

## **I. Attribution**

### **A. General character of attributions**

#### **1. Importance**

- a. Importance of analyzing causal attributions.
- b. Cause and effect and attribution need to be big points.

#### **2. Ambiguity**

- a. The difficulty of determining cause makes cause-and-effect a good place to insert falsehoods.
- b. This is because cause and effect are so loose and hard to determine.
- c. Issue of cause and effect as ambiguous and so the place where confirmatory thought sneaks in.
- d. Advantage taken of ambiguity of meaning, interpretation, and causation to insert one's own agenda.
- e. Exploit difficulty of determining cause and effect, so making statements based on nothing, but requiring evidence for refutation.
- f. One of the primary points of SJW attack is attribution of cause because it is so indeterminate and hard to prove false, though they make not effort to provide proof it is true.
- g. Examine the malleability of causal attributions, how easy it is to switch them or to completely make one up. Then there is the question of what evidence is needed to prove a causal attribution, and what evidence is needed to call a causal attribution into question.

#### **3. Claims and evidence**

- a. Analyze the making of excuses as a question of cause. One can claim cause without evidence, but challenging the cause requires evidence, shift of burden of proof.
- b. CMs make a causal statement without evidence, and then when you say it's not true, they require that you prove it. But causal statements are hard to prove, so it's hard to prove that a cause isn't true. However, this is also true of the initial claim of a cause. And it is the person making a claim who has the burden of proof. So back up to getting the CM to prove their causal statement, rather than disputing it.

#### **4. Typical attributions**

- a. My mistakes are not because of personal failings but because of the situation; your opinions are because of your personal failings, not because of reality. Cause and effect. What causes my failures? Personal failings or circumstances? What causes your opinions? Reality or your personal failings?
- b. CMs attribute their behavior to external causes, while normal attributions of behavior are to internal causes; on the other hand, they attribute their opponents' beliefs and opinions to internal causes, while the normal attributions of beliefs and opinion are to external causes. So they just flip the norm and come up with their insane view.

#### **5. External resources**

- a. Recommend looking into social attribution literature, attribution theory, specifically the one with the three factors.

### **B. Self attribution of behavior to circumstances**

#### **1. General principle**

- a. Shift blame onto situation instead of person.
  - b. Misattributions of behavior.
  - c. Something about how causes are identified in a very convenient way (e.g., your behavior is not caused by you, but by your environment).
  - d. Flip cause and effect.
  - e. Tactic: General form of “I’m late because of traffic, rather than because I left late.”
- 2. Leads to learned helplessness**
- a. Push the philosophy of external locus of control (structuralism); teach it to kids and make them fail so the system collapses.
  - b. CMs teach kids the system is to blame, they can’t succeed, nothing they do will help, and to just give up. This creates failure. Kids should be taught that their future is up to them and depends on their choices and actions when they are young.
  - c. The ambiguity of cause and effect allows blacks to make excuses, which prevents them from improving.
- 3. Self**
- a. Tactic: General form of “I’m late because of traffic, rather than because I left late.”
  - b. Push the philosophy of external locus of control (structuralism); teach it to kids and make them fail so the system collapses.
  - c. Shift blame onto situation instead of person.
4. When complexly determined behaviors or motivations are described by simple catchphrases, such as “expressing one’s sexuality,” usually the phrase is used to cover up something that if accurately described would be shameful, so the phrase is a form of denial.

**C. Other attribution of opinions/beliefs to personal characteristics**

**1. Delegitimizing**

- a. A particular way to defend one’s point of view is to attribute disagreement to some aspect of the individual (e.g., mansplaining) rather than to the substance of what they are saying.
- b. Make personal attributions for unpopular positions. [form of ad hominem, now accepted, as are strawman arguments]
- c. As part of the general tactic of misattributing the cause of effects, say that racism is due to something other than attributes of blacks, but instead to the attributes of racists, or, more interestingly, an attempt to justify slavery and white supremacy, but especially saying that slavery was the cause of negative attitudes toward blacks, because such attitudes were necessary to justify the treatment of blacks, and thus such attitudes have no basis in characteristics of blacks.

**2. Shaming**

- a. Attribution of disagreement to “fear” as a way of shaming you into agreeing with them. “You’re just scared not to agree with me.”
- b. Free-for-all attribution of motives to something shameful, but not true, meanwhile misrepresenting their own motives.

**3. Psychological theories**

- a. Use social psychology, terms like “scapegoating,” “cognitive dissonance,” etc., to delegitimize someone’s positions. These are alternative attributions.
- b. If you have an example that something happens sometimes (e.g., scapegoat), that doesn’t mean it happens every time.

#### **4. Slavery and racism**

- a. Flip cause and effect, e.g., slavery caused racism, vs. racism caused slavery. Is it the case that if A causes B, then we can say B is bad if A is bad, but not necessarily that A is bad if B is bad? Which makes racism seem worse, if racism caused slavery, or if slavery caused racism?

#### **D. Post hoc ergo propter hoc**

1. Every problem is blamed on capitalism in a post hoc ergo propter hoc fashion, with the implication being that getting rid of capitalism will make things better, rather than the problem being based on nature, or the new system actually being worse.
2. If a cultural group did not do something, e.g., develop science or agriculture, it’s because they did not want to, not because they were unable.
3. Reason for not-X is Y. Reason for black failure is racism, Post hoc ergo propter hoc.

#### **E. Attribution flip from them to you**

1. If you take precautions to defend yourself from blacks, you invite attack, and are to blame if they attack you, and you should not be able to defend yourself.
2. Issue of taking chain of events prior to crisis event and only focusing on some while ignoring others, focusing on the ones the white did and ignoring the ones the black did, instead of focusing on sufficient causes and ignoring simply necessary causes.
3. A major tactic of SJWs is flipping blame, so if a black does X, and a white responds with Y, SJWs will say the white was the cause, and the black was the victim. It covers up what the black does while emphasizing what the white does; and it covers up how the white feels while emphasizing how the black feels.
4. How cause and effect is determined to support a conclusion, so ignoring earlier or later events in the chain of events.

#### **F. Paranoia of the left**

1. Certain voices are not features in mainstream venues. The question is why. This is a causal inquiry. Is it caused by race or gender, or by meaningful qualities like logic and empiricism?

#### **G. Ability vs. motivation**

1. The reason certain cultures never developed agriculture, weapons, boats, medicine, etc. was because they didn’t want to, not because they couldn’t.

#### **H. Convenient attribution**

1. To give something negative connotations, say that thing is the cause or the result of something that already has negative connotations as a way of transferring the connotations.
2. Say that problem X is caused by Y, where Y is something you don’t like and want to do away with. So rape (X) is caused by sex jokes (Y), with no evidence it is, but you don’t like sex jokes, so demonize them with causal claims.
3. When complexly determined behaviors or motivations are described by simple catchphrases, such as “expressing one’s sexuality,” usually the phrase is used to cover up something that if accurately described would be shameful, so the phrase is a form of denial.

## **I. Systemic causes**

1. What is the structure of saying that something vague like “patriarchy” causes rape?
2. SJWism is a system or network of interrelated ideas a la Freudianism or Marxism, a la Deleuze and Guattari. The network needs to be schematized.

## **J. Reverse cause**

1. If you take precautions to defend yourself from blacks, you invite attack, and are to blame if they attack you, and you should not be able to defend yourself.
2. The system that brought us here from the dark ages is patriarchal and excludes women, so it must change, instead of women changing.

## **K. Make it work for us**

1. Just as SJWs do, freely reinterpret the cause of people’s behavior to suit agenda, which provides frame of interpretation.

## **II. Category**

### **A. Two-step forbidding**

#### **1. General principle**

- a. Two-step banning process: define banned category broadly and vaguely (e.g., racist, offensive, hate speech, cultural appropriation, bourgeois, counterrevolutionary, capitalist-roader, reactionary), but then be precise that such speech is to be banned.
- b. Certain views are put in categories, “hate speech,” “offensive,” “politically incorrect,” “heresy,” and thus prohibited from expression a priori. The categorization is key.
- c. What is the trick when SJWs automatically reject information etc. when it comes from a labeled source, such as racists or sexists? [They just say “that’s racist,” and they think that is the conclusion of their argument. They don’t get into whether it’s true or not.]
- d. Theory of two-stage arguments: X is racist, and racism is prohibited. [Also hidden complexity behind these terms, such that not all “racism” is the same thing, and some may be more prohibited or allowed than others.]

#### **2. Broad definition of banned category**

- a. If you want to get rid of something for the purpose of subversion, figure out how that thing is racist. This can be done by both interpreting the thing broadly (“America is a land of opportunity” blames people for their failures) and by expanding the definition of racism, e.g., with “microaggressions.”
- b. SJWs portray everything as racist. [Ability of vague structures to accommodate most exemplars.]
- c. Broad definition allows for an all-purpose thought-elimination tool. If there is any way to fit a particular uncomfortable thought into a banned category, and the categories are so vague that almost any thought can be fit into it, then that uncomfortable thought can be banished and forgotten about.

#### **3. Absoluteness of banning**

- a. The thought isn’t worth thinking about or debating. Here is a category of things we don’t even have to think about.
- b. In categorization argument (X is Y, and Y is bad), it needs to be shown that X is bad, or else either X is not Y, or Y is not categorically bad.

