social status. Yet to want this is to want for unreality. It is to want to bend reality to your fantasy. It's no more unrealistic than to want a fit, healthy body whilst eating poorly and never exercising. Sure, popularity and social status are effects of human psychology and operate within the realm of subjectivity, but their effects exist nevertheless. While they do not submit to the strict, black and white nature of objective reality they are still real. They are still effected and in this example, through a means you haven't employed.

Basically dear reader, you can't transfer an abstraction from one individual to another. It is an impossibility. To have that which you want without change is impossible. Perhaps the best example here would be the notion of transferring or pining for the love of his wife. It cannot be made yours, at least not in the same way. You may receive her love, but it will be different than her love for him. Not better or greater or anything of the sort. Such is an attempt at egotistical self-affirmation. It's only different and thus not the same. In essence, one cannot value you for exactly the same reason as another precisely because you are distinct from each another.

Furthermore consider this notion of talent. Say this man is one Justin Bieber. Ask yourself – especially the women, “Do I want his singing voice?” I can most assuredly answer that I, for one, do not.

Regardless the absurdity of that voice coming from my frame, I don't want to have to do the work to maintain and protect it. I don't want to be acclaimed for it nor do I want the work-life associated with it. Neither do I want the interest of others who are enamored with it. I don't care for his singing voice and thus don't care for those who do. Sure, talent in the *abstract* is something I desire. But I want my own, not his.

Though I suppose talent is something I already possess, if not through my own admission then perhaps through yours. Now consider those of you who may desire my talent, be it the written word or my wisdom or whatever you deem it to be, what comes with it? Like the dyslexia which seems to have produced many great authors, am I perhaps afflicted with some similar malady? Is this talent the result of some great crucible? Of some great challenge in my life, internal or external to my person? I can assure you that I'm faced with what I consider to be a great challenge of my own. One that I perhaps egotistically believe would kill 'lesser' men. Though really just *other* men. Yet does this malady contribute to my talent? Is thinking so only a means of excuse? Of ennobling my own bad habits that I see as the worst of my nature, and so retarding my motivation to remedy them? I have no idea. All I can say of the matter is that I would only ever wish it on my worst enemies. Though granted I imagine some are already afflicted with it. Maybe this is why I feel so compelled to give it to you freely, without such suffering.

Yet when I do think about it dear reader, of what it does to me and whether or not I should seek to expunge it, to extirpate, eliminate, to scrub it in its entirety from myself and my person, I fear, sadden, and regret. See dear reader, it's what I'm most scared of too; facing myself. So should this be the origin of my talent, you could no more desire to have my talent than I could desire not to have been so afflicted with its origin. Joined as they are, one causal to the other, for you to have this talent would require you to be me – literally. To have my life as I've lived it and continue to live it. Dear reader, mine isn't merely to possess but to create. Also yours isn't merely to possess but to create. As ever, ours is *how they are*, never *what they are*. We are how we are, not what we are.

Returning to the previous example, consider the subjective nature of the rich man's privilege in its entirety. That which we consider to be youth, beauty, talent, riches, and social status is subjective. Though granted where youth *ends* is the only real subjective aspect of youth but I digress. Such a man could just as easily be seen as old, ugly, talentless, poor, and unpopular. It's not hard to create a

scenario in which this would be true. Consider this man's life amongst the Bushmen of Africa. Consider also their version of such a man coming to live amongst us. Certainly there exist objective criteria that persist regardless, such as health and physical capacity, but all the subjective criteria used to determine their respective 'privileges' have given way under the weight of culture; left only with their novelty.

So dear reader, do you wish to make manifest an abstraction in your own person? Do you wish for talent, beauty, capacity, potential, and so on? Fine, then simply meet your own standard for it and as you do, try to justify the limits of this standard. What epitomizes it. How your actions culminate in it. Where you 'set the bar' so to speak. Feel for once the futility in rationalizing what truly determines these things and hopefully if not finally free the abstraction from your subjugation.

Lastly and most importantly, consider what it means to claim that this man is undeserving of that which privileges him. At the level of his own individual, it is to claim that he hasn't earned and thus doesn't deserve any of it. This much is known. Yet it also means that the decision of all others to provide for and to this man is made in error. That it shouldn't have been made. That they shouldn't value him. Not for what he is nor for what he does. Though it goes even further. It's not just that they shouldn't value him, his youth, beauty, talent, and so supply everything that comes with it. Rather they shouldn't even possess standards that would lead them to believe he is youthful, beautiful, and talented *above any other*. Their own standards are claimed to be in the wrong and should thus be eliminated and why? Of course, because standards individuate. They discriminate. Ergo antithesists, in their pursuit of complete nebulization, insist that everyone are beautiful. They proclaim that everyone is talented, youthful, etc., with the caveat of 'in their own way' i.e. according to their own self-righteous perspective.

Truly, this is merely an extension of self-righteousness, of everyone being right, to all manner of possible criteria. Not that one can be right in what they think is beautiful and another can be right in their own interpretation of beauty, no. Such individuality runs entirely counter to the antithesist paradigm. Instead, everything people think is beautiful as individuals must become what everyone believes is beautiful as a collective and thus what beauty itself is. Remember, 'Everyone's a Winner' easily translates to any and all possible criteria. 'Everyone's a Winner' is fundamentally 'Everyone's Right', masked in language.

Though really, just consider what it means to claim that such a man, born into riches, doesn't deserve them. That he hasn't earned them. Yet who are the ones who provided these riches to him? Whose decision was it to give freely to this man? Who valued this man enough to provide it for him? Who chose to attribute purpose to this man, enough to subsidize and provide for his existence? It was his *parents*.

Dear reader I ask you to consider what it means to denigrate the choice of parents to care for their children. To make claims of greater deservedness to such care, be it monetary or otherwise, of some other party. That the poor or infirm deserve it more than their own child or that their subsidization and so valuation should be split between them. This disgusts me as it is but so much greed. It is also absurd, since by virtue of the parents' choice to provide for their child, their child has earned every penny, every smile, every modicum of care his parents chose to provide him with. It doesn't matter what form it takes. He has earned it if only because his deservedness is only and forever left to his parents to determine. As is his popularity to those who take interest in him. As is his talent to those who value it. As is his beauty to those who perceive it. To claim that he is unworthy of everything that he has and is, insofar as he has received it voluntarily through the choices of others, is to denigrate the very ability to choose at all. To treat it as an unfair and unjust practice, mirroring the antithesist's opposition to and hatred of any means of individuation.

Recall how the antithesist forms their undentity through the actions of others. That rather than to do something for themselves, they insist others react as though they *had* done it. That others would treat them as beautiful when they are not. Talented when they are not. To value them for no other reason than that they exist. In this way and as discussed, the antithesist seeks to control the behaviors of others in order to form an identity that they prefer, rather than to achieve it on their own; necessarily having to submit to the preferences of others. So what are accusations of privilege and the denigration of choice inherent to it if not but a means to manifest such an identity? To control the preferences of others and steer them toward one the antithesist prefers for themselves? One that is them or rather one that affirms their own self-righteousness? Sure it trends and ends with complete and utter nebulization. That all is beautiful and thus nothing is. That all are right and thus no one is. That all is truth and thus nothing is. But such is the destructive nature of the antithesist.

## The Arrogance of Belief: The Necessary Evil of Claiming Truth

There has come a point many times when I'm left to consider the breadth and scope of what it is I believe. I claim so much of human nature, our psyche and how it comes to shape culture, society, and even the nature of ideology itself. How ideology is nothing more than self-righteousness resulting in a non-criterial identity, itself based on the axiom 'I am right' existing subsequent to 'I exist' and merely as a reiteration; using the self as our very first point of reference in the universe. It's a mouthful when said like that but really, it all comes back to 'I am right'. It all comes back to that trite notion and the first question I asked myself of it. The question that spawned this entire perspective: "Can we share a belief in personal self-righteousness?" And sure if true, the implications of this are vast. Extending, permeating into all facets of human society, endeavor, all of humanity itself. But such is the case with any truth. Size, really importance is irrelevant. All are but a single thread woven into the tapestry of reality. All interconnected. All necessary. All shaping the others. There really is no 'size' to truth, yet I can't help but feel the enormity of it. Perhaps this is the nature of limited scope? That this truth merely affects more of my own paltry breadth of understanding?

Be that as it may, this next foray into a grand and sweeping 'truth' is the one of which I feel the most uncomfortable. Perhaps it is because it is more testable than the others. Perhaps it is because there are so many variables to consider that distilling them down to a single factor of influence isn't just absurd, but obviously incorrect. That it must be the result of several factors and not just one. Never one. Yet were I not to make the case here and now I would do a disservice to what I feel is my obligation. My obligation to explore in its entirety, or rather to the extent of my ability, this one idea. So I feel I must make the case, if only for your consideration and possible inclusion into whatever new theory best explains it. I recognize that I may only ever contribute to it in part and that I must be, in some capacity, wrong in nearly everything I say. But that I must say it with the conviction necessary of one who believes it is a necessary evil I bring upon myself. Not that I *must* bring upon myself as I could just as easily keep this avenue unexplored and so hide my thoughts on it. No, I *choose* to bring it upon myself.

That said, it is the concept of privilege that destroys nations.

## Origins of Dictatorship: The Roots of Authoritarianism in Privilege

The inevitable transformation of the communist state into a communist dictatorship seems to be as puzzling to antithesists as it is denied to have even occurred. Though outside of this Leftist paradigm the Rightist is little better in identifying the root cause of it. As ever they are correct in their claims of the *outcome*, of the existence of communist dictatorships, but not in the *mechanism* of their creation. It seems far easier to understand the origin of Rightist dictatorships given their propensity for standardization and how this may lead to a forced and enforced imposition of standards on others. It's much simpler to envision within the Rightist paradigm if only because it operates in greater accordance to reality, given its adherence to individuation. Ergo it's simpler to reason out because, frankly, it's more reasonable. Yet that both Rightism and Leftism are prone to and may indeed result in dictatorship is a product of their shared foundation of self-righteousness. Consider what motivates the dictator, the tyrant, by definition. It is self-righteousness, of course. His dictatorship is only a measure of his ability to inflict his will on others or, in the case of Leftism, the willingness of others to have their will relinquished and usurped by him. Basically, one may be so powerful as to impose his will on others or others may be so weak and mewling that they submit to the will of one or the 'will of the collective' as it is presented. Either way the result of enslavement is the same. But what isn't so recognized is that such dictatorships aren't resisted. In fact they are created not by the will of the few but through the will of the majority; as a reflection of their own beliefs.

This notion of the evil dictator lording over his people is frankly untrue. Perhaps legitimate in the waning years of his rule where people come to reject him, but during his rise and for many years hence he is but a reflection of the peoples' will. The citizenry has formed a nation-wide cult of personality. A personality that isn't his own, not yet. Rather a personality that the people long for that he will come into. See, the people create a zeitgeist in which a dictator may rise and take control. It is they who push him into a position of ultimate authority. As outsiders we see only the ruler and not the willingness, at least initially, of the people to be ruled. It is truly a case of slaves creating their masters. It takes two forms according to the Rightist and Leftist paradigms.

The Rightist paradigm is simple: might makes right. Power is earned and thus deserved and its exercise is therefore legitimate. The people who raise a Rightist dictator to the fore want the strongest to rule and operate this way within their own individual lives. They may seek power and impose their will on others or seek to avoid such imposition through sycophancy, bargaining, bribery, hiding, whatever. Their role within this system is irrelevant. Their consent to it, their desire to live in this fashion is what matters and what inevitably fosters such dictatorship. It needs to be understood that the people are so often the cause for their dictatorial rule through their desire for such rule. Either as a ruler themselves or as a subordinate of another's. Sure it is a hierarchical form of oppression, often derided and lamented, but one accepted if not overtly chosen. Of course not all support and contribute to such a zeitgeist, but enough to make it a reality. Basically, it is rule by one standard.

So for example, the citizenry are not merely German people but *the* German people. Whether a national identity, racial identity, cultural identity, etc., the actual demographic doesn't matter. What matters is the imposition of a particular standard, itself representative of a specific purpose for that demographic. One not necessarily chosen by a dictator but most certainly enforced by him. So where once one was able to forge an identity through their own choice of purpose, they have one foisted upon them. Continuing with the German example, if they are German they must be *the* German. Born a citizen of Germany there is no question that they are German and thus they are obligated to be *the* German. They are perceived as being obligated not by the decree of some dictator and the force of his goons, but by 'reason' itself. See if *the* German is standardized and one is born German, then one must be *the* German. One must take on the role that they are born into. There is no choice. Deviation is interpreted as a rejection of reality. It is seen as denial. The standard of *the* German is taken as absolutely true and thus to oppose it is to oppose reality. To be foolish, irrational, and even mad. Such is the self-righteous yet criterial nature of Rightism. Instead of manifesting an identity through a 'how' and claiming the culmination of that 'how' a 'what', both a 'what' and a 'how' is forced upon you. So now you are this specific identity, no matter what, and must act accordingly. Otherwise you're unnatural. You're immoral or insane. That you are this identity and that this identity must be this specific set of criteria is merely a self-righteous standardization; treated as something axiomatic. Fundamentally a Rightist dictatorship is Rightism without the ability to actualize schism. As an inability to exercise choice, it is a form of enslavement.

So what is privilege within such a paradigm? Well exactly what it is within the Leftist paradigm, save for an imposition of a single standard as opposed to none at all. One may be privileged by the dictatorial system in our eyes, but their privileging is seen as legitimate within the dictatorship. Insofar as it is even called a privilege within this system it is seen as earned, akin to some legal privilege. But one may also possess something the dictator deems they are unworthy of and thus *accuses* the individual of privilege, of unworthiness to it, and so rectifies this disparity through theft. It is the imposition of your will on another with regard to some subjective measure of value and with that the 'moral duty' it obliges you to effect.

The only reason it is 'might make right' as opposed to 'I am right' is the criterial nature of Rightist identity and standardization. In essence, 'might' really only refers to the power to effect, to do, to actualize and so form one's identity through actions. Since as an ideology it is necessarily self-righteous and so personal, it may as well read 'criteria makes standard' and 'actions make identity'. The reason might is chosen is because it operates 'better' or 'greater' than all other means, reflecting the inclusion of both success and failure into the Rightist ideological paradigm. Though granted where once time was the ultimate arbiter of success and failure, it now falls to the dictator to determine.