#### **4. Purpose**

- a. **Silencing**
  - b. **Simplification**
    - i. When you categorize thing A as “bigotry” or whatever and then based on that automatically reject thing A, you take a shortcut without having to say what about A specifically is wrong, and this is the objective of not having to explain one’s reasoning. [See graphics on page 1.]
  - c. **Compartmentalization**
  - d. **Belief protection**
    - i. In Red china, people were labeled “reactionaries” or “counterrevolutionaries” as a way of compartmentalizing them away, neutralizing their beliefs, and persecuting them.
- 5. Examples**
- a. Hate speech is not free speech.
  - b. Call your opinion hate speech or bullying and thus outlaw it, or get your fired from your job, anything to silence you.
  - c. Offensive, racist, homophobic. There might be some exemplars of these categories that are too strong or based just on name-calling, but there might be others that are based on actual information. That’s the problem with this categorization strategy, that it treats many unlike things as if they are like. It’s too simplistic.
  - d. In many ways, CMs use victimhood to win an argument. A person’s feelings must be spared. It’s a moral superiority argument.
- B. Two-step approval**
- 1. Victims win**
    - a. In many ways, CMs use victimhood to win an argument. A person’s feelings must be spared. It’s a moral superiority argument.
    - b. Use of victimization to win arguments. You lose the argument because you are in category “bigot.” They win because they are in category “victim.”
  - 2. Express sexuality**
    - a. It’s OK for women to “express their sexuality” however they want, but not for men to.
    - b. Use of phrase “express her sexuality” to defend what women do to appeal to men’s sexuality. Once again, fitting a constellation of behaviors under a rubric completely determines how those behaviors are interpreted, in a top-down fashion.
  - 3. Nuance and complexity**
    - a. What is really meant by saying that something is more “nuanced” or “complex”? It’s not what it seems. I disagree with you, but I can’t really say why.
- C. Simplification**
- 1. General principle**
    - a. Overall get into how the labeling works and how it is a simplifier of complexity and protects from uncomfortable information.
    - b. What is the effect of naming things the way SJWs do? It simplifies the world by erasing nuance and variability and treating all members of the category the same. People who respond well to such naming desire simplicity and closure.

- c. When you categorize thing A as “bigotry” or whatever and then based on that automatically reject thing A, you take a shortcut without having to say what about A specifically is wrong, and this is the objective of not having to explain one’s reasoning. [See graphics on page 1.]

## **2. Examples**

- a. Theory of two-stage arguments: X is racist, and racism is prohibited. [Also hidden complexity behind these terms, such that not all “racism” is the same thing, and some may be more prohibited or allowed than others.]
  - b. Words, such as “racism,” are shortcuts to thought, cognitive miser, cover up difference.
  - c. Lump concepts together to get the same response to all of them, even though the terms are widely different: “If you say something that threatens violence, or hurts one’s feelings, or contradicts one’s opinions,” you should be banned. [The same thing is done with “violence and hate,” as in “there should be no tolerance for violence and hate.”]
3. Reinterpreting (Does this get recategorized under just simplification, but not as part of categorization?)
    - a. Insistence that when someone says X, they really mean Y, thus simplifying the world and bringing what people say within one’s purview, and also having more say over what another person says than they do themselves.

## **D. Mind protection**

1. Overall get into how the labeling works and how it is a simplifier of complexity and protects from uncomfortable information.
2. What is the trick when SJWs automatically reject information etc. when it comes from a labeled source, such as racists or sexists? [They just say “that’s racist,” and they think that is the conclusion of their argument. They don’t get into whether it’s true or not.]

## **E. Boundary dissolution**

1. Dissolve basic boundaries between OK and gross/disgusting, breaks down all other boundaries.

## **F. Semantic stretching**

1. Moving the line that defines “rape” across the spectrum: violence, force, nonconsent, coercion, drink, non-explicit consent, regret, etc.
2. Blacks can’t be racist.

## **G. Effectiveness of labeling**

1. There is also something about the labels they have, “toxic masculinity,” “white fragility,” etc. that is very powerful because of the label. How does this process work?
2. Fallacious terms that create reality: gender, sexual orientation, rainbow flag, all political words with built-in assumptions.
3. Overall get into how the labeling works and how it is a simplifier of complexity and protects from uncomfortable information.
4. But they categorize change as “evolution” or “improvement.”

## **H. Categorical statements**

1. If you want to say something is or is not true of an entire class or concept, focus only on the part where it is or is not true as desired. Get examples of this.

### **I. How it works for us**

1. Perhaps one way around their game is to expand their forbidden categories to the point of absurdity.
- J. Tendency to be “joiners” where they join an existing group and then subvert it to make the group become about something else, by changing or expanding the definition of what the group was originally about, or by saying the group needs to evolve.
- K. How to deal with “race” doesn’t exist?

### **III. Semantic stretching**

#### **A. Basic process**

1. Expand or contract meanings of words.
2. Advantage taken of ambiguity of meaning, interpretation, and causation to insert one’s own agenda.
3. Continuously expand the definition of words like “rape” and “racism.”
4. If you expand the definition of a word far enough, eventually it becomes meaningless.
5. The most important arguments you will have are not about substance. They are about words and the meanings of words.

#### **B. New meanings for words**

1. CM’s most important offensive move is a redefinition of words, so challenge those redefinitions.
2. A big part of the fight is over what things mean, including words, institutions, places, etc.
3. What is the process by which SJWs can change the meanings of words, like “racist” and how can this be resisted?
4. Analyze the process by which the meanings of words are surreptitiously changed and examples.
5. Examine further the importance of the change of meanings of words, how it works, what it allows CMs to do, etc.
6. Balkanization of language, where different factions use different words for the same thing, or the same word by with different meanings. Language as construal. [Consensual?] Hold your ground. Allow the language to split to become mutually unintelligible.
7. Examine the process by which they change the meaning of words and how this is allowed, change is stronger than status quo, but one group can refuse to use the language.
8. Word meaning changes are on the individual level. If one person changes meaning, that doesn’t mean you have to. If 50 of people change meaning, that doesn’t mean the other 50 percent have to. Even if 90 percent change meaning, the other 10 percent don’t have to. This will just lead to a separation of language. It’s worth splitting the language to avoid accepting certain ideas. So keep using your language. Don’t use theirs. This may make communication impossible. That is probably fine.

#### **C. Change connotation, keep denotation**

1. Shift denotation, but retain connotation.
2. Change denotation of words so they apply to different sets, but retain connotation so that it also applies to the new set.
3. Regularly changing definitions of words in order to transfer connotations that would not apply with standard definitions.

4. What is the mechanism by which one shifts back and forth between two word meanings in order to win an argument?

**D. Causal links imply characteristic similarity**

1. To give something negative connotations, say that thing is the cause or the result of something that already has negative connotations as a way of transferring the connotations.

**E. No true Scotsman**

1. Communism as practiced in the USSR and China were not real communism. Islam as practiced by ISIS and al-Qaeda are not real Islam. [No true Scotsman.]
2. The U.S. is not capitalism, because it's not perfect capitalism (setting impossible bar as strawman), and true communism has never been tried.

**F. Language that assumes conclusion**

1. Syllogism like this: P1: "Basic necessary services" must be provided. P2: X that I want is a "basic necessary service." Thus X must be provided. P1 is a tautology and unquestionable. P2 is anything we say. [Somehow this is done by definition. Figure out the structure.]
2. Trick of including argument in your language as an a priori, so you don't have to actually argue it, e.g., calling something "hate speech."

**G. Vague boundaries allow more exemplars**

1. Lump concepts together to get the same response to all of them, even though the terms are widely different: "If you say something that threatens violence, or hurts one's feelings, or contradicts one's opinions," you should be banned. [The same thing is done with "violence and hate," as in "there should be no tolerance for violence and hate."]
2. Moving the line that defines "rape" across the spectrum: violence, force, nonconsent, coercion, drink, non-explicit consent, regret, etc.
3. Expansion of the meaning of words a major problem.

**H. Artificially constrict boundaries**

1. What's the thing where a concept is restricted to convenient lines: So, free speech is just the law and government, not an overarching principle?

**2. Definitional exclusivism**

- a. Communism as practiced in the USSR and China were not real communism. Islam as practiced by ISIS and al-Qaeda are not real Islam. [No true Scotsman.]
- b. The U.S. is not capitalism, because it's not perfect capitalism (setting impossible bar as strawman), and true communism has never been tried.

**3. Special rules for me**

4. Tactic: General form of "I have special circumstances, so I should not have to follow the rules."

**I. What applies to part of concept applies to the whole**

1. Work through all the examples of this and consequences. Start with category A or object A<sub>1</sub> and want to say something about it. So look through category A for exemplar A<sub>N</sub> where desired thing is true, then say attribute applies to all category A and to object A<sub>1</sub>. However it's easy to find exemplars where this is not the case.
2. Political correctness is just not being an asshole

3. Argument that blocking the road is OK during a protest because the Constitution protects protest in the First Amendment, thus anything you do while protesting, legal or not, is OK.
4. Argument that shouting down a scheduled speaker is free speech. Analyze this.

**J. New vocabulary**

1. Have there been other instances in history when there was a plethora of new terms and phrases such as “privilege” and “rape culture,” as well as a concerted attack on a group of people the way there is on the white man today?
2. Liberals make up new definitions for words and then say you are ignorant when you don’t use their new definition.

**K. Conventient delineations**

1. What’s the thing where a concept is restricted to convenient lines: So, free speech is just the law and government, not an overarching principle?