#### The Elusive Specter of Left Authoritarianism: Nebulization Masquerading as Egalitarianism

The Leftist paradigm is, as always, more complicated. Rather than an imposition of one's will, one's rule, one's standards above all others, there is an elimination of will, rule, and standards above any others. So rather than a single standard enforced as some moral and lawful obligation, all are obligated not to exercise any standards at all. So one must not standardize, neither in belief nor action. You'd think one would be free to manifest their own personal standards so long as they go uncommunicated or mask themselves in Allied Projection, but the manifestation of these beliefs through interaction is inevitable. Ergo they will become demonstrated and met with retribution and, as is the Leftist's nature, further nebulization.

So without the ability to actualize a preference, to act on one's own standards, choice is effectively eliminated. This mirrors that of the Rightist dictatorship. A parallel that is further established through their shared obligatory nature. As is the more egotistical nature of Leftism, this obligation is of a more personal imposition rather than something imposed externally. So rather than an external group imposing their standards on her by virtue of mere word association, say of being *the* German as they deem reality has determined her to be, the Leftist imposes such a standard upon herself. Through the elimination of any of her own standards, themselves representative of 'falsehoods', of a false reality as she perceives it, she obligates herself not to impose them on others. So she relinquishes her standards and forfeits her ability to choose, to exercise preference. She submits.

See in the Leftist paradigm, one must not exercise choice but rather treat all actions as an obligation, as a reaction to the 'injustice' of disparity. One does not earn. One does not create. One is only stolen from and one only destroys; destroys the potential of another to possess. It is what's known as 'lose-lose', the *less less*, the double negative. Of course this is just the fundamentals of antithesis operating at a political level.

In keeping with her obligation to submit and so the obligation of everyone to similarly submit, themselves bound by the same 'truth' of the falsehood of standards and the evil that is the exercise of preference, she manifests the 'moral duty' that is reallocation. Simply put, the elimination of responsibility forever divorces one from that which they have created which naturally eliminates the concept of ownership. Furthermore any claim to such creation, be it food, shelter, even one's own children, is exercising preference. It is what one wants or more specifically what one *wants to keep*. Such notions run counter to the 'moral duty' of reallocation and are punished or rectified given your perspective through just that, reallocation. What I deem theft.

As an aside, the Rightist deems this theft as well but only if not legitimized by whatever standards he imposes on others. Standards which constitute his respective 'moral duty'. So say within a Rightist dictatorship, he would support or at least consent to any such theft by the dictator. This provides a good example of ideologues' distinction but also similarity in thought and action, itself distinguished from our own. But I digress.

Now those that exercise this theft, who are granted this authority are really just granted legitimacy and moral sanction. Though they act when others do not and in a capacity that most dare not, there is truly no *ideological* distinction between them and the regular citizenry. They are not unique. There is no *perceived* hierarchy. Fundamentally any legitimized and sanctioned use of force is treated much as we would treat a lawful citizen's arrest. It is at the behest of the citizen to act so long as any such action is entirely in keeping with and upholding the law and 'moral duty' of the ideologue. If any distinction is understood it is one of greater 'courage' on behalf of those who choose to act, to make the arrest and reallocate, etc.

This isn't just a symbiotic relationship between the citizenry and their government but a perceived blending of the two. A blending that lends itself to a greater propensity for self-regulation. A regulation that takes the form of self-censorship and interpersonal surveillance. A veritable breeding ground for loyalist informants. It is a lateral form of oppression wherein everyone seeks to suppress each other rather than the top-down style of the Rightist variant. This is just another in a long line of self-inflicted wounds endemic to Leftism.

The Leftist notion of privilege, of possessing something that one hasn't earned and its implicit denigration of choice, most certainly results in theft. But more sinister and insidious is that it doesn't. With much of the citizenry convinced that they are always privileged, always in possession of that which they've not earned, they therefore give freely of themselves. They sacrifice their own preferences and thus submit to the collective according to their 'moral duty'. So it isn't theft. It's consensual. Of course given the necessarily nationwide efforts at reallocation, to whom the citizenry feels they owe isn't known. Thus some supreme authority is required to determine to whom they owe within their nation. Though in truth their inability to recognize their own responsibility and with that establish ownership has them feel always and forever undeserving. Undeserving of literally anything and everything. This affords the would-be dictator and his government the opportunity to claim the responsibility for reallocating this nation-wide moral tithe. Though he doesn't so much claim responsibility for it but rather states, and rightly so within the Leftist paradigm, that no regular citizen has any such responsibility; entirely in keeping with the individual Leftists' denial of their responsibility. Furthermore in order to facilitate such efforts he requires vast knowledge, in fact perfect and complete knowledge, of every citizen within the dictatorship. It stands to reason that in order to provide for the least of them, to meet need before desire, the dictator must know who they are and the only way to determine them, to

determine who is the least privileged, the least undeserving, is through comparison to others. Ergo all must be known about everyone in order to complete this task, to fulfill this 'moral duty'. Hence the nationwide surveillance endemic to them. So not only must the dictator and by extension his government be omniscient, they must also be omnipotent – both to complete their task without waste and to maintain such a system that is, in reality, doomed. If antithesism is a religion, or at least acts like one, the state is most certainly its god, whether it recognizes it as such or not.

Now what can be said of the dictator or any ruling bureaucracy in such a Leftist state? Are they as ideologically bound? Are they as imbued with the same false perspective? Well maybe yes and maybe no. The key factor that determines their station, as is the case with their Rightist ideological counterparts, is the extent of their self-righteousness. This is what creates the hierarchy within both ideological states. Strength of belief and strength of will are key to the implementation of and adherence to their respective ideologies. With the citizenry bound by this same measure of success, it is therefore the most self-righteous who rise to power and prominence.

Now whether or not they believe in the ideology is questionable. One I won't explore in this treatise. I say only that the more one understands of reality the more efficient they may operate within it. Though also the greater their truthful understanding of an ideology, the greater the extent of their knowledge of its workings and thus by definition its falsity, the greater their power to manipulate those who subscribe to it. In other words, the more you truthfully know of an ideology the more you know it is false, yet through this it grants you greater ability to control its believers still bound to this falsehood. I will say it's fitting that those in the seat of greatest ideological power, revered as paragons of a false faith, of a grand lie, would themselves be counterfeit. Though I suspect it to be a necessity, I cannot claim it with certainty.

As an aside, I wonder what I could have become were I so possessed of such self-righteousness coupled with my knowledge? Would I be the greatest dictator of all time or even the greatest servant of the people? Or perhaps is such a perspective demonstrative of a lack of self-righteousness? That is, is my perspective a product of humility thereby precluding me from any dictatorial aspirations? If that is the case then are ideological dictators, some of whom I claim must share this knowledge at least in part, more humble than I would suspect? If so then why the continuation of their dictatorship? Perhaps another factor determines their actions. Perhaps it is merely apathy. Not an apathy that results in

nothing. Of doing nothing and seeking nothing as such is a choice and an actualization of individual belief. Rather an apathy regarding change itself. Regarding actualization.

So they do, not because of anything but because of nothing. Apathetic of choice, they refuse to change course. So they just do. They just act. So maybe it's nihilism after all. A nihilism borne from humility rather than the relativity of Leftist self-righteousness, of antithesis. Seems likely. Nihilism forever follows as the natural corollary to any claim of knowledge. Thus apart from ideology, from fundamental self-righteousness, it will still persist and more simply than it had before. That it would be all on its own rather than birthed from antithesis; as something lone rather than subsequent to self-righteousness. Nihilism as a pseudo-axiom – even as a precursor to it. That there would be no 'is' to be. That there wouldn't even be the chance for an axiom to manifest. Only nothing.

#### Legitimizing Their Impetus: A Radical Vindication of Extremism

There exists a contingent of apologists who will excoriate me any time I criticize ideology without the socially accepted, dare I say politically correct, caveats. Such caveats being the terms 'radical' or 'extremist' conjoined to whatever ideology I choose to criticize or excoriate myself. So for example, 'radical Islam' or 'Muslim extremist' or 'radical feminist' or 'extremist Christian doctrine', etc. Of course this only directs our criticism to the concepts of radicalization and extremism, themselves not exclusive from each other, and puts the onus almost entirely on them rather than the ideology they have presumably applied themselves to. In other words, it is only the supposed fanaticism endemic to radicals and extremists that is the problem, not their root ideological belief. Admittedly this is technically true but is nevertheless used to obfuscate the real issue. Essentially fanaticism is a demonstration of one's self-righteousness but to a degree that is seen as everything from foolish to dangerous. Even with such recognition and even though it is shared across every ideology by definition, the fundamental core of self-righteousness itself isn't recognized as the problem. Instead it becomes a matter of degree. So it's only when this belief becomes 'radicalized', when one becomes self-righteous to a great enough degree, that one becomes dangerous or at least deserving of criticism. Yet that would imply that radicalization

and the extremism it describes is truly more a matter of consistency as opposed to capacity. Consistency with the ideology as opposed to a greater degree of self-righteousness. Of quality as opposed to quantity. Of honesty as opposed to hypocrisy.

Contradictions in their religious beliefs notwithstanding, to truly believe that one's soul and the soul of others is threatened by the sinful or that the entire world is theirs' by divine right would have one manifest such 'extremist' behaviors. It's not a matter of 'how true' they believe the content of their ideology to be. It's a matter of whether or not they actually believe it to be true or not. It is a black and white issue, namely because it deals entirely with their *responsibility* to the 'truth' of their ideology.

Recall the means through which belief manifests purpose and actualization of that purpose through interaction. How then could two people claim the same belief and same purpose but one with actualization of said purpose and one without? Simply put, they can't. Their beliefs are different though really it's a matter of lacking faith, of lacking belief. Considering that those who actualize are forming their identities through their actions, in other words adhering to their self-righteousness by way of upholding and maintaining standards within their ideology, those who are often labeled the 'extremist' or 'radical', are actually those who are most consistent with their ideological belief. These are the Rightists, the individuaters. Given that, it's not difficult to guess the nature of those who claim the exact same belief without such actualization. They are nebulizers – at least in part. What are often called the 'moderates'.

#### Aristotelian Meaninglessness: The Moderate Position

Now granted, by way of validating such moderates as the 'true' ideologue we can dissolve their ideological belief through nebulization, but it's a very dangerous ploy given that it doesn't lead to rational empiricism or anything of the sort. Rather it leads to antithesis with any after-the-fact attempts to teach the power and necessity of individuation and standardization only acting to vindicate their prior ideological belief, to repair what nebulization had destroyed. As such it becomes a fruitless

cycle fomenting only distrust between yourself and the antithesist. That is, unless you wish to foment antithesism itself. Otherwise in order to change the mind or rather to communicate truth to a fellow individuate, you must speak the language of individuation. You must speak of causal relationship.

When it comes to matters of truth, merely perceived or factual otherwise, it's always a black and white issue. You can no more have a moderate belief than a woman can be moderately pregnant. 'Moderate' as a term can only ever describe a hierarchy of preferential actualization, of purposes and linked behaviors that you would seek to maintain with greater import than others. So when it comes to moderation and the eponymous moderates in question, it's not a measure of belief but of preference. The core of their ideology, their self-righteousness, has been corrupted by mere prediction. So it becomes less a matter of claimed knowledge and more a matter of humility. A humility that nevertheless holds to the veracity of the ideology but holds other concerns, other purposes as more important.

As ever this may take one of the two ideological forms. The Rightist variant holds to and admits to such humility through what they call faith. Faith not as a belief without or irrespective of or in spite of the evidence, but as hope. As a communication of what one desires to be true. The Leftist variant represents the severing of identity from criteria and actualization. So they claim a belief without any subsequent demonstration of these beliefs, rational or otherwise. They 'just are' an ideologue and 'just believe' in the ideology while in truth there is no foundational criteria for either, just hollow words. It is cowardly and hypocritical certainly, but a trait I encourage in my ideological enemies if only to erode their dissolve and hasten schism. While the Leftist variant deceptively mirrors the humility of the Rightist variant, it is actually a matter of nihilism and apathy. Fundamentally both variants, both Left and Right moderates recognize the lack of objective truth with regard to their ideology but while the Rightist goes on to make a rational claim as to their relationship to their ideology, that of faith and hope, the Leftist does no such thing. Instead and as ever, it doesn't literally matter.

This admission of a lack of objective truth regarding their ideology makes moderates more logical insofar as they are more apt to put realistic concerns and thus reality above ideology. A hierarchy of preferential actualization as I put it. However, regarding their claimed beliefs they are less logically consistent. Fact is, acting on what you hope to be true rather than what you know to be true is foolish. Acting in ignorance, especially when such ignorance is acknowledged as such, is as ever a regrettable

action. A moderate is thus more consistent with reality and less consistent with their ideology, allowing them to be more honest regarding objective reality and demonstrably hypocritical and contradictory regarding their ideological one. A trait they are derided for by their 'radical' i.e. consistent ideological counterparts.

So truly the extent to which one is a moderate is the extent to which they aren't something, rather than are something. Ergo praising the extent to which one is a moderate feminist is really praising the extent to which they are not a feminist and fundamentally praising their humility rather than their arrogance; traits that are far more integral to their ability to reason and its corruption respectively. Traits that in the first place are of far greater import than their eventual superficial manifestation as an ideology. Traits that determine whether one will ever develop one or not.

Now with all that said, the issue in focusing criticism solely on the consistency of one's beliefs, their so-called 'radicalism', is that consistency with regard to truth and especially with regard to designing our perceptual reality is indispensable. Such consistency and the universality inherent to it forms a core of our ability to reason. Consider that without it any effect could proceed any cause and vice versa. There would be no means of establishing any universal truths, any absolutes. Rather everything that is and was would be a matter of instance. Of something happening this way this time but happening another way this time and for no reason. For that matter, distinguishing one instance and time from another would similarly be impossible. The universe would effectively be nebulized and we would be living in the antithesists' theoretical reality. So in criticizing the proxies of radicalism and extremism we're implicitly criticizing consistency, with that universality, causality, and finally individuation itself. We're using nebulization to dissolve their ideology which again is a dangerous ploy. Furthermore in focussing our criticism on consistency we're also ignoring ideologues' superficial ideological beliefs. In so doing we're avoiding the means through which we can best criticize and understand their motivations for believing them.

Consider our exploration of feminism through its superficial ideological structure and how this revealed to us its origins in the nebulization of 'woman' as an identity. Consider also our exploration of Christian apologia and its creation myth which revealed uncanny parallels to our relationship to truth through individuation. Lastly consider our exploration of antithesism as demonstrated through the behaviors of

feminists and social justice warriors. Recall how it mirrored religious themes – especially Christian, thereby hinting at its existence as a corollary in opposition to individuation:

Responsibility was made Original Sin.

Standardization became lying.

Reality itself was made the Devil, the ultimate ‘other’ crafting the ‘evil’ that is circumstance.

Privilege was thus benefitting from evil, benefitting from responsibility and circumstance i.e. Original Sin and the Devil.

Yet such themes present in antithesism isn't by way of plagiarism and bastardization but by way of individuation itself. This notion of ultimate cause as God, the paradox at the root of reason as Original Sin, standardization as truth, causal relationship as divine knowledge, all are a result of the human psyche. A result of the relationship between objectivity and subjectivity. Of fact and prediction. Would this have been recognized were we focused solely on ideologues' consistency alone? No. Instead we must recognize what consistency they are attempting to establish, that is a consistency *with what*, for us to determine not only what they claim to believe or how they claim to know, but by what mechanism their belief has manifested to begin with. Namely, are they individuates or antithesists?

So dear reader, understand my refusal to caveat an ideology with ‘radical’ or ‘extreme’. I will not focus my efforts on consistency; on that which guides us ever closer to truth. As such neither will I ignore the nature of the ideology I criticize. I will meet it as it is, not with some imaginary substitute designed to redirect and waste my efforts. Not in the maw of some politically correct abstraction which endlessly swallows my criticism. Not with some soft, absorbent, amorphous blob filled with holes. Not with the boundless hollows of a language sponge, in other words.

A Match Made in Hell: The Left's Alliance with Islam

With Islam representing a strict socio-political religion, one would think the ideological rigidity of Islam would preclude it from any allegiance to the Left, what with their wanton antithesism, and you would be right – to a degree. Instead of failing to develop altogether, their alliance is entirely one way. The Left has allied itself with Islam and Islam, not to look a gift horse in the mouth, or a useful idiot in the eyes as I would put it, uses them for their own purposes. Namely in their jihad. This hasn't gone unnoticed by methodeologues and Rightist critics alike, both of whom recognize the one-sided nature of what is essentially a sadomasochistic relationship. The question is, why? Why would the Left join with what would, or rather what should be, an ideological rival? For the answer though really just the conclusion, look no further than Rightist critiques of this unholy alliance. The purpose of this alliance is to destroy the West. Of course the Rightist doesn't understand why. How, that is the method used for this destruction, is somewhat understood but why is left the great unknown. The Rightist can and does speculate certainly, though more often than not they provide justifications that operate within their own ideological paradigm making the whole process an act of personal affirmation as opposed to anything realistic. In the case of the religious, Christian in particular, the Leftist is a sinner or devil worshipper; an atheist if they're keen to engage in Hostile Projection. To the Rightist philosopher, somewhat of an oxymoron to me, they correctly identify the nihilism and relativism of the Leftist though not their underlying antithesism and neither their motivations for this alliance with Islam. After all, engaging in a joint effort with Rightists, albeit Rightist Muslims, toward a shared goal is anathema to Leftists. Allying themselves with their perceived enemies, the notion of acting to achieve a goal and to the benefit not just of Rightists but of Rightism itself, is entirely outside their character. It is so foreign it ought to exclude them from the Left, if not in their eyes then in ours. Yet it doesn't. This is precisely because such an act isn't foreign to them at all. Rather it is entirely in keeping with the nature of nebulization that typifies antithesism. I mean really, with antithesism representing a complete dissolution of language and with that communication and even recognition of the legitimacy, the truth that is causal relationship as the basis of reason, why would you assume they'd be *consistent*? Instead inconsistency and from our perspective hypocrisy isn't just permitted, it's unable to be recognized. To them it doesn't exist as we would define it. Rather it exists in a form that aligns with their paradigm, their binary of human action. To them one may either individuate or nebulize. Thus hypocrisy is a matter of claiming to do one of those while doing the other. Ergo so long as Leftists don't individuate, they're free to frame whatever it is they do as an act of nebulization or as they'd put it, 'good'. 'Good' being that

which facilitates the dissolution of language and prior acts of individuation. The paradoxically purposeful purposelessness.

Think on all the examples of self-righteous proclamation we've explored as well as those in your daily life. Basically they are claims made without regard for and indeed without need for justification; that what someone claims is true, at least insofar as what they claim doesn't individuate. As we've explored this results in their hollow and meaningless identities, separated from purpose and with that losing their necessity as having been achieved through their exercise of agency, through their actions. So identity doesn't become a matter of responsibility and thus neither is it a matter of causal relationship. So what's stopping an antithesist from similarly claiming an intention or even outcome of their actions without any regard or need for justification? For reason? Of establishing them through cause and effect? There is no difference between this and claiming a non-criterial identity for yourself. Fundamentally it's still a matter of purpose, or rather a matter of ignoring purpose.

So the Leftist is entirely free to make any claims of their actions regardless their outcome, predictive or demonstrable. To do the opposite, to make claims with regard to reality, according to reason and causal relationship, would be an act of individuation. Hence they avoid such claims. The only thing they hold anyone responsible for is the act of individuation itself, their version of 'sin'. With individuation itself the means through which individuality is created and recognized, the Leftist is strangely though not coincidentally correct in holding people responsible for it. Indeed, it is how responsibility is both determined and created. Determined through observation of the effects of their actions and created through the actualization of their intentions. In other words, through choice and through acting on that choice. So great is the Leftists denial that he has, once again, pinpointed the exact cause, the truth, the nature of individuality and thus the basis of all responsibility. But as they're want to do, they treat it as some nefarious evil. As something to be expunged from our psyche rather than examined and, I should hope, embraced.

Inconsistency from Pseudo-Position: The Battle on All Fronts

“Now as I’ve said the antithesist must start somewhere, must drag down others to her own level before they all plunge further into the ether, into this indiscriminate oblivion. Unable to impose her own standards, themselves only pseudo-positions ever-trending toward complete nebulization, she instead appeals to universality, her vaunted ‘moral duty’ or the ‘greater good’ as it’s called.”

Through nebulizing standards Leftists develop a pseudo-position, one that exists only to oppose a legitimate position, a standard. This opposition takes the form of claiming and acting as though said position is entirely false. See, such opposition isn’t a matter of two standards clashing, of two models of reality opposing each other. Rather there is just one model of reality and those who seek to dissolve it. The Rightist and the Leftist. Think of it in terms of mathematics. A clash of standards between Rightists would be like presenting two different equations both designed to answer the same question. No amount of reconstitution can have them parallel each other and so both cannot be correct. So they try to find some error in the other’s equation. A clash between a Rightist and a Leftist using this same analogy would have a Rightist present an equation and the Leftist merely claim that it is false and take up the position that it is false. Now, they have no reason to suspect it is false because they’ve done no work of their own to answer this question. They have no equation of their own to present and any they do produce are only as a means of disproving that which the Rightist has presented. This equation thus becomes their pseudo-position.

Using mathematics it’s fairly simple to establish contradictions. For example, should one Rightist present the answer as greater than 0 and another Rightist present it as 0 or lesser, the Leftist cannot reject both of them. Yet neither can she agree with both of them. Instead, well, there is no instead. She dutifully and self-righteously rejects both of their answers irrespective of the contradiction in doing so. Now she may mask this by attempting to delegitimize the question altogether or even to go so far as to claim that mathematics itself is flawed, but this is merely ex post facto justification. In truth and as we know, her position is only that there is no such thing as position.

Recall that all the undentities presented by the Leftist aren’t at all creations. They appear as creations, but are actually creations of destructions. Namely in dissolving some standard they open it to the ether which further dissolves it into meaninglessness, such as what happened to gender. So with a construct defined as an idea or theory, typically formed upon simpler elements, the Leftist’s version is only in

resistance to that. Not just the idea or theory or its elements, but the act of forming a construct itself; of constructing. Ergo the positions they espouse are not positions, are not constructs. Rather they are nonconstructs presented in an effort to deconstruct constructs. Pseudo-positions designed to dissolve legitimate positions. Undentities designed to nebulize criterial identities.

So given several models of reality, several standards as Rightists' present them, Leftists will seek to nebulize them all thereby manifesting pseudo-positions in the interim. Positions like equality, to take one example. So because they only *react* to standards created and maintained by the Rightist, they do not develop any consistency in their resistance. That is to say, that they resist is consistent but the manifestations of this resistance in the form of pseudo-positions are often irreconcilable with each other. They cannot *logically* co-exist ergo the Leftist develops inconsistency and through their simultaneous advocacy of them, hypocrisy. Though obviously when you resist every possible position that exists as an effect of individuation, you will develop logical inconsistencies by definition. Lucky for them they don't recognize their responsibility as determining their identity and are thus free to ignore this illogic. A freedom which extends into their alliance with Islam. So long as they claim this alliance is actually a means to nebulize, to dissolve some standard, they avoid any sense of contradiction and so hypocrisy. Though they even go so far as to claim Muslims – all Muslims, are victims of the West. They frame their aggression as purely reactionary and so justifiable self-defence; often no matter the extreme. Truly this alliance rests upon a foundation of total unreality. That so long as the antithesist can maintain their delusion in spite of reality, in spite of Objectivity Creep, their alliance will hold and when it comes to antithesists, delusion is unfortunately the one thing we can count on.

The Fall of the West: It's *Nothing*, Personal

So it stands to reason that these unreasonable ideologues can wantonly believe anything insofar as it doesn't individuate. Insofar as it doesn't make any sense, frankly. But this answer only passes the buck. That is to say, this fact only raises a subsequent and equally important question. See, if antithesists can

ally themselves with individuals, why don't they ally themselves with all individuals? Why have they targeted the West in particular? The answer lies in the personal and narcissistic nature of antithesis.

Consider that no man can entirely nebulize his reality. Were he to do so all perception and understanding would be void. Nothing would be anything. Anything would be nothing. Worse than unconsciousness, it would be nonconsciousness. Eventually even the self would give way to the void, unable to perceive any distinctions between themselves. Therefore every man, despite his antithesis convictions, is possessed of some measure of standard and so individuality. I have said as much. But what I've not expounded on is where this comes from. The answer is twofold and obvious. Self and society. Nature and nurture.

The individual crafts his own standards for his person, as does society, making him into the man he is or rather the man he perceives himself to be. So in order for this man to become an antithesisist he must nebulize his own standards. In truth and by necessity, his actions to nebulize reality are a personal matter. It's his perception of reality through his standards that he seeks to dissolve, to distort. Sure, he imposes this perspective on others and this perspective results in particular, inevitable actions that he shares in common with all antithesisists. But antithesisism is first and foremost an individual phenomenon. Again, such is the self-righteous nature of antithesisism and of ideology in general. Fundamentally, antithesisism is a personal purge. It is a purging of every standard, every discrimination, every distinction an individual has. It is the dark corollary to self-righteous affirmation. To be self-righteous about everything that you perceive as false.

With this in mind, is it not obvious why they target the West? It is because they are a product of it. Their prior standards, what these antithesisists see as lies and all the 'sin' that they have wrought through them, were taught to them by the West. Taught to them by families, communities, everyone within their sphere of influence. Hell even the act of standardization itself, while not taught directly since it is inherent to us, was cultivated and encouraged in them by the West. So in some form or fashion all that they still are, and what they perceive as having been, is the fault of the West. Though taking it one step further, those standards that cultivated and crafted their character are themselves very much a part of the West. What is often called Western culture. So in order to purge themselves of these standards, these 'lies', they in turn must purge the West. They seek to destroy this 'other' in the same fashion we would seek to destroy any enemy or simply illuminate any untruth.

Given this, why would the antithesist have any cause to target Islam? What part of their character was forged by Islam? What did it ingrain in their psyche? What standards did it cultivate? How did it 'impose' the awful 'sin' that is individuation onto them? It didn't. Ergo their alliance is as simple to forge as it is to declare. Islam hasn't done a single thing to them and anything that they may do in the future is framed as a necessary evil of sorts. Civilian casualties lost to their reactionary war, or rather their self-defence against the West. Basically, so long as antithesists believe the true target of such Muslims is the West in the abstract or even Western Rightists in particular, and not antithesists themselves, they are not only free to but obligated to forgive them. The perceived ignorance of the jihadist frees them from any moral responsibility by virtue of them *supposedly* maintaining a purity of intention. In other words and to quote the bible, 'Forgive them...for they know not what they do.'

This is undoubtedly a case of the soft bigotry of low expectations, but since antithesists don't hold any standards and thus morals or ethics or whatever as human universals, they hardly see this invasion as a personal attack or affront against them and their ideology. Indeed, by definition antithesists have no expectations of anyone. Such would be an act of prediction and thus an ascription of purpose to them. An act of individuation that they mustn't commit. So they see this Muslim invasion as just another effect of the evil West, of the individuaters they seek to destroy. Of the 'other' who created this Muslim uprising through their own actions, rather than the actions of the ever-victim Muslims. And people wonder why feminists and Islam have made bedfellows of each other?

"To [feminists], their undentity will always exist. Instead, any characteristics that can be attributed to their undentity *ex post facto* are claimed as the result of the actions of others, not their own. Hence anything that should occur, any outcome as a result of their interaction with others and reality itself, is not attributable to their undentity but characterizes it as it exists in reality. In other words, how it is *forced* to exist in reality. This is how the characteristics that have come to define 'woman' are all an effect of the actions of others; descriptive of an imposition rather than a self-actualized characterization. Taking 'woman' as the example, nothing is the fault of 'woman' and 'woman', as it is *made* to exist, is the fault of others. Forever shaped by the other, 'woman' is forever guiltless. So 'women' are oppressed, are victims, are targeted, harassed, vilified, hated, controlled, etc. They are granted characteristics only by virtue of the actions of the 'other' whilst tellingly rejecting any characteristics attributable to their own actions 'as women'. Instead they claim to struggle to characterize themselves the way they wish

to, to struggle to express...themselves. Naturally this is an effect of [Leftists'] denial of personal agency with regard to [women's] identity and so their inability, or rather unwillingness to recognize that they can and very much do characterize themselves."

By virtue of the self-righteous, narcissistic, egomaniacal root of antithesism, its projection of its personal purging, its deterioration of personal standards onto anyone and everyone, it can make bedfellows of any it wishes to. Any whom they view as non-contributory, as non-influential in what little personal identity they have left. From there their reasoning, or rather their ex post facto justifications, are all the same. Now reread that quote and replace any mention of women with Muslim and Islam. It will read the same. The target too is also the same. The responsible 'other', the corporeal manifestation of casual relationship; acknowledged therein by the very people who engage it.