**L. Excluding exemplars from a category**

1. Hate speech is not free speech.

**M. Slipping between definitions**

1. What is the mechanism by which one shifts back and forth between two word meanings in order to win an argument?

**IV. Hijack symbols**

**A. Basic processes**

1. I had formerly thought that the ability to say no was the greatest form of power, and this may still usually be so, but I have just read in Foucault of a positive form of power, and it made me think of the ability to speak, and to determine what symbols mean, such as the rainbow flag.
2. If you just say the rainbow flag is a symbol of LGBT, it becomes so, and there is no way to argue against it; the same is true for making new meanings of words.
3. Analyze the process by which the meanings of words are surreptitiously changed and examples.
4. Examine further the importance of the change of meanings of words, how it works, what it allows CMs to do, etc.
5. Examine the process by which they change the meaning of words and how this is allowed, change is stronger than status quo, but one group can refuse to use the language.
6. When something is expressed like “trans\*” it is meant to be disruptive, but there is no equivalent response that is not simply a reaction that reinforced the expression. This is the power of expressions; you cannot un-express it or effectively counter it. You can’t say, “Don’t say that.”
7. Balkanization of language, where different factions use different words for the same thing, or the same word by with different meanings. Language as construal. [Consensual?] Hold your ground. Allow the language to split to become mutually unintelligible.
8. How did liberals get the ability to dictate the truth and decide new meanings for words.
9. Is it easier to expand the meaning of a word than to maintain it as is? Or to contract the meaning of a word? So change is easier than stability?

**B. Specific instances**

1. Interpret all changes as good by referring to them as “evolving” or “growth” or some other generally positive word, though going in the opposite direction could also be called the same thing.
2. Similar to how there used to be just normal people and transgender people, now there are cisgender and transgender people, so that the “normal” is denormalized and put on equal footing with transgender, thus there is no default. The 99% of the population is the same as the 10%. This is basic euphemisms of political correctness, except instead of making the minority sound good, the majority is made to sound just as bad.
3. What is the process by which SJWs can change the meanings of words, like “racist” and how can this be resisted?
4. Fallacious terms that create reality: gender, sexual orientation, rainbow flag, all political words with built-in assumptions.
5. There is also something about the labels they have, “toxic masculinity,” “white fragility,” etc. that is very powerful because of the label. How does this process work?

**C. Make it work for us**

1. When SJWs take over a term, like “partner,” start using it in a wildly inappropriate places. Same with “they” for singular “non-binaries.”

**V. Right of interpretation (essentially strawman argument, and arguing without evidence)**

**A. General principle**

1. Open, arbitrary interpretation of A = B, symbol = referent, manifest = latent, etc., a la Freud.
2. What we say exists exists even if you don’t know it because it is disguised. I.e., disguised X is the Y of our theory, because we say so.
3. This is arguing without evidence. It’s also similar to Plato’s work about word meanings.

**B. Construction**

1. If you want to “construct” a truth (e.g., the races are equal, race does not exist), first say that the truth (e.g., races) are constructed. This is similar to commies saying that all literature is political, so when they interpret literature from a Marxian perspective, it is nothing different than what is already being done. Accuse, then do what you accused.

**C. Change word meanings**

1. Change denotation of words so they apply to different sets, but retain connotation so that it also applies to the new set.
2. Shift denotation, but retain connotation.

**D. Presumption of conclusion**

1. Use of words or phrases that presume desired conclusions: “business ‘open to the public’ cannot refuse blacks,” where “open to the public” presumes conclusion by tautology, but is only presumed.
2. Syllogism like this: P1: “Basic necessary services” must be provided. P2: X that I want is a “basic necessary service.” Thus X must be provided. P1 is a tautology and unquestionable. P2 is anything we say. [Somehow this is done by definition. Figure out the structure.]

**E. Right of misinterpretation**

1. Intentional misunderstanding of one’s arguments or misinterpretation of one’s words.

## **F. We set the bar**

1. If you are not a woman, lack, or whatever, you cannot speak on issues concerning them (unless they agree with you). Another way of silencing opposing views, a big part of SJWism.
- G. Call for moment of silence as method to control opposition by positioning yourself as the victim if anyone breaks the silence.
- H. Criticism or disbelief is a negative reaction which indicates that something is true. so either believe and it's true, or disbelieve and it's true.
- I. Political correctness is just not being an asshole.
- J. Tendency to be "joiners" where they join an existing group and then subvert it to make the group become about something else, by changing or expanding the definition of what the group was originally about, or by saying the group needs to evolve.
- K. Editing book about postmodern literature, which says that there is no reality, but rather just linguistic constructions of reality. This means there are no lies or untruths, because there is no reality against which to compare what someone says. So if you want to get away with lying, and lying big, this is the philosophy you want everyone to believe.
- L. A big part of the fight is over what things mean, including words, institutions, places, etc.
- M. How did liberals get the ability to dictate the truth and decide new meanings for words.
- N. What is the thing where SJWs feel that they can tell you what you are saying, and if you disagree, they are more right about what you are saying than you are? Insisting on a strawman?
- O. Examine the lunacy of gay arguing.
- P. Insistence that when someone says X, they really mean Y, thus simplifying the world and bringing what people say within one's purview, and also having more say over what another person says than they do themselves.

## **VI. Silencing**

### **A. Basic principle**

1. A large part of SJW tactics is to silence the opposition in various ways, including by making direct demands that X not be said, or by bringing negative social pressure from their cohorts upon those who say X.
2. Pick specific issues where certain things cannot be said, with that issue not being of fundamental concern, but as a foot-in-the-door against free speech, with the goal being to establish islands of restricted speech, which can then be expanded, indefinitely, with the absolute control of all speech being the real objective.
3. Censorship for those in power; free speech for those out of power.

### **B. History of censorship**

1. Have there been other social movements or responses to social problems where the primary act was to prevent people from saying certain things, with epithets like "racist" and outright censoring and punishment of certain views?

### **C. Misunderstanding free speech**

1. Argument that shouting down a scheduled speaker is free speech. Analyze this.
2. Distinction between freedom of speech as primarily an expression of thought vs. as an impediment to other's expression of thought. That is, between expressing a view and prohibiting another from expressing a view by shouting them own or punishing them in some way, such that the goal is not to express one's own views but to prevent the other's views from being expressed.

- a. -Shouting down speech is free speech.
- b. -Free speech has consequences.
- c. -Firing people is free speech.
- d. -Hate speech is not free speech.

**D. Punishment for speech**

- 1. Free speech has consequences.

**E. Need for control**

- 1. Curtailing freedom of speech is not a means to an end, but rather the end to which all SJW issues are means. It is the attempt to get the foot in the door and start down the slippery slope [of complete control of thought and speech].

F. Censorship isn't just about stopping people from speaking. It's also about stopping people from hearing. Often it's just one person speaking, so only one person is restricted. But it's also usually lots of people hearing, and they are restricted too. Also it's easier to say we don't want X saying Y because it's offensive than it is to say we don't want all these Xs to hear Y because it's offensive. The argument for not letting people hear things is never made, and usually the issue is not broached. The focus is only on the person speaking. But censorship is just as harmful to the people who might want to hear the message.

**G. Free speech**

- 1. A company firing someone for speech is an example of free speech, not an infringement on free speech. Analyze this.

**H. Fear of free speech indicates fragility**

- 1. SJWs cannot tolerate deviation from their beliefs. This is a fundamentalism. What follows from that?
- 2. Much of their agenda is to hide reality or not look at it, deny it, or reframe it. Point this out. Find gaps and magnify them.
- 3. They are completely sure their ideas are right, but they don't think their ideas can withstand challenge or will win in the battle of ideas.
- 4. They also don't want others to hear other ideas because they aren't sure others will be as persuaded by their own ideas as they are and won't instead be more persuaded by the other side.

**5. Censorship implies losing**

- a. Hate speech must be banned because if people are allowed to speak freely, the result is racism and probably ethnic cleansing. But doesn't this suggest that racism is correct?
- b. Whatever they try to silence is a threat to them.
- c. Distinction between freedom of speech as primarily an expression of thought vs. as an impediment to other's expression of thought. That is, between expressing a view and prohibiting another from expressing a view by shouting them own or punishing them in some way, such that the goal is not to express one's own views but to prevent the other's views from being expressed.

**6. System fragility**

- a. SJWs are extremely sensitive to any kind of opposition nor negative feedback. How can this sensitivity be exploited?

**I. Motivation for censorship**

1. Much of their agenda is to hide reality or not look at it, deny it, or reframe it. Point this out. Find gaps and magnify them.

**J. Freedom vs. equality**

1. The values of free speech and equality are in competition.
2. Women and blacks are a threat to free speech.

**K. Denial of being against free speech**

1. Does the left ever explicitly give an argument for why they oppose free speech? (See hate speech arguments.) They often deny that they oppose free speech. [This implies they know it is wrong to do so, and yet they still do it, without admitting it. So they can have their cake and eat it too.]

**L. Two-step categorization**

1. Call your opinion hate speech or bullying and thus outlaw it, or get your fired from your job, anything to silence you.

**M. Outright forbidding**

1. A primary argument of SJWs is to not say certain things.
2. Much of the argumentation now is not that X is wrong, but that you should not say X.

**N. Specific words**

1. Don't say certain words.

**O. Certain groups silenced**

1. Privileged people should step aside and allow marginalized people to speak.
2. If you are not a woman, black, or whatever, you cannot speak on issues concerning them (unless they agree with you). Another way of silencing opposing views, a big part of SJWism.
3. You can't speak about someone else's experience.

**4. Privilege**

- a. -Privileged people should step aside and allow marginalized people to speak.

**P. Self-victimization**

1. I don't want you to disagree with me. I will say it scares me when you disagree with me. You have no right to scare me. Therefore you have no right to disagree with me.
2. Those who are "victims" cannot be challenged, disagreed with, criticized, or offended. Victimhood creates an entire class of speech and thought that is off limits.

**Q. Consequences of free speech**

1. Hate speech must be banned because if people are allowed to speak freely, the result is racism and probably ethnic cleansing. But doesn't this suggest that racism is correct?