But does there really exist such a particular manifestation of the West? That is, is there a 'Western person' or 'Man of the West' that antithesists target and for the purpose of dissolving Western standards? Well frankly, yes. Remember that 'the West' is only an umbrella term, used to encompass several different standards which culminate in what is recognized as 'Western Values' or a particular Western ethos. Ergo those who would become the target of Western nebulization would be those who best hold to that ethos, to those standards. Thus such particular hatred is directed at those who maintain the greatest sense of their responsibility within the West. So by virtue of all the nebulization of prior Western standards and their respective identities, a single demographic has to come to form as the target of their scorn, ridicule, and blame; a passive resistance to the dissolution of Western ethos. The antithesis to the antithesist. He is again and once more, the straight white male.

Basically with antithesism existing to essentially deny reality, they're concerned with those closest to an adherence with reality rather than with Islamic and other Rightist fantasies. Christianity representing a small exception insofar as it exists as a metaphor, alluding to individuation. So amusingly, antithesists subconsciously recognize that Islam is nonsense. Otherwise they'd be actively targeting it. It's a case of 'you shall know him by his enemies.' As such the antithesist is known, is revealed through what he resists, of whom he makes an enemy, rather than the pseudo-positions he takes in this effort. Once again defining himself through the 'other'.

## Validating Perceived Victimization: The Pragmatic Approach

Naturally Islam seeks the destruction of the West through submission. Submission to their boots and eventually to their god, which aligns entirely with antithesists' desire to purge the West itself. To purge the 'lies' both inside and outside their person. See, the antithesist has begun a campaign of total identity annihilation. They have to destroy what was a part of *themselves*, internally and externally. So the threat of Islam forcing their doctrine onto antithesists doesn't matter in the slightest. Islam can no more force belief in them than they can forsake and relinquish their self-righteousness. So since Islam never 'imposed' standards onto antithesists in the first place, they don't view it as an enemy. Tellingly antithesists only ever excoriate 'radical' and 'extremist' Muslims though as discussed, what they're really criticizing is consistency; criticizing individuation through a proxy. With that they praise the moderate but only for his nebulization of Islam. Praise they share in common with the Rightist though as discussed, for different reasons.

Yet there is a simpler reason as to why the antithesist allies themselves with Islam or rather their jihad. Recall that antithesists are ever in search of validation as opposed to their goal-oriented counterparts. Thus they require the 'other' in order to define themselves via the actions of said 'other', as a victim of them. Now given the increasing absurdity of power with which this 'other' is granted in order for the antithesist to increasingly deny their responsibility, two solutions manifest. Solutions not unlike the twin facets of schism, that of reformation and nebulization. The nebulization model has them shift the goalpost and create incorporeal, fantastical things through which they can foist their denied responsibility. This was labeled 'systemic oppression' in which circumstance and the aggregate outcome of all actions within a demographic was granted an agency of sorts. But the reformative approach, the approach that operates within the realm of standardization, within reality, wasn't as thoroughly explored. Yet I would be remiss not to mention the parallels between it and the 'rape advocacy' of feminists. Recall:

“Indeed, that rape isn't nearly as prevalent as they claim it is should come as a relief to feminists but is instead met with hostility. Sure, as an advocacy group for 'women' they are keen to ensure that rape statistics aren't being underestimated, but their zeal is hardly borne out of

concern and caution. Rather in presenting a much lower and even decreasing rate of rape you are depriving feminists of their means of personal validation. So with the feminists' personal validation inextricably tied to both the prevalence and occurrence of rape, they have become another beneficiary of the horrible act alongside the rapist. Two groups benefit from rape: rapists and feminists. This is the abhorrent nature of tying the perpetual need for validation into an act of victimization. It creates a necessarily sadistic relationship...By stating that the event was entirely out of their power, that they had no power to prevent it, a feminist only inflicts helplessness on the victim. The victim, should they heed the words of the feminist, will never recognize their own power and so...may become a feminist ideologue all her own and so shirk her personal responsibility for her self-preservation...thus increasing the chance of re-victimization and essentially aiding rapists. Hence the rape prevention done by feminists results in, again at worst, rape enablement. A complete inversion of their proclaimed goal."

So with her identity as a feminist based in female victimization, she is in want for such victimization in order to validate her identity. She does this by increasing the probability that such victimization can occur. In this example it is by aiding the rapist via counselling learned helplessness in women. But one can just as easily manifest this victimization through a direct invitation for perpetration. That is, one may simply invite the perpetrator to victimize them. Of course such invitation would be consensual, ergo the perpetrators in question mustn't be viewed as such. Enter Islam, literally.

Antithesists do not view Muslims as perpetrators and nor do they recognize any increased risk of perpetration amongst their ranks. Such would be an act of discrimination and even so, they excuse their behavior through the soft bigotry of low expectations and also through their moral relativism. So antithesists invite Muslims into their countries, their communities, even their homes, all with the subconscious motivation of demonstrating a wanton disregard for any responsibility to protecting their person. Unconsciously or subconsciously they want to be accosted or otherwise victimized in some fashion, but cannot recognize this consciously. So coupled with championing *non*-prevention, they invite would-be perpetrators to victimize them thus validating their identity as a victim. Yet even before all that occurs, they are demonstrating their denial of any personal responsibility. Think of it like the most extreme manifestation of the 'Slut Walk' that exists. Not only are they want to parade themselves around, courting interest and all without any sufficient means to resist it's violent manifestation, but now they're also doing so around those whom they know, but refuse to recognize, as a demographic

more likely to victimize them. Such is the extent to which they seek to demonstrate their denial of personal agency. It is all an act of masturbatory self-affirmation. A masochism that not only borders on but is demonstrably suicidal. Indeed, the West's response to this so-called 'Migrant Crisis' is little more than an international 'Slut Walk'; sharing the same motivations in common. It's just more insane, given that they're not even willing to blame Muslims for their crimes. Instead their excusing them and foisting the blame onto the West. So bizarre are their ex post facto justifications that they have shifted from 'teach men not to rape' into 'teach Muslim migrants not to rape'. The onus is, of course, on 'Western Men' or the straight white men to teach these Muslims and furthermore to prevent them from accosting women.

Dear reader, we cannot and must not treat these perspectives as something so innocuous. Sure, the 'Slut Walk' is a foolish, stupid, dangerous, and damaging practice, but it was only *your* incredulity that could suppose it would remain isolated to the streets of Toronto and other imitators. That it was able to manifest at all demonstrated not a new zeitgeist but an old, secret one. One that had already spread throughout the West, laying the foundation for what would become the 'Migrant Crisis'. See, the only real crisis, the actual crisis is your unwillingness and inability to prevent their invasion of your homelands. 'Migrants' aren't the problem. It's your people, your fellow countrymen and their idiotic notions of moral obligation and sentimentality. In essence, you've already been counseled in non-prevention. You've already succumbed to learned helplessness.

Again and again and again and again. It doesn't matter the superficial manifestation of antithesis. Be it feminism, communism, transgenderism, progressivism, social justice, the 'Migrant Crisis', whatever. When you fight one you fight them all. I'm not the one who makes them mirror each other through some mental gymnastics or psychological sleight of hand. I'm not the one who designs their parallels. I'm not the one who built them on the exact same foundation. They are and always have been the same damn thing. So I ask you dear reader, now do you know thy enemy?

## CHAPTER 10 - The End of an Error: Our Literal Emancipation

## Introduction:

As in any matter of philosophical inquiry I'm ever aware of my own Sword of Damocles, that of Hume's Guillotine, poised above my head. As such I'm in no position to make claims of what one ought to do with this information. I can no more derive an 'ought' from an 'is' than any other before me. However, I should think I'm in a unique position in that the cause I champion isn't merely of a single 'ought'. That is, I don't champion a singular position above any and all others. Instead I champion or rather have purposed myself to preserve the very ability to take a position and so manifest purpose therein. In other words, I seek to preserve 'ought' itself.

I don't know of any objective hierarchy of merit or import through which one could judge this endeavor, yet I recognize that it distinguishes itself from any other. It operates at one removed, at a baser, more fundamental level and as such it is more integral than anything subsequent to it. With that I find myself asking, "Ought we preserve ought?" In other words, "Should we preserve our ability to ascribe meaning and so establish purpose?" Though we should yet consider that this question isn't merely without answer but entirely unanswerable. It could very well be true, indeed I believe so, that our ability to ascribe meaning and so establish purpose, that of individuation, is a permanent and necessary component of reason. As such we're bound to this fixation with 'ought' and our personal operation according to it. So to ask whether or not it ought to be preserved is pointless as it's entirely beyond our ability to control. Truly, the only means of ceasing it insofar as humanity is concerned is through the elimination of the species itself. Yet why extrapolate this matter so beyond our persons when it's core to our very selves? Consider, 'Why ascribe meaning in the first place? Why attribute purpose to anything to begin with? Why do you do so and why should it be preserved? Why not just end yourself?' Ah, but therein lies the rub as even suicide is, after all, a choice. It is an 'ought' like any other. Even apathy is the choice to do nothing or not to change what you're doing presently. There is simply no escaping choice.

See dear reader, once imbued with the ability to reason, to individuate, we're incapable of operating without it. We could no more want for its separation than we could want for the separation of life from living. It is thought, belief, meaning, purpose, it's everything. It defines us. So this 'ought', this purpose, this prediction is ever ours to shape and forge and to make manifest in a future in which such purpose invariably lies. Still, we can no more claim that it ought to be than we can know the future in which it resides. So that said, all we can do to influence individuation is to either increase or decrease its

efficiency and efficacy. In other words, we can only influence our understanding of this psychological mechanism, not cease its operation.

To positively impact this mechanism, we learn rightly. We develop knowledge, consistency, anything and everything that will assist in our predictions; our understanding of cause and effect. So regardless the purpose we may choose to effect in our personal lives, we've a better understanding of how to do so. Of how to lose weight, how to communicate, how to do anything. As such we're able to operate according to our own purposes but act as a collective in our efforts to improve this very operation. That we enact our will such that we are better able to enact our will. A self-sustaining human enterprise. A positive feedback loop resulting in greater congruity with, and operation within, reality. One that demands the preservation of humanity along with all its knowledge lest it decay entirely.

So what does that make of the antithesist? Well of course they seek to undermine this process. They seek to corrupt our knowledge with falsity. They seek to deny the truth of their operation according to individuation by ironically resisting it; by reacting to the very thing they contend doesn't exist. The ultimate paradox of denial. So they preserve and champion only that which doesn't make manifest our predictions. They invert our understanding of causal relationship and with it erase our sense of selves; our identities as crafted through our sense of responsibility. In all that they do they seek to hinder individuation and our progress therein. To deny its influence in their lives and their obligation to it for crafting for themselves not only a sensible but demonstrable sense of self and reality. For without it they'd be unable to argue, to 'reason' that which they claim. They'd have no means to purpose themselves let alone recognize and even understand purpose.

Yet bound to it as we are, their resistance is futile; a power they wish to usurp and put to their own cause of validating their non-criterial identity. To take the universal binding power, the axiomatic status of individuation and put it to the task of substantiating their own selves, their own unreality. To take the essence of all reason, the very thing we use to explore the universe, what we use to fashion knowledge from ignorance, purpose from obscurity, truth from falsehood, and to twist it to the singular selfish goal of justifying themselves. A goal that leaves this mind-shaper, this world-forger, the very impetus to our entire conceptual reality, impotent. That leaves it unable to substantiate anything other than the antithesist herself. She sacrifices all knowledge, all truth – everything on the altar of her own narcissism. That she may become the shining light, the enlightened ego, the one true self whose radiance stretches across all of infinity, but whose light shines on nothing, is seen by no one, and whose reflection can never be admired. Not even by herself.

A cause forever without effect. It is folly.

So it is in the spirit, the purpose of preserving 'ought', of preserving purpose itself that I seek to end social justice, feminism, Leftism, any and all superficial manifestations of antithesism. Should you wish to join me in this endeavor read on and please, don't let that be the only thing you do.

"On your feet. This is not heaven. It is the world, and there are troubles in it."

### Voiding the Void: The Exorcism of Nothing

It's been said of Islam that it requires a reformation, a retooling of its religious dogma, or rather the response to it, in order for it to survive. As much as some well-wishers may long for an Islam that treats people better, that their hopes for a reformation is for some grander humanitarian purpose, that's hardly going to be the cause or rather the need to usher in such a reformation. Fact is Islam must reform or face annihilation at the hands of the West who've been entirely unwilling to respond in kind – for now. Sheer numbers aside, the notion that Islam represents any existential threat to the West is a cruel joke. Certainly Islam represents a threat to whatever retarded ideals have stymied an equal response from the West, but such disillusion hardly affects our own corporeal existence. Truly, all Islam can do is to alter how we view ourselves insofar as we choose to respond to it. That the fear of this alteration has stayed our hand for so long is a product not of Islam but of this damnable self-righteousness we're afflicted with. It's only the fear of 'what we will become' that has any sway over us and as such reveals this slow cultural suicide of the West through Islamization as yet another product of rampant and unyielding narcissism; and yet our relationship to the Left is little different. We've suffered a long and slow cultural suicide through nebulization at the hands of the Left but also through our own complicity and outright submission to it. We've been taken in by much of their rhetoric, becoming Leftists or rather antithesists in far more matters than we're willing to recognize. Thus to remedy this we've first to look to ourselves and expunge what corruptive influences we've imbibed. It's then and only then that we can seek to reform the Left. Such is the old biblical wisdom,

“...remove the plank from your own eye such that you may see clearly to remove the speck from another’s.”

## Planks in Our Eyes: The Implicit Acceptance of False Premises

As I’ve mentioned before yet it bears repeating, through our argumentation with antithesists we often implicitly and even explicitly accept the validity, the truthful legitimacy of their premises. Such premises are themselves birthed from their core belief of self-righteousness and the nebulization it engenders. Thus to accept these premises is to accept the entirety of their ideological pseudo-position. It is to make yourself an ally, a believer, an antithesist by any other name. As such any criticism crafted in this manner only ever targets the observations and so claims of said premises, not their actual legitimacy. It becomes a matter of criticizing the individual antithesist, their perceptions and justification therein, and as such can only delegitimize and prove wrong *the individual*. In this way a critic becomes a gatekeeper of sorts, an arbiter acting to determine what in the real world is truly an example of say, sexual objectification or privilege or offense. Of course with such premises being nonsense, any positive claims he may make are false and his error. Though so too are his negative claims given that they too operate on the supposed truth of these premises. Either way in treating such premises as in any way legitimate, as something that *can or could or even has been observed*, as something standardized when they represent the very opposite process, he is making a grave error. He’s taking the ‘truth’ of these premises for granted and as such provides a means of social substantiation for any antithesist whose undentity is validated through these premises. The whole process is a non-starter which is why it fails so spectacularly.