**R. How this works for us**

1. Whatever they try to silence is a threat to them.
2. Whatever they ban is what they fear, whatever they fear is what they are vulnerable to, and whatever they are vulnerable to is what we need to do more of.
3. Find out what they don't want said by seeing what they censor. Then say these things in veiled ways in Internet safe spaces. [They indicate their weakness. Use it.]
4. In an ideological war, whatever the enemy does not want you to say is what will make you win. That's why they don't want you to say it.
5. That which they seek to suppress and silence is that which they fear, because it is our greatest weapon.

6. Perhaps one way around their game is to expand their forbidden categories to the point of absurdity.
- S. It's really all about hiding the truth. Certain people have decided that the public can't handle the truth, probably because of what the consequences would be.

## **VII. Critical theory**

### **A. Creating doubt**

1. It's easier to cast doubt than it prove something. How does one cast doubt? What are the methods/techniques? [Asking questions.] [This depends on how much into the conversation you plan to get. If you are just going to make one assertion, then an assertion can have more weight than saying nothing at all, even if not proven true and even if questioned. It presents a new possibility. But if the discussion is going to be long, it's easier to be on the questioning side.]
2. It is much easier to tear down standards than to build them back up. This is why "progress" is hard to reverse.
3. When is assertion the strongest position and when is criticism the strongest? What criteria separate these situations?
4. The way to attack CM is to find their axioms (equality, consent, cooperation and collectivism) and attack them at an epistemological level, as in how they know these things are true, or are the basis of morality?
5. Difference in difficulty between proving a theory versus calling one into question, while at the same time simply stating something is easier than disproving it.  
Difficulty: statement < questioning < proof.
6. Issue of getting opponent to move from their position of certainty to one of uncertainty, even if not necessarily to your position. This is good even if you have to admit uncertainty of your own position, especially if the other side is the status quo (because you have introduced change) or if they are about to implement a policy (because then they have to reconsider and hold off the policy).
7. It's good to prove your side, but it can also be good just to prove the other side wrong, or not even to prove it, but to cast doubt on it by locating the primary assumptions and questioning them. That is, rather than giving the person answers, you give them questions and doubt. Make them doubt their beliefs. That is the first step to changing minds. Once they have doubt, then it will be easier to replace their beliefs with new ones.

### **B. Everything is political**

1. Insertion of politics into entertainment excused because all entertainment is political in a substructural/ideological way.
2. SJWs have taken over movies, comic books, and sci-fi literature. They're trying to take over gaming.

### **C. Assumptions**

1. The way to attack CM is to find their axioms (equality, consent, cooperation and collectivism) and attack them at an epistemological level, as in how they know these things are true, or are the basis of morality?

### **D. Axioms**

1. A priori axiom that blacks are good, and everything else must be changed, twisted, interpreted to be consistent with that.

### **E. Destabilize-change-stabilize**

1. Make radical proposal, inconsistent with direct experience. When challenged that the proposal is invented and not real, i.e., is an ideology, say that direct experience is also an ideology, thus both calling direct experience into question and putting the radical proposal on equal footing with direct experience. The ultimate conclusion of this is that there is no direct experience of reality, but only ideologies, all equally valid, and thus experience and evidence cannot serve as resources for debunking radical proposals.
2. If one does not see things your way, suggest multiple perspectives, relativity, and open-mindedness, which opens the door to your perspective. If they don't agree with your perspective, they are absolutists, dogmatic, only capable of seeing one side, closed-minded. [Then once they have considered your idea as possible, then close the door again and make your idea absolute.]

## **VIII. Rhetorical tricks**

### **A. Specific trick**

1. If something is viewed negatively, ameliorate it by claiming it is nothing new.
2. Belief X is old, from decades ago. It's 2015. So you should believe Y.
3. They explain inconsistencies as complexity and nuance, and you are too simple if you don't understand.
4. Rather than facts and logic serving to support one's position, other, nontraditional means are used to support it: denial counts as verification, reinterpretation of evidence so falsifications are verification; changing meanings of words to support position, etc.
5. Claiming that makeup empowers women because they can succeed better with it than without it, ignoring the fact that this different path to power and success itself is sexist. So it's feminist to follow the rules of sexism because this is how women can be empowered.

### **B. Presume one is right to prove one is right**

1. On the wrong side of history.
  2. Fact checking
  3. Common sense
- C. Often I will say something on the Internet and the response I will get from leftists will be similar in wording with just a few changes. E.g., I say "Maybe if more blacks were like this guy instead of like Trayvon and Mike Brown, they wouldn't get shot," and the response, "Maybe if more whites were like Bernie and not these people, less would be racist and uninformed."
- D. In Maoist China, biological terms were popularly applied to ideological enemies, such as worms, pigs, cows, poisonous snakes, rotten eggs, poisonous weeds, flies, and germs.
- E. A major logical problem that comes up is ad hoc hypothesizing, or shifting the argument to something else when the first one fails. Get more info on this.
- F. Notion of "reappropriating" something by claiming it and acknowledging it.
- G. Infiltrating an art form (books, comic books, movies, etc.) and subverting the art as an end in itself and changing it into a means to advance a political agenda, which takes center stage. Was done under communism with "socialist realism." Then say all art is political, so no change.
- H. How can you use reason to get to people who are irrational? For example, people who move goal posts and change definitions of words?

- I. Comparisons to other countries are considered valid as if we should try to be like them.
- J. What is really meant by saying that something is more “nuanced” or “complex”? It’s not what it seems. I disagree with you, but I can’t really say why.
- K. If you point out inconsistencies in their narrative, such as how not allowing whites to have groups on campus, they strawman as if you’re saying you’re oppressed, and ad hominem by saying you are whining.
- L. Media manipulation works through selective reporting, selective interpretation, as well as magnifying some, and reducing other information. This is how they make Trump seem racist. Misinterpret then magnify.
- M. A company firing someone for speech is an example of free speech, not an infringement on free speech. Analyze this.
- N. If you don’t like what someone is doing, rather than telling them to stop, give them an example of something else to do. This is how Jews infiltrated art with modernism and destroyed art, or how they infiltrate political movements and send them off track on wild goose chases.
- O. Pretend not to understand degrees, or amounts, or percentages. Pretend only to understand dichotomous presence or absence.
- P. If a comparison is unfavorable, change the object of comparison to something else.
- Q. Issue of determining bias in media influenced by idea that it’s not the media that is biased, but reality. E.g., reality has a liberal bias, and that’s why the media has a liberal bias. It’s not bias; it’s realistic.
- R. Set standard of proof higher for opponent than for oneself.
- S. Associating “science” with soft sciences makes that claims of the hard sciences more dubious.
- T. Use a difference between two things to argue they should be treated in a preferred different way, when the opposite difference could lead to the same preferred difference in treatment, so it’s an a priori decision rationalized rather than an actual reason.
- U. Ideas can be spread more readily with images, so start working on art.
- V. Rationalization by using ad hoc hypotheses to explain black failure in order to protect ideology of racial equality.
- W. Blacks can’t be racist.
- X. Many SJW tactics come down to accusations that put you on the defensive of trying to disprove. [These are issues about you personally, rather than about the issue.]
- Y. On the wrong side of history.
- Z. Frame desired changes as not really different from the existing conditions. Step by step this can lead to being changes without ever admitting that any change occurred.
- AA. If you want to say something is or is not true of an entire class or concept, focus only on the part where it is or is not true as desired.
- BB. Look into the treatment, framing, and selection of history.
- CC. Ameliorate something new by saying it is nothing new or it’s “evolution.”
- DD. Get into accusations of ignorance or being uninformed, and how this just means people are ignorant of what you believe, assuming one is right without actually demonstrating it, also ad hominem.
- EE. Examine the lunacy of gay arguing.
- FF. Sometimes bad syllogisms, like If shoe is there, it must have been murder. Shoe is there, thus murder. But first premise is not certain.

- GG. But they categorize change as “evolution” or “improvement.”
- HH. If only 10% of the truth supports you, pretend that’s 100% of the truth. Trump is a game show host. Richard Spencer’s arguments were two shots fired into the crowd.
- II. Many times in an argument, people will change the subject, or change the causal relation, without acknowledging they’ve done this, or that you just disproved their causal relation. [You have to take a moment to step back and acknowledge that something was just disproved.]

## **IX. Structural explanation**

- A. Rather than making any kind of full argument, provide a frame of interpretation. How to do this? Put spin on all facts. Use cause and effect to frame, both as motivations behind action, and proposed consequences of action
- B. How to start with a frame and then see everything in terms of that frame, top-down perception.
- C. Groups etc. that favor minority groups are fine but not for majority groups because of “structural inequality.”
- D. Proposal of a system by which all facts can be interpreted to be in line with and to confirm it. What are the attributes of such a system? [Conspiracy theories, Russian hacking, only considering part of the evidence, rather than all of it for context.]
- E. How to deal with claims of institutionalized, systemic racism. Analyze this. What is the Evidence? Is it falsifiable?
- F. White privilege, systemic racism, patriarchy, etc.

### **G. Blame**

- 1. What is the structure of saying that something vague like “patriarchy” causes rape?

### **H. Confirmation**

- 1. If you look for something vague like racism, you’re sure to find it.

### **I. Unfalsifiability**

- 1. SJWism is a system or network of interrelated ideas a la Freudianism or Marxism, a la Deleuze and Guattari. The network needs to be schematized.
- 2. Something about the unfalsifiability of their system, and how everything fits their system because their system is so vague. Also get into systemic racism and what kind of evidence it would take to demonstrate that, and whether there is such evidence. Or generally how the systemic racism is like belief in god, because existence of the world proves existence of God.

### **J. Vagueness**

- 1. SJWs portray everything as racist. [Ability of vague structures to accommodate most exemplars.]

## **X. Subversion of values**

### **A. From prescriptive to descriptive values**

- 1. Traditionally, the good was defined a priori in terms, e.g., of usefulness, and men then trained to become good. Now this is being flipped, the good is being changed to fit what women are. So previously men changed to become good, and now the good is changed to be like women. that is rather than improving oneself to jump over the bar, the bar is being lowered to accommodate women.
- 2. The system that brought us here from the dark ages is patriarchal and excludes women, so it must change, instead of women changing.

### **B. Entropy**

1. It is much easier to tear down standards than to build them back up. This is why “progress” is hard to reverse.

**C. Process of lowering standards**

1. Have standards, blacks can't meet them, lower standards for blacks, then lower standards for everyone.

**D. Universal to limited**

1. The reason logic etc. is favored is not because it works but because it is masculine, thus it is not universal but particular; if you are bad at logic, men are to blame; etc to other implications of this. [Cause and effect.]
2. Different cultures are just different; none is better than another, even though they all value health, and some cultures are more effective at maintaining health.
3. Propose that a structure in society is caused by a particular ideology, but without proof this is the case. However, this calls into question the structure as contingent, as well as provides evidence of the ideology, and can frame both as negative. Also the structure may be caused by natural exigencies, rather than an ideology.

**E. Victimhood as a value**

1. Use of victimization to win arguments. You lose the argument because you are in category “bigot.” They win because they are in category “victim.”

**F. Change object of equality**

1. From everyone is equal because they can marry someone of the opposite sex, to everyone is equal because they can marry someone they love.
2. A person should be paid based on his identity, not on how much he works, so women should be paid the same as men, even if they work less; figure out the logic of this.
3. There is the issue of determining equality by internal states (“love” member of same or opposite sex; identify as man or woman) versus by objective characteristics. This obliterates any meaning of “equality.”

**G. Destabilize-change-stabilize**

1. Make radical proposal, inconsistent with direct experience. When challenged that the proposal is invented and not real, i.e., is an ideology, say that direct experience is also an ideology, thus both calling direct experience into question and putting the radical proposal on equal footing with direct experience. The ultimate conclusion of this is that there is no direct experience of reality, but only ideologies, all equally valid, and thus experience and evidence cannot serve as resources for debunking radical proposals.
2. If one does not see things your way, suggest multiple perspectives, relativity, and open-mindedness, which opens the door to your perspective. If they don't agree with your perspective, they are absolutists, dogmatic, only capable of seeing one side, closed-minded. [Then once they have considered your idea as possible, then close the door again and make your idea absolute.]

**H. Top-down, bottom-up**

1. Traditionally, the good was defined a priori in terms, e.g., of usefulness, and men then trained to become good. Now this is being flipped, the good is being changed to fit what women are. So previously men changed to become good, and now the good is changed to be like women. that is rather than improving oneself to jump over the bar, the bar is being lowered to accommodate women.

**I. Freedom**

1. How to deal with idea of collectivism, use of science to make decisions, reduction of freedom, and individualism? Err on the side of too much freedom or too little? Start with absolute freedom and apply control only when absolutely necessary? Or start with complete control and allow freedom only where absolutely unproblematic? And what if science is wrong? Is it too much faith in science?
2. Freedom and equality are mutually exclusive.

**J. Empathy**

1. Along the lines of Matthew the Economist in Champaign-Urbana Occupy, there is a new push for people to vote in other people's interests rather than their own, similar to Lakoff. What are the implications of this? [Also a push for empathy.]

**K. Redefine quality for the inferior**

1. Different cultures are just different; none is better than another, even though they all value health, and some cultures are more effective at maintaining health.

**L. Hijack norms of civility**

1. If you can in any way frame yourself as a victim, you win, but this is only because, a priori, it has been decided that we should sacrifice everything for victims, for the lowly.
2. Default positions that always wins: being offended or being a victim.

**M. Competition of values**

1. The values of free speech and equality are in competition.

**N. New logic**

1. During Obama's reign, nigger logic got privileged as a valid way of thinking, whereas previously it would have been considered illogical. This also opened the gate for other illogical thinking.
2. **Standard of judgment**
  - a. It doesn't matter if something's true or false; what matters is if it's bigoted, racist, whatever. This allows inconvenient facts to be brushed aside. It's a way to inoculate against the truth [with labels].

**O. Specific examples**

1. Derogate work, independence, self-sufficiency as egoism, selfishness, greed, "rugged" individualism; champion conformity and collectivism.

**P. Standards as bad**

1. Refer to having standards as "discrimination" and "hate."
2. Referring to having no standards as "tolerance."

**Q. How this works for us**

1. The way to attack CM is to find their axioms (equality, consent, cooperation and collectivism) and attack them at an epistemological level, as in how they know these things are true, or are the basis of morality?

R. Tendency to be "joiners" where they join an existing group and then subvert it to make the group become about something else, by changing or expanding the definition of what the group was originally about, or by saying the group needs to evolve.

S. There is the issue of determining equality by internal states ("love" member of same or opposite sex; identify as man or woman) versus by objective characteristics. This obliterates any meaning of "equality."

T. Assumptions of equality and consent as an objective basis of morality. [But these aren't objective; they are arbitrary. In fact the evidence is against equality.]

## **XI. Universal to limited**

### **A. Basic principle**

1. The reason logic etc. is favored is not because it works but because it is masculine, thus it is not universal but particular; if you are bad at logic, men are to blame; etc to other implications of this. [Cause and effect.]
  2. The same is done with various rules of our society, which are attributed to white supremacy, implying that if some other racial group does things differently, that way is just as legitimate as the “white” way. So having laws about noise favor the desire of white people to live in a quiet neighborhood, but blacks do not value that and they enjoy the ability to make noise. Thus the law against noise is not universal but white, and existence of the law is white supremacy. So get rid of the law.
  3. Propose that a structure in society is caused by a particular ideology, but without proof this is the case. However, this calls into question the structure as contingent, as well as provides evidence of the ideology, and can frame both as negative. Also the structure may be caused by natural exigencies, rather than an ideology.
  4. Idea of postmodern society of pluralism, of various worldviews equally viable, rather than just one with deviations. So there are multiple logics, multiple epistemologies, etc., thus destabilizing science, Aristotelian logic, etc., and allowing anything goes. [Logic is a lot about what is not allowed in argument.]
- B. The system that brought us here from the dark ages is patriarchal and excludes women, so it must change, instead of women changing.
- C. Traditionally, the good was defined a priori in terms, e.g., of usefulness, and men then trained to become good. Now this is being flipped, the good is being changed to fit what women are. So previously men changed to become good, and now the good is changed to be like women. that is rather than improving oneself to jump over the bar, the bar is being lowered to accommodate women.
- D. Certain voices are not featured in mainstream venues. The question is why. This is a causal inquiry. Is it caused by race or gender, or by meaningful qualities like logic and empiricism?
- E. I whites/males criticize nonwhites/women, it’s delegitimized as privileged, mansplaining, etc. These are ad hominem. If whites/males deny criticisms from nonwhites/women, it is because of white/male fragility. Again, ad hominem. Attribution of white/male position is to white/male pathology, rather than to quality of position.
- F. During Obama’s reign, nigger logic got privileged as a valid way of thinking, whereas previously it would have been considered illogical. This also opened the gate for other illogical thinking.
- G. Some universally applicable rule that improves social functioning is attributed to a specific group, such as whites or men, thus limiting the applicability of the rule, and this is done with laws, language, logic, and science.

## **XII. Victim**

### **A. General principle**

1. Default positions that always wins: being offended or being a victim.
2. CMs often play on pity: if you don’t agree with us, you are a horrible person who does not care about other people; guilt trip.
3. It’s like some kind of reverse ad hominem; rather than a person’s argument being rejected because of who the person is, the argument is accepted because of who the

- person is. But the quality of an argument should be the same regardless of who the person is. That's the assumption of ad hominem being a fallacy. But CMs seem to treat fallacies as valid arguments
4. I don't want you to disagree with me. I will say it scares me when you disagree with me. You have no right to scare me. Therefore you have no right to disagree with me.
  5. In many ways, CMs use victimhood to win an argument. A person's feelings must be spared. It's a moral superiority argument.
  6. Exploit and exaggerate victimhood to win sympathy, which trumps all other arguments, so you win.
  7. Frame your side as a victim, then the other side is abusive if they disagree with you.
  8. Use of victimization to win arguments. You lose the argument because you are in category "bigot." They win because they are in category "victim."
  9. Claim internal feelings of victimhood, and you can win any argument and get anything you want.
  10. Playing the victim is a favorite way for SJWs to win arguments. What are the many ways that people play the victim? Why does this work? [Abuses real victimhood and undermines it.]
  11. For any issue find a group of people toward whom a particular emotion should be felt (e.g., pity, thankfulness) and frame the issue so that not taking the preferred side does not show the appropriate emotion. [What is the mechanism of framing?]

**B. Assumption that victims are sacrosanct**

1. If you can in any way frame yourself as a victim, you win, but this is only because, a priori, it has been decided that we should sacrifice everything for victims, for the lowly.

**C. Set up a victimhood from scratch**

1. Call for moment of silence as method to control opposition by positioning yourself as the victim if anyone breaks the silence.
2. Start a fight, play the victim.