Truly, all a critic can do through this process is demonstrate the ineptitude of the individual antithesist who makes claims of observing these premises in reality. This shows, as such critique very much results in character assassination, at least insofar as their ability to reason is concerned. As more and more antithesists are similarly discredited they, along with their superficial manifestation of antithesism, become unpopular rather than outright refuted. Essentially whatever appeal to authority and tribalism facilitated the fellowship of their ideological collective is all but eliminated leaving ‘moderate’

ideologues of a similar persuasion to jump ship along with any outside observers initially swayed by their ideological rhetoric. Basically the ideology loses its ability to ingratiate itself to outsiders and moderates alike, leaving it less able to attract and so nebulize newcomers. Yet regardless their unpopularity and their illegitimacy, their premises remain unmolested. The mind-virus they preserved persists and ironically in those who seemingly most criticized it. Naturally they hardly resisted it to the capacity that they themselves would claim, but they nevertheless situated themselves as the chief or rather most popular resistance to it. In this way this vanguard is transformed into another vanguard of sorts. One who becomes the foremost *authority* on the false premises espoused by the very ideologues they resisted. How? Well as is their way, these critics seek to define and so demonstrate these premises in a more reasonable fashion. In so doing they make claim of what sexual objectification *really is* or what privilege *really is* or what *is really* politically correct with examples to that effect. Ironically their greater adherence to reason results in a greater perceived legitimacy of these false premises and so their acceptance with it. Thus this mind-virus metastasizes in this new host and emerges all the stronger for it.

Through this new psychological vector it mutates into a more virulent and infectious strain, awaiting its next infection cycle through the inevitable criticism and eventual usurpation of these premises by a new vanguard having manifested in response to it. In essence, the sheer fact these premises are nonsense allow them to attract detractors whom, unless armed with the whole truth regarding the falsity of these premises, are doomed to infection; turned into an unwilling vector to the very thing they sought to destroy; becoming what they hate.

Dear reader, it isn't altogether unlikely that you've become infected yourself. That you implicitly accept the legitimacy of the premises espoused by antithesists; arguing only against their observations and subsequent claims. Yet in the knowledge accrued through this treatise you're already in possession of the cure. One that you must take yourself of course and in the full knowledge of what particular malady, what particular premise you wish to target for remediation. It is a bitter pill you must take for yourself as all I can do is offer you the opportunity. It is one I encourage of course, but hardly one I can claim you ought to make. So with that said, here are some though hardly all of the false premises you can remedy at your own behest.

Privilege – Is only an observation of distinction but when made with reference to matters of deservedness implicitly criticizes and denigrates valuation, standardization, the ability to choose and thus the ability to recognize distinction itself. As such it is entirely self-defeating.

Non-sexualized Gender – The attempt to create and so standardize a purposeful identity for either sex that is corrupted through the hollow term ‘sexual identification’ resulting in a complete nebulization of gender and in its stead the creation of an identity for an identity, a perception of a perception, known as ‘gender identity’ i.e. plumber plumber, man man, etc.

Perceptual Sexual Objectification – A self-inflicted dehumanization created by basing one’s identity in a descriptor for one’s sex. A conflation of the subjective aspect of identity with the objective aspect resulting in a denial of the necessity for responsibility as the key factor in determining one’s identity. Falsely labels their disillusionment or rather their enlightenment regarding this matter as causal to their dehumanization, resulting in the denigration of anyone who identifies their sexuality.

Objective Offense – Seeks to ground an aspect of one’s identity in reality as some objective truth thereby acting to validate their identity through social substantiation insofar as they claim any matter to be objectively offensive.

Advantage/Disadvantage – Always determined with reference to purpose and as such whilst certain matters may objectively benefit or hinder a particular purpose, the pursuit, valuation, or otherwise referencing of that purpose is entirely a matter of choice and thus self-imposed.

Simply put:

“They only exist with regard to what one wishes to accomplish. Ergo they are determined by the desires of the individual.”

Inherent Value – Operates without reference to purpose, to a predicted outcome based on some causal relationship in reality. As such it represents a contradiction, given the nature of valuation.

Selfishness – Not merely doing something for self-interest, true selfishness (while unattainable) is doing something to ensure *only your* self-interest.

Virtue of Selflessness – Transforms logical selfishness i.e. self-interest into pathological altruism which supports the pursuit of true selfishness of other individuals; a charity formed subsidy for the self-interest of others. Selflessness benefits most those who take advantage of it, not those who engage in it.

Sacrifice – The attempt to frame oneself as a victim of one's own choices. It is always an exchange for greater value according to personal preference, of what one wants *more*, and is thus an exchange. Ergo a 'sacrifice' is a gain and the choice to gain, without exception, and is therefore always self-interested.

Moderation – Descriptive of a behavior rather than a position, they represent the nebulization of an ideology both in their dissolution of ideological standards as well as submitting the claimed purpose of the ideology to a hierarchy of preferential actualization.

Political Correctness – The attempt to nebulize and/or maintain the nebulization of an identity, it grows according to number of identities available for nebulization. As politicians are ones not necessarily to lie but not to tell the truth, to not define or standardize most anything, the use of the term 'political' refers to their natural tendency toward nebulization.

Radicals – Those consistent with an ideology.

Homophobia/Islamophobia – Slander as a result of projection, it implies denial i.e. fear of reality; framing their own interpretation as a fundamental truth that as such shouldn't be feared any more than some physical law or mathematical principle. An identity without reference to purpose, a non-criterial identity, an undentity, cannot be rationally feared as it produces no effect by definition. Thus any negative response or belief regarding such undentities are framed as fearful, ignorant, or otherwise entirely false.

Representation – Equal Representation becomes entirely literal. That what 'black' represents is equal to what 'woman' represents. The loss of any and all distinction, the nebulization inherent to synonymy.

Identity – The subjective application of purpose to some objective criterion or criteria in possession of an individual as created through their actions. As such it is always a descriptor of that which they are responsible for through an exercise of their agency.

Identity Politics – Results from the fixation with 'what' and with that the denial of any necessary 'how' with regard to an identity. As such it manifests as claims as to what some identity is and with that what it deserves as opposed to how that identity is and thus what it has created for itself. Ergo it results in victimology with regard to what the identity does and does not deserve

as an effect not of their own actions but necessarily of others. As such what is known as the 'Progressive Stack' is entirely comprised of such identities i.e. undentities.

You must, *must* take these truths to heart and so operate accordingly. Do not use these terms as they are presented by your ideological rivals and fellows alike as such is to tacitly accept this nebulization of your language. It's been said that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance, but truly the price or rather the reality of anything is that it must be maintained. The 'price' as it were is always and forever maintenance. That in order to have a 'what' one must adhere to a 'how'. As such should you wish to have language and the truth or rather reason it attempts to communicate, you must be ever vigilant. You must maintain it. You cannot afford to have your language nebulized as none can bear such a cost.

Dear reader, the full list of false premises, insofar as I've recognized and catalogued them, will be perceived as more controversial and morally egregious than the entirety of this treatise. Of that I am certain. As such to divulge it would mar my purpose here and now. So that said, you'll not be made privy to it. Though should you be so inclined you've now the tools in your possession to discover these 'truths', or rather these implications, at your own behest. With these I'll be sure to court detraction, rejection, and denigration in due time. But that time isn't now. There's much work to do before I threaten your alliance and even friendship. There is still much to lose before we've to gain anything so real as what we truly long for. That is, much to lose before we may know some little truth.

## The Formation of a Reformation: Forcing Schism

The means to destroy any ideology lies in exposing their incongruous beliefs. To shatter their illusion of agreement as fostered through Allied Projection in order to make manifest schism. Though of course such schismatic opportunities allow for further nebulization and thus an even greater ideological congruity through that same shared behavior. Thus in order to avoid catalyzing antithesis amongst ideologues we've got to control this schism. In fact, we've got to control it such that we foster reformation and minimize what nebulization we can. Given that nebulization results in the relinquishing of personal standards in order to maintain their non-criterial collective identity, we must instill a want

and even need to hold to these standards – their very personage, in spite of the will of the collective. As I see it there are two effective strategies to court this desired effect: acceleration and affirmation. Both of which focus on natural psychological processes that threaten any ideology, but catalyzed beyond their ability to control.

Simply put dear reader, to sunder their ideological alliance we're going to help them get to know each other better.

### Acceleration: Cultivating Absurdity through Reason

The goal of this approach is to assist the ideologue in reaching the logical conclusion of their ideology far sooner than they're able to maintain. In this way it mirrors Intellectual Conflict Therapy, but whereas ICT manifests as an external vector for an ideologue to entertain her own doubts, Acceleration 'flips the script', having the external vector manifest doubt in the ideologue. Now naturally one could just as easily assume this is mere criticism, but not so. The failure of criticism is that it operates as an overt affront or otherwise disagreement with an ideologue. As such it allows for defense mechanisms designed to protect the 'I am right' axiom to manifest. Rather Acceleration takes on the insidious approach of feigning agreement whilst pursuing the logical conclusion of your supposed 'shared' beliefs. This covert method allows one to slip by their defenses by virtue of their desire to validate themselves through your fellowship overriding their skepticism; a skepticism that rarely operates within their ideological zeitgeist anyway.

Now the beauty of this method is that any ideology, when taken to its logical conclusion, is absurd. It becomes woefully irrational and unreasonable. This is why radicalization, otherwise known as consistency with an ideology, is typically a slow process. In order for an ideologue not to break with their ideological community let alone their ideology, they must be allowed to slowly imbibe the implications of their ideological belief at a pace that doesn't conflict too swiftly and thus too greatly with their own identity. They must slowly submit to the ideology, gradually relinquishing their standards and so identity with it. Like bringing a frog to a slow boil though even then the frog jumps out, demonstrating that the

self-destructiveness of ideology is so much a matter of choice rather than ignorance or even apathy. The best example of this is, I think, Scientology. It begins as a silly but more or less grounded ideology that eventually culminates in spiritual alien invaders, hydrogen bombs, and the dictator of a galactic confederacy Lord Xenu. Yet look at how it first presents itself:

“Scientology is a religion that offers a precise path leading to a complete and certain understanding of one’s true spiritual nature and one’s relationship to self, family, groups, Mankind, all life forms, the material universe, the spiritual universe and the Supreme Being.”

At its initial presentation it seems innocuous enough, mirroring just about every major religion’s purported goals. Though you’ll notice that it focuses solely on ‘what’ as opposed to ‘how’. It offers to potential converts *what* they could want without any reference to *how* it may be achieved. As such it skirts our incredulity if only because such conclusive statements cannot be dismissed offhand. Refutation requires the presence of ‘how’, the reason and evidence used to reach such a conclusion. Infamously Scientology traps this information behind a paywall, though less arbitrarily than you may think. Using what knowledge they have of human psychology at their disposal, they wait until a fellow ideologue is sufficiently indoctrinated and otherwise stupefied before revealing this information to them. With their faculties handicapped they’re unable to actively and effectively criticize the retarded notions they’re presented with which in turn has them imbibe them for the sake of preserving their undentity at the expense of both their reason and their actual identity. In this way, Scientology takes control of just about every aspect of their ideology in order to avoid any manifestation of schism.

As an aside, that’s how I know Scientology isn’t just a scam but that its upper echelon is comprised of individuals privy to this information who are effecting a campaign of brainwashing or otherwise psychological manipulation. In spite of the consensual nature of the church, it is nevertheless forcing people into a state of duress and mental deficiency after which they ‘convince’ them to relinquish their wealth to the church. For all intents and purposes this is unethical and demonstrably illegal.

Now when it comes to Scientologists, presenting them with the truth of their ideology, not actually a logical conclusion by design, does nothing to sway their allegiance. Focusing on ‘what’ as opposed to ‘how’ and fundamentally as a result of intention ‘why’, doesn’t assist an ideologue in their own subconscious and even unconscious skeptical battle. In order to focus on ‘how’ and ‘why’ one must have a reasonable understanding of the logic of the ideology as well as an intimate understanding of the motivations of the ideologue respectively. As such ingratiation is necessary in order to effect doubt and

so trigger schism. Thus you cannot act as an opponent or otherwise conflicting individual. Certainly you become an external source for their manifestation of doubt, but you cannot do so overtly. Rather you must approach them in the guise of fellowship or at least legitimate interest. To present oneself as a threat to their identity is a complete nonstarter.

So feigning allegiance you allow ICT to seemingly manifest within an ideology between ideologues rather than outside the ideology with skeptics. From this position you begin to accelerate the process through which an ideologue recognizes the logical conclusions of their ideology. Recall the period of lull within every ideology and ideologue. A gestation period of sorts between each step in their path toward radicalization. A time to evaluate and reconstitute themselves after having relinquished some of their personal identity for the sake of maintaining their ideological one. This lull occurs only at the speed at which an ideologue is comfortable. If accelerated it results in too great a threat to their identity and so triggers a schism in an effort to protect their self-righteousness from the logical conclusions of their ideology. Naturally the only way to accelerate this process is through presenting them with the logical conclusions of the ideology faster than they themselves can recognize and entertain. Hence the goal of the Acceleration method is to hasten this lull by masking ICT in the guise of innocuous conversation and shared fellowship.

I know many of you would consider this methodology rather cruel, both in its deceitfulness as well as the interpersonal conflict that is sure to result. I don't disagree, but then again I don't consider cruelty to be some absolute moral horror. It certainly can be, but cruelty as a concept is amoral. How it is visited on another, its physical manifestation, is what we only need consider. Causing strife between ideologues, distress through ostracism, and sadness through abandonment is certainly our responsibility but we're hardly to blame for it. Such is merely the nature of injecting truth into their ideological zeitgeist. Of accelerating Objectivity Creep, sowing doubt amongst their ranks. Frankly the only thing I consider cruel is leaving them to their ideological fate. Ours is a tough love of sorts.