**D. Fallacy of victim worship**

1. Only sympathize with the perpetrator, but not the victim.

**E. Negative consequences**

1. Overplay the victim card. Just like some people need welfare while others abuse it, so are some people victims, while others abuse victim status. And just as the abusers of welfare make people less sympathetic to those who need it, so do abusers of victim status make people less sympathetic to real victims.

**F. Silencing**

1. Those who are "victims" cannot be challenged, disagreed with, criticized, or offended. Victimhood creates an entire class of speech and thought that is off limits.

**XIII. Word games**

**A. Words that presume conclusions**

1. Use of words or phrases that presume desired conclusions: "business 'open to the public' cannot refuse blacks," where "open to the public" presumes conclusion by tautology, but is only presumed.
2. Trick of including argument in your language as an a priori, so you don't have to actually argue it, e.g., calling something "hate speech."

3. Adding a negative adjective before another adjective: “toxic masculinity,” “rugged individualism”?

**B. Respond to tagged category by tagging normal category**

1. Similar to how there used to be just normal people and transgender people, now there are cisgender and transgender people, so that the “normal” is denormalized and put on equal footing with transgender, thus there is no default. The 99% of the population is the same as the 10%. This is basic euphemisms of political correctness, except instead of making the minority sound good, the majority is made to sound just as bad.

**C. Separation of language**

1. Power/arguments are made a priori with the language that is used. So when there are two opposing factions, they will use different language. There is nothing wrong with this.
2. Balkanization of language, where different factions use different words for the same thing, or the same word by with different meanings. Language as construal. [Consensual?] Hold your ground. Allow the language to split to become mutually unintelligible.

**D. Shifting definitions**

1. What is the mechanism by which one shifts back and forth between two word meanings in order to win an argument?

**E. How this works for us**

1. When SJWs take over a term, like “partner,” start using it in a wildly inappropriate places. Same with “they” for singular “non-binaries.”

**XIV. Language**

**A. New vocabulary**

1. Have there been other instances in history when there was a plethora of new terms and phrases such and “privilege” and “rape culture,” as well as a concerted attack on a group of people the way there is on the white man today?
2. There is also something about the labels they have, “toxic masculinity,” “white fragility,” etc. that is very powerful because of the label. How does this process work?
3. Fallacious terms that create reality: gender, sexual orientation, rainbow flag, all political words with built-in assumptions.
4. Examine the process by which they change the meaning of words and how this is allowed, change is stronger than status quo, but one group can refuse to use the language.

**B. Redefinition**

1. Blacks can't be racist.
2. CM's most important offensive move is a redefinition of words, so challenge those redefinitions.

**C. Balkanization**

1. Balkanization of language, where different factions use different words for the same thing, or the same word by with different meanings. Language as construal. [Consensual?] Hold your ground. Allow the language to split to become mutually unintelligible.

**D. Language encapsulation**

1. Marxist notion of surplus labor value [but there is also value added by means of production, as well as value because of social demand]

#### **E. Slogans**

1. Fall back on trite phrases to explain inconsistencies in ideology: “choose your own battles”; “it’s complex”; “nuance” (come up with a full list of these)
2. Use of phrase “express her sexuality” to defend what women do to appeal to men’s sexuality. Once again, fitting a constellation of behaviors under a rubric completely determines how those behaviors are interpreted, in a top-down fashion.
3. Analyze “Diversity is our strength.”

#### **XV. General discourse**

- A. Issue of lowering quality of discourse so that fallacies are accepted, which takes time to dispel at the expense of more fruitful discussion.
- B. Issue of lowering the bar to discourse.
- C. In circumstances where all interlocutors have high standards of rhetoric, they leave out certain well-known fallacies, such as strawmen and ad hominem.
- D. Importance of raising the level of discourse. The Internet has lowered the level of discourse, so lots of time is wasted on fallacious arguments.
- E. In the same way that we may see a balkanization of word meanings, we may see the same with logical moves vs. fallacies. Just because one side accepts certain logical moves as valid doesn’t mean other people have to. We don’t need to convince everyone. It’s fine if even large numbers of people use words differently and use different kinds of logical arguments from us. We don’t need to change to their way, and we don’t need to get them to change to our way. Simply talk to people who share our language and epistemological groundings.

#### **F. Quality of rhetoric**

1. During Obama’s reign, nigger logic got privileged as a valid way of thinking, whereas previously it would have been considered illogical. This also opened the gate for other illogical thinking.

#### **XVI. Labeling**

- A. Defining one’s position as positive without substantiating evidence, e.g., calling one’s opinion adult, non-ignorant, modern, etc., or defining the opposite opinion negatively, as ignorant or old-fashioned without demonstrating this or explaining why it is bad.
- B. Interpret all changes as good by referring to them as “evolving” or “growth” or some other generally positive word, though going in the opposite direction could also be called the same thing.
- C. Refer to having standards as “discrimination” and “hate.”
- D. Referring to having no standards as “tolerance.”
- E. Frame changing mind as positive: growth, evolution, moving out of comfort zone. But they never frame their own change this way, or they only frame some change this way.
- F. The position of no standards is more “supportive” and tolerant than the position of standards.
- G. Belief X is old, from decades ago. It’s 2015. So you should believe Y.
- H. They explain inconsistencies as complexity and nuance, and you are too simple if you don’t understand.
- I. In Red china, people were labeled “reactionaries” or “counterrevolutionaries” as a way of compartmentalizing them away, neutralizing their beliefs, and persecuting them.

- J. Women not wearing clothes is “expressing sexuality,” and so is men whistling at women. [Compartmentalization under a phrase.]
- K. What is the effect of naming things the way SJWs do? It simplifies the world by erasing nuance and variability and treating all members of the category the same. People who respond well to such naming desire simplicity and closure.
- L. What is the trick when SJWs automatically reject information etc. when it comes from a labeled source, such as racists or sexists? [They just say “that’s racist,” and they think that is the conclusion of their argument. They don’t get into whether it’s true or not.]
- M. It’s OK for women to “express their sexuality” however they want, but not for men to.

**XVII. Specific points**

**A. Ability vs. willingness**

- 1. What is the response to the accusation that whites steal countries and resources?

**B. Anchoring**

- 1. Very general principal of starting from one extreme or the other and then compromising toward the other side, but different people start from different sides (e.g., freedom vs. safety; too much time vs. too much to do).

**C. Dog that doesn't bark**

- 1. Sometimes what one doesn’t say is as important as what one does say. E.g., Bernie Sanders could call for his supporters to remain peaceful, but he doesn’t. There’s what you should say, and not saying it implicates you. It’s the dog that doesn’t bark.

**D. Divide and conquer**

- 1. The best way to destroy a group is to sow disunity by exploiting existing differences and causing conflict and factioning.

**E. Comparison**

- 1. Also, kids are taught to compare themselves to others, and that they will never be millionaires no matter what they do, so trying and working hard aren’t worth it. Instead they should be taught to compare themselves to themselves, depending on what choices they make.

**XVIII. Accusatory stance**

- A. Make accusations (racism, sexism) with no evidence, then wait on defense, denial, and apology.
- B. This is also a method of silencing.

**XIX. Ad hom flip**

**A. Silencing**

- 1. Tactic: When X criticizes a protected group (e.g., gays, blacks), say the criticism says something bad about X (e.g., gay, hateful). This makes it impossible to criticize the protected group without losing face.
- 2. If someone (e.g., homos) does something extreme (e.g., anal sex), and you point it out, they flip it on you and say you are obsessed with it, and potentially this obsession indicates desire; the goal of all this being to get you not to talk about it.
- 3. CMs often play on pity: if you don’t agree with us, you are a horrible person who does not care about other people; guilt trip.
- 4. Attribute disagreement to “shameful” motives, such as fear, jealousy, or hatred. How does this actually work?

5. For any issue find a group of people toward whom a particular emotion should be felt (e.g., pity, thankfulness) and frame the issue so that not taking the preferred side does not show the appropriate emotion. [What is the mechanism of framing?]
6. I don't want you to disagree with me. I will say it scares me when you disagree with me. You have no right to scare me. Therefore you have no right to disagree with me.
7. In many ways, CMs use victimhood to win an argument. A person's feelings must be spared. It's a moral superiority argument.

**B. Shaming**

1. Along the lines of Matthew the Economist in Champaign-Urbana Occupy, there is a new push for people to vote in other people's interests rather than their own, similar to Lakoff. What are the implications of this? [Also a push for empathy.]

**C. Blame**

1. As part of the general tactic of misattributing the cause of effects, say that racism is due to something other than attributes of blacks, but instead to the attributes of racists, or, more interestingly, an attempt to justify slavery and white supremacy, but especially saying that slavery was the cause of negative attitudes toward blacks, because such attitudes were necessary to justify the treatment of blacks, and thus such attitudes have no basis in characteristics of blacks.
2. If you require a dress code for women, it's because men cannot control themselves. Women therefore have to dress in such a way not to over-excite males.
3. This also plays into how you can't say that women should do things to avoid rape, because only the rapist is to blame for rape. But that doesn't mean certain behaviors don't make it more or less likely, and if you want to avoid rape, you will do those behaviors.

**D. Reverse interpretation**

1. Use of reverse accusations by homosexuals. Analyze how this works.
- E. If one does not see things your way, suggest multiple perspectives, relativity, and open-mindedness, which opens the door to your perspective. If they don't agree with your perspective, they are absolutists, dogmatic, only capable of seeing one side, closed-minded. [Then once they have considered your idea as possible, then close the door again and make your idea absolute.]
- F. Free-for-all attribution of motives to something shameful, but not true, meanwhile misrepresenting their own motives.
- G. Criticism or disbelief is a negative reaction which indicates that something is true. so either believe and it's true, or disbelieve and it's true.
- H. If you point out inconsistencies in their narrative, such as how not allowing whites to have groups on campus, they strawman as if you're saying you're oppressed, and ad hominem by saying you are whining.
- I. Make personal attributions for unpopular positions. [form of ad hominem, now accepted, as are strawman arguments]
- J. Use of reverse accusations by homosexuals. Analyze how this works.
- K. SJWs call people homos or imply that they are homos as an insult and then deny that it's an insult, and your interpretation of it as such is homophobic.
- L. If you call out SJWs, they accuse you of "white fragility." [Ad hominem, attribution.]
- M. Examine the lunacy of gay arguing.

**XX. Fallacies are being validated**

## **A. Ad hominem**

1. I whites/males criticize nonwhites/women, it's delegitimized as privileged, mansplaining, etc. These are ad hominem. If whites/males deny criticisms from nonwhites/women, it is because of white/male fragility. Again, ad hominem. Attribution of white/male position is to white/male pathology, rather than to quality of position.
2. If you are not a woman, lack, or whatever, you cannot speak on issues concerning them (unless they agree with you). Another way of silencing opposing views, a big part of SJWism.
3. You can't speak about someone else's experience.
4. Get into accusations of ignorance or being uninformed, and how this just means people are ignorant of what you believe, assuming one is right without actually demonstrating it, also ad hominem.

## **5. Simplification**

6. Insistence that when someone says X, they really mean Y, thus simplifying the world and bringing what people say within one's purview, and also having more say over what another person says than they do themselves.

## **B. Strawman**

1. If you point out inconsistencies in their narrative, such as how not allowing whites to have groups on campus, they strawman as if you're saying you're oppressed, and ad hominem by saying you are whining.
2. Intentional misunderstanding of one's arguments or misinterpretation of one's words.
3. What is the thing where SJWs feel that they can tell you what you are saying, and if you disagree, they are more right about what you are saying than you are? Insisting on a strawman?
4. Insistence that when someone says X, they really mean Y, thus simplifying the world and bringing what people say within one's purview, and also having more say over what another person says than they do themselves.

## **C. Anecdotal evidence**

1. Does one counter example disprove a theory? Need for percentages.

## **D. Post hoc ergo propter hoc**

1. Every problem is blamed on capitalism in a post hoc ergo propter hoc fashion, with the implication being that getting rid of capitalism will make things better, rather than the problem being based on nature, or the new system actually being worse.
2. Reason for not-X is Y. Reason for black failure is racism, Post hoc ergo propter hoc.

## **E. Shift burden of proof**

1. CMs make a causal statement without evidence, and then when you say it's not true, they require that you prove it. But causal statements are hard to prove, so it's hard to prove that a cause isn't true. However, this is also true of the initial claim of a cause. And it is the person making a claim who has the burden of proof. So back up to getting the CM to prove their causal statement, rather than disputing it.

## **F. Falsifiability**

1. How to deal with claims of institutionalized, systemic racism. Analyze this. What is the Evidence? Is it falsifiable?

## **G. New rationality**

1. SJWs accept ad hominem, strawman, and either-or fallacies as legitimate, also personal experience as decisive.

#### **H. Slipperiness of reason**

1. How to deal with the assertions of absolute rationality and correctness (fundamentalism) of SJWs? They claim infallibility of their positions by asserting they are based on reason, as if reason cannot lead to different results [and as if reason cannot be biased or selectively used]. This provides the same kind of fundamentalist certainty as provided by religion.
2. How to deal with the problem that reason can lead to different, mutually exclusive conclusions, but which then both have the imprimatur of being based on reason and can therefore lead to a fundamentalism?

#### **XXI. Rationalization**

- A. If something goes wrong with a theory, of course it did, it was predictable, expected, though it wouldn't have been predicted ahead of time. (Of course we lost that election.)
- B. If you habitually rationalize one set of beliefs, and get good at it, do you generalize and learn to rationalize other sets of beliefs too?

#### **C. Ad hoc hypotheses**

1. Rationalization by using ad hoc hypotheses to explain black failure in order to protect ideology of racial equality.

#### **D. Defense mechanism**

1. What is the trick when SJWs automatically reject information etc. when it comes from a labeled source, such as racists or sexists? [They just say "that's racist," and they think that is the conclusion of their argument. They don't get into whether it's true or not.]
2. Overall get into how the labeling works and how it is a simplifier of complexity and protects from uncomfortable information.

#### **XXII. CM personality type**

##### **A. Arrogance**

1. How to deal with the assertions of absolute rationality and correctness (fundamentalism) of SJWs? They claim infallibility of their positions by asserting they are based on reason, as if reason cannot lead to different results [and as if reason cannot be biased or selectively used]. This provides the same kind of fundamentalist certainty as provided by religion.
2. Liberals make up new definitions for words and then say you are ignorant when you don't use their new definition.

##### **3. Presumption**

- a. Defining one's position as positive without substantiating evidence, e.g., calling one's opinion adult, non-ignorant, modern, etc., or defining the opposite opinion negatively, as ignorant or old-fashioned without demonstrating this or explaining why it is bad.
- b. Interpret all changes as good by referring to them as "evolving" or "growth" or some other generally positive word, though going in the opposite direction could also be called the same thing.
- c. Get into accusations of ignorance or being uninformed, and how this just means people are ignorant of what you believe, assuming one is right without actually demonstrating it, also ad hominem.

#### **4. Overestimation of self**

- a. How to deal with the assertions of absolute rationality and correctness (fundamentalism) of SJWs? They claim infallibility of their positions by asserting they are based on reason, as if reason cannot lead to different results [and as if reason cannot be biased or selectively used]. This provides the same kind of fundamentalist certainty as provided by religion.

#### **5. Privileged view**

- a. Get into accusations of ignorance or being uninformed, and how this just means people are ignorant of what you believe, assuming one is right without actually demonstrating it, also ad hominem.

#### **6. Being offended**

- a. Something is offensive to me, as if I am the intended audience, when in fact maybe you are not the intended audience and your assumption that you are is the real problem.

### **B. Control**

1. Call for moment of silence as method to control opposition by positioning yourself as the victim if anyone breaks the silence.
2. If you can in any way frame yourself as a victim, you win, but this is only because, a priori, it has been decided that we should sacrifice everything for victims, for the lowly.
3. They are like the hall monitor, or tattletale, or teacher's pet. When did these people get on top? They are supposed to be hated.
4. Focus on issue of control as a motivator. This is part of the attribution tactic. They use the tactic against us; use it against them too.

### **C. Ignorance of what?**

1. Get into accusations of ignorance or being uninformed, and how this just means people are ignorant of what you believe, assuming one is right without actually demonstrating it, also ad hominem.

### **D. Puritanism**

1. SJWs actually do not value freedom of speech, due process, and other Enlightenment values.
2. Making new sins/crimes: cultural appropriation. It's all about control and telling people what they can and cannot do.

### **E. Fundamentalism**

1. SJWs cannot tolerate deviation from their beliefs. This is a fundamentalism. What follows from that?
2. Fact checking
3. How did liberals get the ability to dictate the truth and decide new meanings for words.
4. If you habitually rationalize one set of beliefs, and get good at it, do you generalize and learn to rationalize other sets of beliefs too?

### **F. Collectivism**

1. One root of SJWism is collectivism.

## **XXIII. Focalism**

### **A. Focus on only part of an issue**

1. The trick of critical theory is to focus on the known negatives of the past and present while ignoring the known positives and comparing this to speculated (i.e., unknown) positives of the future while ignoring any speculated negatives.
2. If 10% of something supports your view and 90% opposes it, only mention the 10%, not the 90%. Thus, Donald Trump was a reality show host, while his work as a businessman is left out.
3. If only 10% of the truth supports you, pretend that's 100% of the truth. Trump is a game show host. Richard Spencer's arguments were two shots fired into the crowd.
4. Communists focus on problems of capitalism but not its benefits; meanwhile ignoring all the problems of communism.

**B. Focus on only one side in a conflict**

1. Only sympathize with the perpetrator, but not the victim.
2. Tendency to consider rights of only one side in a conflict rather than the rights of both sides.

**C. Focus only on specific time range**

1. In considering inequality, SJWs often consider only the recent past in showing that those who work make less than those who are idle, whereas if you were to take the whole history of individuals, it would be found that the idle did their work early, while the toilers were idle in their youth.
2. When a black does something, focus on only certain time ranges but not others. So the black was just jaywalking and he was beaten up by a cop. Ignore that he resisted arrest. Focus on slavery and Jim Crow; ignore the black's thoughts right before robbing the liquor store. This is a focus on attribution.

**D. Specific examples**

1. Lots of movies against the Nazis, but not so many against the Soviets [or about Weimar Germany].
2. Marxist notion of surplus labor value [but there is also value added by means of production, as well as value because of social demand]
3. When making changes, think of the pros but not the cons.

**E. Selective focalism**

1. Look into the treatment, framing, and selection of history.

**F. Morality**

1. Only sympathize with the perpetrator, but not the victim.

**G. Focus on some facts, ignore others.**

**H.** What is the effect of naming things the way SJWs do? It simplifies the world by erasing nuance and variability and treating all members of the category the same. People who respond well to such naming desire simplicity and closure.

**I.** How cause and effect is determined to support a conclusion, so ignoring earlier or later events in the chain of events.

**J.** What is the process of specifying a hypothesis or phenomenon and then only looking at instances and ignoring base rates? So, Russia posted ads before the 2016 election, but did they always make ads, not just before the election? Were all the ads political? Were they all in the same direction? Did other countries post ads? Also, Russia hacked the DNC. But did Russia hack other computers? Did other countries hack the DNC? [Icahn sold steel stocks, but also other stocks, right before Trump's steel tariff.]