Affirmation: Cultivating Distrust through Honesty

One of the first ideological phenomena discussed in this treatise, affirmation is and always will operate as an impetus to schism. As such successful ideologies have all managed to hinder its manifestation, often through ritual, and to mitigate the results of its inevitable pronouncement through ambiguous language. So armed in this knowledge as we are we're able to sabotage their efforts, releasing affirmation from its artificial constraint to freely sunder their assumed ideological confluence. Such an effort shares the insidious nature of acceleration, but rather than focusing on their ideological beliefs we focus on their personal ones. In essence, whilst Acceleration focuses on an ideologue's recognition of the true nature and so implications of their undentity, Affirmation focuses on an ideologue's recognition of the true nature and so implication of their personal identity. Furthermore whilst Acceleration allows for the ideologue to reject the ideology and her peers, Affirmation allows for her ideological peers to reject her, the ideologue. Truly it's a 'two sides of the same coin' sort of situation, setting them against each other in the same fashion albeit through opposite approaches.

With Acceleration doing the thinking for the ideologue, presenting them with the logical conclusions of their belief, Affirmation does the opposite. It instead poses questions to the ideologue in an effort to discern their standards and so encourage said ideologue to hold to them. As your rapport builds with an ideologue so too does their resolve, having developed a more intimate connection with you by definition, rather than nebulizing their identity for the sake of their collective undentity. When their inevitable public affirmation manifests, either through their own efforts or through its discovery by the rest of the collective, they turn to those who have best validated their personal identity and thus rely on them for continued social substantiation to weather their eventual rejection by the collective and their peers therein. Whether it be a single prominent ideologue or a great enough number of the collective, such affirmation but more importantly rejection comes as a revelation; often demonstrated through their shock in the face of it. The necessarily public nature of this event acts not only to rally others who may actually agree with the ostracized individual(s) in question, but to broadcast the possibility that fellow ideologues aren't as ideologically congruous as they appear. Thus the honest nature of affirmation ironically triggers distrust between ideologues, fearing that none truly believe as they do.

Given that ideologues operate in an inverted reality, it is of little wonder why our efforts to subvert them would in any normal circumstance strengthen their bonds of fellowship. It is for this reason that Acceleration and Affirmation are so amusingly ironic.

## Literal Soul Food: The Wonders of Ideological Cannibalism

In order to properly effect both Acceleration and Affirmation within an ideology, one must know the particular identity that has been nebulized into an undentity. It is then and only then that one can demonstrate the logical and so inevitable conclusion of its corresponding ideology. It's also through this identity that one can determine an individual ideologue's personal interpretation and in so doing encourage their affirmation of it. Now as discussed, every ideology has such terms and so in order to effectively target them one must recognize these terms, both in how they actually exist and how they are interpreted as existing. Now granted, Rightist ideologies are more rooted in reality; are standardized and thus not so easily breached in this manner. However, such breaches yield better results as through their standardization both schism and reformation are easily manifested and countenanced as entirely keeping with their subconscious adherence to, and acceptance of, criteria as necessary for their ideological identity. So it's a trade-off. It's harder to effect schism amongst their ranks but once it begins it's far less prone to nebulization or to return to the ideological fold. It's like a tough glass. Difficult to shatter but once it begins to crack it pulverizes itself. Should we be unsuccessful the crack remains albeit repaired. This repair forever serves to mar the consistency and so image of this glass, creating a noticeable distortion for any outside observer to see. A distortion in the form of an ideological or rather logical inconsistency within the ideology itself. Thus even in our failure this crack remains as both an exploitable weakness as well as a deterrent to any future converts.

It's ideological rival, that of antithesism, is more like an amorphous viscous goop and no, these physical parallels are not lost on me. That said, antithesism is easy to split, to effect schism within, but difficult to keep apart once this separation is made. Through nebulization it seeks to rejoin itself and fuse back into its amorphous, nebulous collective. Prone to nebulization as it is, should it rejoin itself after a schism our stirring only serves to lessen its viscosity. It removes particular 'impurities' otherwise known as standards that served to thicken this ideological goop. So unlike our failure to separate a Rightist ideology which lingers on as a weakness, our failure to separate a Leftist ideology only serves to strengthen it. For this reason such attempts against Leftist ideology, against antithesism must be engaged carefully.

Of course with the advent of the internet such attempts are being made every second of every day, purposefully or otherwise. As discussed, the internet served to catalyze the inevitable nebulization of Leftist ideologues, serving to produce a greater antithesism than has ever existed. It is for this reason that while I laude the efforts of others who criticize and unpopularize the superficial manifestations of antithesism as a means to 'hold the fort' as it were, I have to conclude that their efforts endanger that very cause. In essence, while their resistance served both to rally and protect those of our shared purpose, it also served to exacerbate the fervent zealotry of antithesists themselves. Antithesists who by virtue of sociopolitical and government policy hold far greater sway than us, making them all the more dangerous. Though as I've rightly pointed out, attacking the heads of this ideological hydra only serves to strengthen it. You must target the body in order to bring it down. So let's do just that:

Get a feminist to define what 'woman' is and they'll eat each other.

Get a Black Lives Matter proponent to explain *what* black lives matter to and thus *how* black is so constituted with reference to purpose, and they'll eat each other.

Simply take whatever identity, or rather category that they purport to champion and have them define it in any fashion that either affirms their own beliefs or seeks to bind the identity to any demonstrable criteria. That's it really. Though I alluded as much with my critique of feminism:

"As an aside I find this behavior really embarrassing. It is a cringe-worthy display to see such people so adamant in their support of an ideology yet admitting to a total ignorance of it and its content. It demonstrates such a gross fear of both reality and the threat of ostracism from fellow ideologues whom they honestly know nothing about. It is the greatest display of personal insecurity I know of."

Truly their greatest strength is their greatest weakness. The nebulousness of their undentity of choice is ironically the linchpin which binds them and governs all their actions. An intangible, indiscernible foundation that nevertheless rallies everyone to it, charming them with the promise of an ultimate and final validation of their identity. That it represents the great culmination of their efforts to substantiate their own identity and with that attribute meaning to their existence. The answer to the riddle of themselves, in other words. But as such it's the only thing we need to target. As immutable and powerful and impossible to challenge as the rest of the ideology is, it's only because it's a giant defense mechanism. An enormous ex post facto justification for the only true belief, the only real element that exists in their ideology. It's this linchpin that we need simply pull, like a single loose thread, to unravel

their entire ideology; no matter how meticulously crafted and complex the tapestry they've woven. Get them to define terms, to use real substantive language, and their undentity dies and at the hands of their own ego no less.

With their enlightenment so steeped in this humorous paradox, I can't help but label our efforts in this matter the weaponizing of irony itself. For nowhere can one be faced with such psychological inversion than that of the antithesist. With that all the regular outcomes of our efforts are similarly inverted, transforming every action taken into its unintended opposite. Thus in our challenge to antithesists though truly ideologues of any sort, the more seemingly antithetical to our purpose our efforts, the nevertheless more effective their result. So it is in the spirit of this iconoclastic effort that I label any and all engaged in such ironic behavior as ironyclasts. Truly ours is to kill them with kindness, to give them what it is they believe they want. To purpose ourselves to facilitate greater elucidation and understanding of their individual selves, their ideology, and their fellow ideologues just for it to come crashing down all around us. You're not liable to believe me until you engage this process but afterward be advised that it is really amusing. Funny even.

Now I imagine there are some, likely most of you who are unsatisfied with this answer. You'd prefer a course of action more meticulously planned or complicated or what have you. Well that's the rub. In dealing with such a basic psychological mechanism any method designed to affect it is similarly simple. With everything subsequent to this mechanism, to this axiom acting only as ex post facto justification and a defense mechanism at that, targeting that is a fool's errand and so a waste of time. However, don't believe for a moment that this solution, while seemingly simplistic, doesn't become complicated when engaged. The interpersonal communication required to elucidate an ideologue, be it through Acceleration though especially Affirmation, must be catered to them as individuals. Furthermore you will employ and so require all of the knowledge presented in this treatise. Of how to affirm their personal identity and what it is truly comprised of. Of how to link their identity to purpose without directly communicating this reality and, though not covered in this treatise, how to communicate through but also around their ambiguous ideological language. In essence, how to lead them to these conclusions without stating them yourself. It is truly the roll of a therapist, but such is the nature of ICT; even one so covertly engaged in as this. So far from simple, it's so complicated that it operates at the level of singular individuals, each requiring their own unique plan of attack and one that I obviously cannot outline. Though I hate to put it so bluntly, you're left to your own devices in this matter. I've provided you the tools, but it's your job to make something with them.

Acceleration and Affirmation, while effective in triggering schism, aren't effective at *maintaining* said schism nor severing the continued ideological tendencies of such individuals. Within them still lies their perpetual need for validation that must be provided, or at least self-actualized as a personal pursuit, in order to prevent any surrender to their ideological impulses. So if we are unable or unwilling to provide validation for these individuals, we leave them in an ideological limbo of sorts. Should we outright abandon them in this hour of substantive need they will either return to their prior ideological collective or seek another to fill the void. Basically they're left in search of answers and any answer, regardless its validity, is preferable to none. Ideological placebos as I put it. Thus we cannot abandon them should we wish to assist them, but also ourselves, in the defense against ideology itself.

As is the case in committing to any purpose, we're obligated to make it manifest in reality, not merely use it to frame our intentions as something noble or otherwise important regardless the outcome. So we are very much obligated to assist these individuals and with that ourselves and our purpose. To reject this obligation is to reject our commitment to this purpose and with that any claim that this matters to us – at all. Simply put, if you fail to actualize, if you fail to even pursue a desire, if you don't even try, it's not something you actually desire. In this way you communicate only a desire to have this desire or rather a desire to claim that you have this desire. That is all. You're a pretender not unlike the ideologues you so scorn. You become yet another moderate, submitting your beliefs to a hierarchy of preferential actualization, rather than anything of principle. Of that which you *wish* would manifest, rather than that which you *make* manifest yourself.

So left with no alternative we're forced to provide for ideologues, ironically, an alternative: methodeology.

Methodeology: 'Knows' by any Other Name

I've spoken of methodeology before though I question the wisdom in naming it as such, rather than simply 'methodology'. Yet methodology as a term doesn't reference the process of thought of an individual. While methodology certainly describes how one seeks to achieve a given outcome and is thus

purposeful, it doesn't explain one's relationship to this methodology and its outcome. In other words, it doesn't explain the individual's intention i.e. why they engage in a particular methodology.

Methodology however, does. Basically, methodology is a means of discerning truth which submits itself to outcomes in reality. That belief is based on and so changes according to reality, rather than belief operating independently and in denial of reality. Though really, methodology was merely a term used to contrast it with ideology. To supplant the notion of *ideas* governing belief with that of *method*. To replace self-righteous fantasy with factual reality. In essence, methodology is just rational empiricism, at least by my estimation.

It is at this point that I cannot and will not expound on some particular philosophical worldview to replace an ideological one. To do so would be more a matter of personal preference rather than fact. Neither do I believe I'm privy to the ultimate mode of human learning, understanding, and interaction. All that I can do is to advocate against ideology and with that direct you towards other avenues of knowledge and understanding. Rational empiricism certainly has my recommendation, but that is all the praise I'll lend it. Exploration of this matter is, I think, one of personal understanding and introspection rather than something absolutely and ultimately true. This is something methodology's relationship to ideology shares in common with Rightist ideology's relationship to Leftist ideology. Whereas Leftism is a singular *destructive* belief and behavior trending toward nothing, Rightism is myriad *constructive* beliefs and behaviors trending towards many different ends, some eventually destructive. The relationship between methodology and ideology is the same. Methodology has myriad *constructive* methods to determine beliefs and behaviors whilst ideology has a singular belief of self-righteousness that all subsequent beliefs and behaviors attempt to justify in vain.

That said, it is our duty not only to direct toward but to motivate ideologues to pursue these avenues; to explore themselves, their relationship to knowledge and reality itself. We cannot offer them nothing though neither can we offer them the absolutism of their prior ideological belief. We offer them only a pursuit, a purpose that ends only with their own contentedness in their efforts, rather than any actual end itself. Simply put, we don't offer them an answer but the means to achieve a real one. One that isn't some self-righteous justification of their axiomatic identity. One that hell, may not even exist but most certainly isn't one on offer from an ideology. It's perhaps sad to say, but we can only offer them the truth of their falsehood. We cannot offer them anything so satisfactory as the answer to who they are and so some ultimate purpose for their existence. We can only offer them the means to sufficiently explore this eternal question in the hope that their efforts alone will satisfy their inevitable failure. That

they may yet come to be content in their ignorance, rather than frightened and abhorred by it. That they would become courageous in the face of this unyielding and unknowable answer. It's really all that we can do.

### The Enemy Within: Cultivating Paranoia through Fellowship

There does exist another means of subverting antithesis that while as initially covert as Acceleration and Affirmation becomes necessarily and purposefully overt. This method is Atomization. Atomization can occur as the result of some overall plan of attack but can and inevitably will result to some degree should either Acceleration or Affirmation become botched. In essence, Atomization is the gradual infiltration of an ideology or a particular ideological community to a significant enough degree, truthfully or otherwise perceived as significant, such that when this infiltration is revealed it sows distrust and discord amongst ideologues. With them unable to know whom to trust, their fellowship suffers and the ideological community begins to splinter and, hopefully, atomize. From there whatever sects or small pockets of communal trust they are able to establish act very much like different Rightist sects. But rather than espousing different standards than the others as Rightists would, keeping such sects from converging and fusing, they simply refuse to trust the other groups. Thus they remain separate and become distinct entities. This has the added benefit of increasing the probability of standardization either through Objectivity Creep or any continued effort at Affirmation, given the smaller population. Such is a trait sociological evolution shares with that of biological evolution. That is, the greater opportunity for mutation to occur within smaller populations.

Such a divisive attack isn't entirely unfamiliar to antithesists as it was well exemplified in the earlier years of feminism. Unknown to most the first attempt at feminism utterly failed given both the absurdity of its premises and the obvious hate and hatred that fueled it. With that the decision was made to hide much of their core beliefs, not unlike Scientology, in order to better ingratiate themselves to the public. What feminists did was to champion their purposes and especially themselves in the name of Women's Liberation and other ambiguous and interpretable causes such that they could grow in

popularity and population through Allied Projection. Then when they had sufficient social and political power they began to reveal their true nature and with that their true purpose. The consistent, 'radical' purpose that they had always been operating toward. Essentially they sought to resurrect their intention now that their vision was mass-produced. Rising dictators though fascists of any sort are also prone to the same behavior because, of course, they are the same sort of people.

So it's by this same method that Atomization operates, distinguished only by the infiltrative and so offensive nature of Atomization as opposed to the feminist method which built a mass of useful idiots around it, rather than infiltrating them. Though as the ideology begins to return to its roots, to become consistent with the original designs of so-called radicals, the more elucidated 'moderates' can and will claim that their ideology has been infiltrated and is being corrupted by the very same radicals who founded it in the first place. This is the power of moderation to destroy an ideology. Feminists' choice to rally moderates to it has or rather will result in its destruction through the reassembly of feminist ideology according to popular redefinition by moderates; themselves currently opposed to the purpose it was truly designed for. This doesn't mean such moderates will not return or rather rediscover feminism's true nature, but for now their existence is beginning to unravel it entirely. Another reason why consistency is so vitally important lest you be torn asunder through mere association with moderates; by a collectivism wrought by your foolish use of Allied Projection to ingratiate yourself to the public.

The issue, or rather the consequence of this method is that it is an entirely destructive exercise. Rather than to demonstrate the irrationality of their ideology or its intrusive and corrupting nature regarding an ideologue's personal identity, it simply destroys the bonds of fellowship within an ideological community. So instead of using reason as a weapon, introducing it as a necessary and key element to recognizing one's identity, Atomization uses irrationality as a weapon, directing the hostile nature of their tribalism inwardly to destroy what it had once assembled. So where the former two methods result in a more rational individual or at least a more rational understanding of their prior ideological beliefs, Atomization essentially abandons them. It nullifies their effort to validate themselves and so returns them to their prior state; to another void of sorts where this ultimate question of self remains with no understanding of how to pursue it. It returns them to a state of quiet desperation without any intention to repurpose them or at least provide them the tools to find purpose.

Such that this is an unnecessary and inefficient course of action, I very much do find this practice invariably cruel. Whilst some may consider it a fitting punishment, it inevitably leads to their

reconstitution within some new ideological collective; bolstered and soon invigorated with a profound hatred for those who had abandoned them prior. So too a hatred for what their abandoners stood for. As such whatever vindictiveness or simple misgivings we have regarding their rehabilitation act only to our detriment. Call it the last defense of the ideologue; this spite which fuels or inaction only serves to allow their ideological reincarnation. As such it's not only wise but necessary to rehabilitate the ideologue rather than to leave them to their own devices. Frankly such wisdom ought to extend into all matters of vindication and subsequent punishment should rehabilitation be the primary concern. A sentiment that isn't as widely shared as, dare I say, it ought to be.

Though I can and perhaps eventually will make the case that our assistance is entirely necessary, not only for the sake of this purpose but one that binds us all, I say for now that I will not abandon them. That in spite of all I know of them, their irrationality, treachery, dangerousness and yes, their penchant for violence and even death, I'll not leave them to this fate. Not because this affects us all, that we are all bound by this one ill-fated doom. But because *no one* should suffer it alone. Not again. *Never again.*

#### Another Lutheran Revolution: Our Cause

With all this talk of reformation I would be remiss not to revisit perhaps the greatest, most famous reformation of all time: the Protestant Reformation. Recall what I said regarding this historic event:

'So when it comes to affirmation how do large organizations build upon this 'I am right' axiom without succumbing to such a schism? Well truth is they don't. None of them do. Just look at what happened to Christendom: shattered into a thousand sects and why? The affirmations every Christian participated in, every action, every word, every song, everything they did to show their belief, everything that had so much meaning poured into it by every Christian, everything they knew in their heart affirmed their love of God, was in a language they didn't understand. None but the priests understood it. Martin Luther, God bless him, translated the bible into the vernacular and not soon after Christendom shattered and still shatters to this very day.'

The key to Luther's success wasn't in allowing Christians to finally read and so understand biblical text. It was certainly an integral part in effecting such schism but it wasn't its impetus. Instead and as we should know by now, this schism had always existed. Not necessarily at a social level but most certainly at an ideological or intellectual one. But one that wasn't able to consciously manifest.

This reformation is presented as manifesting in response to Christians finally reading the bible for themselves and so finally understanding the true nature of their ideological belief. I don't doubt that this may have fomented schism amongst some Christian ideologues at the time, but it's hardly the case with regard to the majority. See, by labeling the revelations offered by their biblical text as revealing the true nature of their ideology, we're entirely ignoring the self-righteous nature of ideological belief. Christians didn't read their bibles thinking, "Is this what I've *been believing* all this time?" Instead they responded with, "This isn't *what I believe*." The origin of the bible be damned, the supposed holiness of scripture be damned. This wasn't what each Christian believed. They had their own ideas and so eventually their own interpretations of scripture according to those ideas. Translating the bible into the vernacular only served to demonstrate that Christians didn't believe the same things. That they had simply been projecting their own interpretation onto everyone else through the ultimate vector for Allied Projection, an indecipherable language. It wasn't that knowledge was kept from them. That the true nature of their belief was hidden away by the priesthood. What was truly hidden away was the truth of their incongruity and even incompatibility with their fellow Christians. The 'true nature' of their belief was whatever they believed, all external factors be damned. Sure it's subject to change given certain circumstances, but ultimately their ideological belief is self-righteousness and so self-originated, always.

So what Luther did was to allow for this schism to be recognized by removing the language barrier that nullified their affirmations of belief. That had masked their true beliefs in entirely ambiguous language and also terms referencing this language as presented through scripture. Just consider the fact that the majority of Christians *remained Christians*. They kept the title regardless their distinction to their fellow Christian brethren because to them, they always were and always would be Christians – even 'true' Christians. It wasn't the bible as it *had* been presented nor the priesthood that *had* determined their Christian status. It was and always *had been themselves*. It was a matter of their own determination, a matter of their own proclamation, a matter of their own self-righteousness. Luther's translation showed Christians what they all believed, but that it wasn't the same thing. That's the beautiful irony of it all and what has happened since? Thousands of different Christian sects have come to exist, all claiming for

themselves the title of 'true Christian' insofar as their ideological humility will allow yet their actions through choice of affiliation absolutely demonstrate.

That's what's so fundamentally amusing about ideologues. The more they know of each other, the less bound they are through fellowship. Ideology isn't about groupthink. It's about self-righteousness. It's about believing you're right and believing that all others believe you're right too. That's the only belief they really share and one that, again ironically, cannot truly be shared. Thus what binds ideologues together is a mutual self-deception; masking the true nature of the beliefs of their fellow ideologues. Though once again, such self-deception is the nature of projection and the requirement for maintaining an undentity in the face of reality itself. It is as ever, denial. This is why a single truth undenied, no matter its form, is anathema to ideological belief – in time. Always in time.

Of course with the advent, or rather metastasis of antithesism such schism has resulted in greater ideological congruity rather than reformation. Would Luther's efforts been poised against some Leftist ideology he would have likely failed, nebulizing Christendom entirely rather than shattering it. Though frankly the sect of Christianity known as Liberation Theology is so much an effort to nebulize Christianity or even religiosity as a whole. Those familiar with incursions into their communities by SJWs, targeted gamers and atheists alike, would be shocked at how well this sect parallels their own SJW invaders. For this reason these groups may come to exercise some sympathy and help Liberation Theologists. Even just to block another avenue of infection for this metastasizing ideological cancer for the sake of self-preservation.

So that said, the reason Luther's efforts can be considered a success is strictly due to the Rightist ideologues he targeted for reformation. Would they have been Leftists his efforts would surely have sped the nebulization and an eventual elimination of the Church in its entirety. All other contributing factors aside, we're rather lucky Luther sought to reform a Rightist ideology as it allowed for the various Churches to become vectors for, and the vanguard of, much of our knowledge; insofar as it pertained to or rather could be twisted in order to contribute to their ideological beliefs. Leftist ideologues would have entirely nullified this information.

So as you may have guessed, I share this purpose in common with Luther. I too seek the reformation of an ideological belief. Though along with reformation I also seek elimination and for all ideologies, not

just one. Yet if I have to focus my efforts, which I do, I most certainly have and will target the Left. Such is the nature of triage and with that, dare I say, the more difficult my task than that of Luther. Though it's perhaps self-aggrandizing, heretical and even blasphemous to say, I believe I'm continuing Luther's effort. That is, I'm continuing his reformation, at least the spirit of it. I want to reveal what I believe is false, not just through argumentation but also translation. I aim to take the nebulous ideological language that has saturated our discourse and translate it for everyone to read plainly and simply. I want to reveal that all the ideological affirmations they participate in, every action, every word, every song, everything they do to show their belief, everything that has so much meaning poured into it by them, that everything they know is being communicated in a language that they fundamentally don't understand. Not only don't understand but individually interpret. In so doing it will break the ideological hold of the 'priests' over these people. 'Priests' aware of this phenomenon and who bend those under its influence to their will, to their own design.

See, it's the same thing all over again and not because of some grand design or some sort of cyclical historic nature, no. It's because humanity has never stopped fighting this mind virus. It's because it has remained largely unmolested and so free to infect us, eventually culminating in necessary reformations or purges or what have you for the sake of preserving the species. Or rather for the sake of preserving that which allows us to observe and explore the universe; to operate unhindered by social sanction and violence. To pursue our own quest for truth because it is only through the phenomenon of individuality that we observe differently, think differently and so produce something different, something new. Some new observation, thought, or theory to add to our pool of human knowledge that may yet prove true – even prove truth, in time. We fight for the sake of preserving something that without which we are doomed to stagnation, falsehood and death. We fight for the exact opposite of self-righteousness and what self-righteousness not only destroys but attempts to replace in vain.

Dear reader, we fight for simple, everyday human curiosity.

Our greatest strength isn't our ability to adapt or to observe or *just* to think. Nor it is the stupid mantra 'Diversity is our strength' which is so much an attempt to dissolve our standards by equating apathy with tolerance. No, 'curiosity is our strength'. A mantra that will ring true if only because it is. It is what motivates us through desire, guides us through facts, and teaches us through knowledge. And where does it all come from? This desire to know, to have answers for that which we are ignorant of? To know

the truth? Why, from the necessary reconciliation of 'what' with 'how', of 'I' with 'as'. The quest to constitute the self, given the impossibility of believing otherwise. That we must believe in ourselves, thus we seek the truth of ourselves in order to reconcile this single irrationality. Dear reader, curiosity is as much a product of the 'I am right' axiom as self-righteousness. But it's the result not of accepting it but doubting it. Of admitting that while you cannot doubt your own existence, you can certainly doubt its nature regardless what you currently believe of it. That in everything single thing in which you admit ignorance you fundamentally admit an ignorance of the self; knowing that in any exploration of your ignorance lies not only the possibility but the inevitability of reconstituting your self. That each new 'truth' will come to shape you in some fashion. That you will change because of it. That this self, all that you were and are and all that you knew, can change forever in an instant. As such, curiosity is inextricably linked to self-doubt. It isn't doubt in and of itself but exists in opposition to self-righteousness by its very nature. Thus to be curious is to doubt the self. To doubt its nature and so your nature. To doubt its truth and so your truth. To doubt its legitimacy and so your legitimacy.

Curiosity is the lifeblood of our very humanity and I, for one, will ever defend it.

### The Great Elucidation: A Return to Meaning

We must understand that antithesism and its behavior of nebulization isn't just some ideological phenomenon. Truly it is a matter of language, of words and meaning which comes to shape or rather to corrupt our beliefs. This matter of Rightism and Leftism and of ideology and methodeology comes as a result of our understanding of language, not the beliefs subsequent to that understanding. It is through this vector, either in its remedy or its corruption, that we develop methodeology and ideology respectively. So it is my plea that we seek to reconstitute our language. That we become masters of our language rather than slaves to it. That we seek to understand the nature of meaning rather than to supplant it with self-righteous falsehood. That *our* language will once again become an objective device. That it will operate according to reason and to communicate reason. That each word will represent an explanation all its own but also form an integral part of a consistent logical framework. That we will craft for ourselves a logically and realistically consistent model of communication where meaning is paramount. Where we will no longer seek to supplant explanation with replacement; a word only

-serving to equate another in a near-endless cycle, culminating in a singularity of meaning. Where all words become all other words. Where everything becomes synonymous. Where meaning is lost because distinction is lost, mirroring the replacement of the self with an undentity, a 'pseudo-I'. Where Susan merely becomes Christian. Where Simon merely becomes socialist. Where Michael merely becomes Muslim and Richard merely becomes progressive and they all merely become social justice warriors. Where their distinctions and so identities are all lost to synonymy. Lost to this equation simply known as equality.

Dear reader, should we want for communication, should we want for language, should we want for meaning, should we want at all we cannot allow this. But it's not about allowance is it? Neither is it strictly about defense and protection. No, it's about our obligation to what it is we want. To move toward, to act to fulfill, to manifest legacy. To want for more: the faster, the larger, the better, the greater, the best. To preserve the very notion of greatness, of the 'greater'. That one thing can be greater than another. That there is a standard of determination in all things, both in our own design and in reality itself. To sacrifice this concept is to sacrifice progress. To sacrifice any striving, any yearning, any desire not just for more but for anything at all. Anything that we do not possess be it knowledge, warmth, food, companionship, love, happiness, everything. I say this now, we can't give this up if only because *we can't give this up*. We can't. We can't forsake our nature, our indelible curiosity. The attempt is not only folly, not only impossible, but would result in something entirely unnatural. Something that isn't human. The unthoughtful mind. The incurious man. The inactive actor.

We don't get the luxury of absolute self-fulfillment. We don't get the satisfaction of knowing ourselves in our entirety. Instead we're left to *learn* of it. To *hope* for it. To *pursue* it. To cooperate to better achieve it. To fail and through it bring wisdom to those still in pursuit. We strive because we want to, yet we want because we must want. It is the single *cause* that binds us all. We may want for other things but it is the substantiation of the self, this single question that we so long for, that of 'who am I?' which originates all of our desires. So we cannot hinder its pursuit. We cannot block it with self-righteous falsehoods nor reverse course through nebulization. Antithesis is not for us to gain, to attain, nor even our ability to maintain. We cannot give up, to surrender to an absolute truth of nothing. To the ultimate untruth. Instead we seek a goal that may yet be as impossible, but one that we can nevertheless hope for and hope for all time if need be. The cause of 'the greater', fueled by our eternal curiosity, our greatest strength.

For this is our purpose.