**XXIV. Double standard**

- A. Use of phrase “express her sexuality” to defend what women do to appeal to men’s sexuality. Once again, fitting a constellation of behaviors under a rubric completely determines how those behaviors are interpreted, in a top-down fashion.
- B. Your opinions are relative; mine are absolute.
- C. Frame changing mind as positive: growth, evolution, moving out of comfort zone. But they never frame their own change this way, or they only frame some change this way.
- D. If a cultural group did not do something, e.g., develop science or agriculture, it’s because they did not want to, not because they were unable.
- E. Women not wearing clothes is “expressing sexuality,” and so is men whistling at women. [Compartmentalization under a phrase.]
- F. Homosexuality occurs in nature; so does rape. [What is the general structure of this argument? Put it in a syllogism. In general taking any argument and structuring it as a syllogism can help you to see the problems in it.]
- G. Consent as some absolute criterion rather than arbitrary like any other criterion or right and wrong.
- H. SJWs are more antiracist than they are antiwar. Suggests Jew control.
- I. When complexly determined behaviors or motivations are described by simple catchphrases, such as “expressing one’s sexuality,” usually the phrase is used to cover up something that if accurately described would be shameful, so the phrase is a form of denial.
- J. It is OK for non-whites to have racial interests and groups because of a history of oppression and underrepresentation. Whites have no interests to advance because they are already overrepresented.
- K. Does the left ever explicitly give an argument for why they oppose free speech? (See hate speech arguments.) They often deny that they oppose free speech. [This implies they know it is wrong to do so, and yet they still do it, without admitting it. So they can have their cake and eat it too.]
- L. Look more into arguments about why white organizations are not allowed on campus.
- M. SJWs justify racism, sexism, and bias in one direction but not in the other. At first white men discriminated. Women and blacks asked for equality. White men acquiesced. But now women and blacks want special treatment. So bias is OK again. They give reasons why only women and blacks can be biased, but white men can disagree with this and give their own reasons why they can be biased too.
- N. Justification of nonwhite groups but no white groups because of history of racism and discrimination, but is this justification sufficient?
- O. Examine issue where blacks etc. can have racial groups, but whites cannot, with the inequality justified by past inequalities.
- P. Groups etc. that favor minority groups are fine but not for majority groups because of “structural inequality.”
- Q. SJWs say they want to make people uncomfortable, but they don’t want people to make them uncomfortable.
- R. General idea that exceptions you make for yourself can also be made by others on their own terms.
- S. It’s OK for women to “express their sexuality” however they want, but not for men to.
- T. Limited morality**

1. If you require a dress code for women, it's because men cannot control themselves. Women therefore have to dress in such a way not to over-excite males.
2. Use of phrase "express her sexuality" to defend what women do to appeal to men's sexuality. Once again, fitting a constellation of behaviors under a rubric completely determines how those behaviors are interpreted, in a top-down fashion.

## **XXV. Racism**

- A. Bad behavior normalized by blacks spreads. [Explain this process.]
- B. Write out process by which blacks cause the lowering of standards in our society.
- C. People who don't have jobs have eight hours of free time each day that others do not have. What do they do with that time?
- D. Make the argument about blacks in the workplace, their mistakes multiplied a millionfold.
- E. Even if we are not equal, it's just that everyone is different. Also, there is more genetic variation within than between races. Plus race is not scientific, just a social construct. This is because we a priori set that bar for the concept too high.
- F. Women and blacks are a threat to free speech.
- G. Blacks can't be racist.
- H. Words, such as "racism," are shortcuts to thought, cognitive miser, cover up difference.
- I. A priori axiom that blacks are good, and everything else must be changed, twisted, interpreted to be consistent with that.
- J. It doesn't matter if something's true or false; what matters is if it's bigoted, racist, whatever. This allows inconvenient facts to be brushed aside. It's a way to inoculate against the truth [with labels].

## **K. Competition**

1. It is OK for non-whites to have racial interests and groups because of a history of oppression and underrepresentation. Whites have no interests to advance because they are already overrepresented.
2. Look more into arguments about why white organizations are not allowed on campus.
3. SJWs justify racism, sexism, and bias in one direction but not in the other. At first white men discriminated. Women and blacks asked for equality. White men acquiesced. But now women and blacks want special treatment. So bias is OK again. They give reasons why only women and blacks can be biased, but white men can disagree with this and give their own reasons why they can be biased too.
4. Justification of nonwhite groups but no white groups because of history of racism and discrimination, but is this justification sufficient?
5. Other groups want to compete against white men, but they don't want white men to compete back. They give all kinds of reasons for this, but at the end of the game, it means white men will be beaten because others were competing against you and you weren't competing back.

## **XXVI. Framing**

- A. Frame your side as a victim, then the other side is abusive if they disagree with you.
- B. A big part of the fight is over what things mean, including words, institutions, places, etc.
- C. Rather than making any kind of full argument, provide a frame of interpretation. How to do this? Put spin on all facts. Use cause and effect to frame, both as motivations behind action, and proposed consequences of action
- D. Look into the treatment, framing, and selection of history.

- E. How to start with a frame and then see everything in terms of that frame, top-down perception.

**XXVII. Construction**

- A. If you want to “construct” a truth (e.g., the races are equal, race does not exist), first say that the truth (e.g., races) are constructed. This is similar to commies saying that all literature is political, so when they interpret literature from a Marxian perspective, it is nothing different than what is already being done. Accuse, then do what you accused.
- B. Social construction of alternative reality, requires unanimity to maintain the illusion.
- C. Editing book about postmodern literature, which says that there is no reality, but rather just linguistic constructions of reality. This means there are no lies or untruths, because there is no reality against which to compare what someone says. So if you want to get away with lying, and lying big, this is the philosophy you want everyone to believe.
- D. People may know something is fallacious, but if they collectively pretend it’s not, it gains the force of validity.
- E. Much of their agenda is to hide reality or not look at it, deny it, or reframe it. Point this out. Find gaps and magnify them.

**XXVIII. Problems caused by SJWism**

- A. CMs teach kids the system is to blame, they can’t succeed, nothing they do will help, and to just give up. This creates failure. Kids should be taught that their future is up to them and depends on their choices and actions when they are young.
- B. Also, kids are taught to compare themselves to others, and that they will never be millionaires no matter what they do, so trying and working hard aren’t worth it. Instead they should be taught to compare themselves to themselves, depending on what choices they make.
- C. The ambiguity of cause and effect allows blacks to make excuses, which prevents them from improving.

**XXIX. Our side**

- A. Find ways to advocate and support mass killers without explicitly calling for mass killing.
- B. How to use narrative to unite white people against coloreds.
- C. Find out what they don’t want said by seeing what they censor. Then say these things in veiled ways in Internet safe spaces. [They indicate their weakness. Use it.]
- D. Ideas can be spread more readily with images, so start working on art.
- E. How do we get whites, who have gone over to the black side (i.e., support them) to come back to our side?
- F. The importance of educating people to our side [that is, in regard to racism].
- G. Find rare truths (57% of blacks have herpes) and spread them. People won’t forget. [Especially if you spread interpretive frameworks.]

**XXX. Claim first and win versus reactionaries**

- A. How did liberals get the ability to dictate the truth and decide new meanings for words.

**XXXI. Communism**

- A. My question: How is communism different from feudalism?

**XXXII. Convenience**

- A. Say that problem X is caused by Y, where Y is something you don’t like and want to do away with. So rape (X) is caused by sex jokes (Y), with no evidence it is, but you don’t like sex jokes, so demonize them with causal claims.

**XXXIII. Diversity**

A. Diversity is the number one cause of conflict and war in the world. Diversity is not a strength. It damages social cohesion and leads to national collapse.

**XXXIV. Equality**

A. Freedom and equality are mutually exclusive.

**XXXV. Expansive definition**

A. For any issue find a group of people toward whom a particular emotion should be felt (e.g., pity, thankfulness) and frame the issue so that not taking the preferred side does not show the appropriate emotion. [What is the mechanism of framing?]

**XXXVI. False linkage**

A. For any issue find a group of people toward whom a particular emotion should be felt (e.g., pity, thankfulness) and frame the issue so that not taking the preferred side does not show the appropriate emotion. [What is the mechanism of framing?]

**XXXVII. Fundamentals**

A. How to deal with the assertions of absolute rationality and correctness (fundamentalism) of SJWs? They claim infallibility of their positions by asserting they are based on reason, as if reason cannot lead to different results [and as if reason cannot be biased or selectively used]. This provides the same kind of fundamentalist certainty as provided by religion.

**XXXVIII. Group tactics**

A. The creation of or focus on outside enemies, such as racists or white men, can lead to cohesiveness within those opposed to it.

**B. Group favoritism**

1. Is it more effective to focus on loving one's own group or hating the other group?
2. Can sports insanity be used to understand groups and help increase intergroup friction?

**XXXIX. Mass effects**

A. Social construction of alternative reality, requires unanimity to maintain the illusion.

**XL. Miscellaneous**

- A. Only the truth of a statement matters. Whether it is racist is irrelevant.
- B. The followers of SJWism are zealots and will do anything to advance their cause, including lying and the use of violence.
- C. The biggest problem isn't blacks; it's the whites who defend them. So what can be done about them?
- D. If a comparison is unfavorable, change the object of comparison to something else.

**XLI. Opposite of truth**

A. Diversity is the number one cause of conflict and war in the world. Diversity is not a strength. It damages social cohesion and leads to national collapse.

**XLII. Being offended as a winning position**