“I cannot and will not recant anything, for to go against conscience is neither right nor safe. Here I stand, I can do no other, so help me God. Amen.” – Martin Luther



## Epilogue:

I hope you've understood now why it has taken so long for me to explain this. Given the implications of the material as well as its challenge to our way of thinking, not our choice of thought but the very means through which we process information, literally the *way* we think, you can appreciate the precision necessary not only for its understanding but its acceptance. I can certainly explain my entire position in less than five minutes, but given the corruption of our own language and the ambiguity therein it would have fallen not only on deaf ears but on clasped ones. On ears blocked by ideological palms. As such in order to skirt such defenses I had to proceed slowly though certainly not cautiously. Nevertheless I'm similarly certain that my work will be ignored, derided, and thrown aside should it ever make its way to print. The day I can please everyone is the day I determine a single thing we can all agree on and I'm not holding my breath for that.

This treatise is just a means to avoid the perceived non sequitur in stating my case in its condensed form. I need only make mention of the 'I am right' axiom and the true nature of identity for my case to be true, albeit seemingly incomplete. The ramifications of these little truths are simply too far beyond most to recognize, viewing them as fantastical extrapolations rather than necessary implications. Hence I penned this treatise in order to explain the nature of these little truths in their entirety; to do your thinking for you as I don't think you're as capable nor as motivated as I to do so. I don't say this to denigrate you. It's merely the nature of individuality but also the time-consuming, zero-sum nature of developing expertise. This is what I've purposed myself to do and you, I assume, have chosen some other. Our value is, as I've argued, only ever with reference to purpose. There is no hierarchy to be found in literal cross-purposes, save for our respective preferential actualization. In other words, our desires. That said, another reason I penned this treatise is so that you wouldn't have to trust me – at all. That you won't need to want for my claims to be true in order to accept them. Hopefully I've made my case clearly and cogently, allowing your own faculties to determine its validity rather than to rely on my own dictation. If you take dictation, if you replace skepticism with trust I can and will appreciate that insofar as you're useful to me. But recognize that it does make you a useful idiot. There is no shame in this save for whatever hypocrisy you court by stating otherwise. Trust is a very efficient tool, but hardly something to honor in the realm of objectivity. That said, it's a role I've taken on myself and continue to exemplify in some respects. I just admit it and feel no shame otherwise. We're never experts in all things nor have the time to become such. Ergo becoming a useful idiot is the best we can do; steering people

to those whom we trust rather than to present the legitimacy of our position ourselves. In most of everything we may do we are laymen, we are plebs. The shame is pretending otherwise or believing otherwise and so failing to demonstrate otherwise. So if you can, take this treatise for what it is rather than what you want it to be. If you can't well, wear your fanboy badge with pride and respect the limits of your own understanding. Just be true to yourself.

### The Quest for Truth: Always the Open Window

Throughout the course of writing this I've had ample opportunity to source current events especially regarding ideological behaviors. I've not seized upon them for two reasons. The first is that there is so much ideological overlap by virtue of the ongoing process of nebulization and reformation that to choose anyone as an example, literally an exemplar for their ideology, would come across as disingenuous. Not to mention arguments from perceived intention, that of subjective identity crafting, would abound rendering my efforts mostly moot. Of course as I've argued it's impossible to satisfactorily represent antithesism, and so any superficial ideologies based in it, by design. Neither is it particularly helpful to establish similarities across all ideologies a la Horseshoe Theory as the so-called 'centrists', otherwise known as moderates, detonate the entire exercise by nebulizing ideologies through their dissolution of the logical consistency within them. So whatever is consistent becomes 'radical', thereby eliminating the consistency necessary to establishing congruity in the first place.

The second reason I don't source them is that my reasoning should stand on its own. While this treatise does exist in response to ideology and its expression through ideologues, I've not crafted it in an effort to explain the behaviors they engage in. I've attempted to understand and explain their rationale which in turn has provided explanation for their behaviors after the fact. While it was their behaviors that initially got my attention it was ultimately my exploration of their thought processes which provided explanation for their behaviors, not the other way around. So examples demonstrating *what* they do as opposed to *why* they do it aren't all that helpful, regardless that I've established their thought processes beforehand. Neither am I keen on presenting dozens of instances of Collectivized Allied Projection or the Zealotry Toolkit or even Doubling Down. I could just as easily be misrepresenting the true nature of such events as well as strain credulity, given peoples' interpretation of the events in question. Instead I want all focus to be on my reasoning and my arguments therein. From there, real world examples can be

recognized by you individually by virtue of this perspective. I'll not base my treatise in inclination, suspicion, and ultimately in probability. Such is more in line with preaching to the converted and courting the ire of the ideologue; which is something I aim to do, just not through this vector.

I've questioned the wisdom in including the following as part of the treatise and for that reason alone I've quarantined it here in the epilogue. It's not that it's unrelated, in fact it very much is, but I believe it's more tangential than what it is I aim to prove through this treatise. Yet because I proved or at least have well-argued this tangential point I would be remiss not to include it. It's more philosophical than anything prior and even questions the legitimacy of meaning, at least insofar as the concept of objective individuality is concerned. It's also quite disturbing: emotionally, intellectually, and existentially. It's something I really shouldn't burden anyone with as it opens up an entirely new avenue of exploration, one deeper than what I've engaged prior. Essentially it detracts from the greater purpose of this treatise. So it's in that spirit that I ask you to create a distinction between this treatise and the following, if only so that your focus remains with its message and not its continuation. Truly this continuation could persist forever for the same reason that every truth implies another through the possibly endless method of individuation through which we are all bound.

Knowing this, if ours is a purpose to reform our brethren, friend and foe alike, then we can't march on in pursuit of truth, leaving them behind. To bring them with us they've got to be made to match our speed. To bring them up to speed, as it were. Surely you've noticed how indecipherable many philosophers and intellectuals have become, both by virtue of their expertise but also by virtue of their, in a sense, ascendancy well beyond the norm. How we praised communicators like Sagan or Kaku or whomever, given not only their ability as orators but also their rarity and necessity for us. Without these men these otherwise indecipherable savants mostly become useless in the present, their works only to be discovered in a future both willing and able to understand them. A future they could have effected themselves were they keen to purpose themselves for it. For this reason it is often of great benefit to speak through a popular medium or even a flesh and blood mediator. Something that I aim to use to great effect in my own purpose. Something I've actually already employed, should you have noticed.

So consider the following not as an addendum or some final revelation but a look to the future. A glimpse of what is to come not only by my own hand but certainly and eventually through your own recognition and understanding. Maybe not you specifically, but a future reader whose peoples' zeitgeist is ready and able to explore this frontier. A people who have been brought up to speed, I hope in some measure by myself.

## Vanishing Mediator: The Unnamed is the Unknown

As I've demonstrated there exists an obvious paradox within ideology. That is, how does one represent or at least claim to represent a collective when it is necessarily, definitively, and at its very core entirely individualistic? That regardless its superficial manifestations it is as ever a personal, self-righteous phenomenon? It is undoubtedly strange. Though how are methodeologues to know they aren't so similarly constituted? How do they know they're aren't just as self-righteous as ideologues? Well of course we know how to determine this. We've reality to parse fact from fiction, truth from prediction, and so methodeologues from ideologues. Time remains the ultimate arbiter of our beliefs and rightly so. So this brings about an interesting question. That is, when a methodeologue purposes himself to become a plumber, he plumbs. He takes on an action designed to achieve a particular outcome which he intends. So when he engages in this behavior, can we say he is copying a plumber? Certainly plumbers have existed prior to him and during his lifetime, so is he copying such individuals or merely producing the outcome necessary to earn the title of plumber? Well it's the actions and outcome that he's copying of course. He's producing that which he understands as plumbing as demonstrated to him by plumbers themselves. He's not copying the individual as there's simply too many facets of his overall identity apart from plumbing. You can't copy the individual nor his exact personal method. Instead he's copying their behaviors thus earning his title of plumber insofar as he produces the necessary outcome of plumbing; that he manifests its purpose.

But what of ideologues? Remember that undentity isn't bound by such behavioral criteria, especially the undentity of antithesists. Now for the sake of argument we'll reference only the most extreme of ideologues, the antithesist, in order to avoid the complications, though not contradictions, that Rightist ideology presents. So regarding the Leftist ideologue, what is he copying? He comes into a world aware of many superficial manifestations of antithesism yet trends toward a pure antithesism via nebulization. He thinks he is a feminist or progressive or social justice warrior or what have you, yet he slowly but surely morphs more into what he truly is, an antithesist. So what action is he copying? Well the answer is none. He's not copying an action nor purposing himself toward any outcome. His effort to become a

feminist for example isn't at all demonstrable in the same fashion his effort to become a plumber would be. Now granted some behaviors and their governing standards are emulated of course, but they're not integral to his identity as a feminist – at least not forever. They're discarded as the pseudo-positions that they are.

Basically when it comes to antithesism there is nothing to copy. I've made the point that antithesism is essentially nothing, which it is, and thus to copy it would have one become nothing. So they lose their identity by relinquishing their standards, becoming part of a hive mind through losing their individuality. We've already covered this. But we're discussing 'nothing' as some sort of abstract concept here. There truly is no 'nothing' as defined. It's always something – always something in the universe even if the only thing we can say is that it's a part of the universe. So if they're not copying nothing, what are they copying? Well the answer is elementary: they aren't copying anything. They aren't copying at all. They're not engaged in any such behavior. Now you would think this is absurd given the antithesist is more alike his fellows than any two methodologues. Indeed, but that isn't because antithesists copy each other. It's because they limit their number of distinctions with each other by virtue of elimination, not emulation. Antithesists purge their individuality rather than cultivate it. So say for the arbitrary number of ten million differences any individual can have from another, antithesists only have one million. Thus their ability to differentiate themselves from each other is only 10% of our ability to.

Consider two people standing beside each other, neither of them moving and never moving for all eternity. Apart from their physical distinctions, what's left to distinguish them? Nothing. Without the category of action or rather cause and effect, they've eliminated an enormous number of possible distinctions. So through their inaction, through their apathy they've massively decreased our ability to distinguish them. Antithesists are so much the same but rather than merely an apathy of action, it's an apathy of standard, of belief. Their refusal to standardize is an intellectual apathy of sorts that yes, translates into a physical apathy as well. Like the two people in the example, every second, every instance in time provides them the opportunity to do something, yet they refuse. Antithesists are the same but with regard to belief. Every criterion provides them the opportunity to recognize distinction and so determine a new standard, a new belief, yet they refuse. Instead they claim irrelevance, the intellectual version of apathy. Now sure, you could claim that such behavior is merely copying it in others, but this isn't true. Namely it's not consciously recognized as such but more importantly it's not copying since the impetus to this behavior is only themselves. It's self-originated. They aren't copying another but acting of their own accord. That it mirrors the behavior of another is coincidental or by

design, considering the possible psychological nature of humans. But regardless such a nature, it's not at all intentional nor externally influenced and thus isn't an act of emulation – at all. It isn't copying. Those who do engage in copying are, ironically, those with the greatest distinction from each other: methodeologues.

Methodeologues engage in the process of copying by virtue of their emulation of behaviors and their reliance on time for arbitration and the designation of their identities thereof. Yet that they copy so many different behaviors in order to achieve various purposes has them create or rather maintain their vast array of near-infinite distinctions from each other. Sure, in their capacity as a plumber they emulate other plumbers and in their capacity as a leader they emulate other leaders, but their overall identity is vastly incongruous to any other. This is yet another reason that choice develops individuality through distinction. Such individuals are like plants planted in the same soil. They are all equally rooted in this soil and so bound to it to for nutrition; dependent on it for their very existence, for their literal determination. Similarly they all rely on photosynthesis to grow and to mature. The end result, be it a tomato plant or corn stalk or tulip, are vastly distinct from each other yet produced by the very same method. Thus despite their distinctions, they are commonly bound through method. Antithesists on the other hand are like daisies floating in the vacuum of space.

Now taking the Rightist ideologue for example, he seeks to emulate the behaviors of his fellows who themselves have taken many more behaviors in common than a methodeologue. As such while they very much base their identity in criteria ex post facto, that they share so much in common by virtue of maintaining their ideological identity has them appear less distinct from each other than methodeologues do. Albeit more so than antithesists. This serves to demonstrate once more how ideology results in a loss of individuality. Though again, Rightism only presents a complication so let's return to our Leftist critique.

In essence, the true collective is formed by methodeologues. They are the ones joined through mutual purpose and action and even intention, given their knowledge of cause and effect and the outcomes they predict will occur. So as crazy as it may sound, it's the antithesists who are the true individualists for they share no belief nor purpose in common. Theirs' is entirely a pursuit of personal validation for their respective undentities. Whatever congruity that manifests between them and their fellow antithesists is unintentional. They aren't copying anything yet manifesting common behaviors nonetheless. They are copies without an original. Not an original that is now absent, some ancient paragon or vanishing mediator, but an original that never was. Again, one may have the belief 'I am

right' and another may believe that they themselves are right, but they cannot both share this belief. They can believe it insofar as their own selves are concerned, but cannot both believe it at the same time with regard to each other.

Fundamentally, antithesists are individual actors acting in unison without knowledge of their true union and true 'purpose' despite their claims to the contrary. Claims that are corrupted by Allied Projection through ambiguous language, thereby masking the true nature of their goals and thus the truth of their false allegiance to each other. They aren't copying anything. There is no original 'ist' as they interpret it. There is no original feminist or progressive or social justice warrior. There is 'no true Scotsman' as they present it. They merely congeal together, eliminating disparity by relinquishing their standards thus ever-trending toward the nothingness that is pure antithesism. They are more similar to each other by virtue of being less individualistic – hell less the individual itself, rather than emulating a particular individuality, a particular paragon or standard. It's an entirely coincidental commonality without reference to nor need for purpose, emulation, nor even the recognition of the existence of anyone or truly anything in order to manifest. It is entirely of the mind. No external factors are necessary to it nor influence it, as I've argued. Thus it's a completely self-contained phenomenon that, perhaps, speaks to our most basic psychological nature and so some absolute truth of the human condition.

In the presence of standards it engenders the behavior of nebulization and as a pseudo-position I've dubbed it antithesism, the ever antithesis to every standard, to everything. But I've given no name to this phenomenon alone. No term to encapsulate its individualistic nature and operation. Neither will I. Instead I ask it of you dear reader. I ask you to take your first step in thinking for yourself in this matter absent my guidance.

To produce something new we combine two or more criteria in order to generate a new distinction. But to finalize this conception we must give it a name. Such is the necessity of creation and I've already created much. I've presented you with many new words and terms and different definitions for already existing words. But now it's your turn.

So tell me dear reader, if you had to give a name to this phenomenon, what would you label it?