Some of you may remember my last article, 'post-imperialism, a template for a new social order', where I described a utopian society. It discussed ideas of community, values, the quest for truth and objective reality. The present article does almost the opposite, it describes the current state of our society and where it is probably heading. More specifically, I will focus on the emergence and predominance of 'organized' minorities, be they homosexuals, atheists, migrants, pagans, modern art enthusiasts, vegetarians, LGBT advocates, you name it.

The list is long and keeps getting longer, as if we had entered an age of the race for victim-hood. Most of those minorities consider themselves as 'Social justice warriors' or SJWs. I’ll try to explain how SJWs ended up imposing their vision of the world on the majority and where this raging proselytism displayed by SJWs comes from.

Many terms have been used to describe the dystopian world in which we find ourselves: materialist, scientist, atheist, individualistic, rationalist, consumerist. They all are valid descriptions, although they only address one of the facets of our global society.
Recently some thinkers attempted to give a more extensive assessment of our society and described it as nihilistic, relativist, post-modern. What those three terms have in common is that they make the claim that there can be no objective truth, no objective meaning and no objective moral values.

But when you observe the vehement proselytism displayed by ‘acting’ minorities, it seems that they strongly believe they hold truth and they are very willing to fight for it. How can this be in a nihilistic/relativist/postmodern society, where there is no truth, no future and no goal?

Along with tracking the fundamental causes and origins of the fervor and proselytism displayed by ‘dominant’ minorities, I'll try to describe the current dynamics and show that they go way beyond 'nihilism'. That's why I use the term 'post-nihilism' to account for the society that emerges after the transitory 'nihilistic' phase.

From oppressed minorities to oppressing minorities

In previous articles I described how the fundamentals of our society have been systematically undermined: beauty and art, gender and identity, nations, family, religions... In all of those fields we see the same process at work.

It all starts with concerns about a minority: homosexuals, atheists, migrants, pagans, modern art enthusiasts,... and, most of the time, there's truth in those concerns: yes, heretics were persecuted, women were oppressed, non-classical art was forbidden, homosexuals were persecuted, single mothers were ostracized.

Then, the past abuses that the minority was subjected to are widely publicized and often exaggerated by the media, by academics and in education programs. The following survey perfectly illustrates this point.

![Perceived homophobia VS. actual homophobia](image)

The IPSOS Mori institute tested 27,000 subjects across the world. The question was: what percentage of people do you think said they personally believe that homosexuality is morally unacceptable?

The results showed that people grossly overestimated the negative perception of homosexuality. For example in the Netherlands the actual intolerance level is very low: 5%, however it was estimated to be 36%.
What does this mean? First, homophobia seems to be largely a thing of the past. Second, the 31% discrepancy is the direct result of an inflated and illusory homophobia conveyed by the media and LGBT movements. Third, and most importantly, the seed of guilt has been successfully planted in the public's mind. Like in the 'Jack and the beanstalk' fairy tale, this seed will grow tremendously, but unlike the 18th century tale's happy outcome, it won't lead to the discovery of great riches, quite the opposite most probably.

This artificially inflated oppression is the foundation for ascribing victim status to the minority and sending the majority on a memorable guilt trip. Interestingly, the survey above shows that the most LGBT-tolerant countries show the highest discrepancy. This correlation suggests that it is indeed the perceived oppression that enables the implementation of measures to 'protect' the oppressed minority. The more guilt is felt by a country, the more likely a minority is to get excessive rights and eventually unwarranted privileges.

When the victim status is firmly established in people's minds, society is ripe for the equality agenda, be it gay marriage for oppressed homosexuals, secularism for oppressed atheists, modern art museums for oppressed modern 'art' enthusiasts, no-meat restaurants for oppressed vegetarians, etc.

So far it's all fair and square, but here's the rub; once equality is reached, the claims from the minority don't stop. Equality is obviously not an end but rather a convenient politically-correct step. The claims made by the acting minorities continue because the influential spheres (academics media, education system) keep over-inflating the perceived oppression, but there is also a deeper and darker factor. The 'oppressed' minority feel entitled to obtain direct reparation and in their drive to see 'justice' done, the oppressed becomes the oppressor.

'Social Justice Warrior' combines two rather mutually exclusive terms: 'war' and 'justice'. War is the victor's justice, not justice. The fundamental role of justice is to intervene as a third party between two involved parties (the oppressor and the oppressed). Justice punishes the oppressor, not in order to sanction a past event but in order to preserve the future. No one punishes wrongdoers putting his mind on what they did and for the sake of this - that they did wrong not unless he is taking mindless vengeance, like a savage brute. One who undertakes to punish rationally does not do so for the sake of the wrongdoing, which is now in the past - but for the sake of the future, that the wrongdoing shall not be repeated, either by him or by others who see him or by others who see him punished.

- Plato, Protagoras, 324 a - b
Those lines were written more than 2,000 years ago and they still held true, until recently. This is the very purpose of the **rule of law**, which is the foundation of Western civilization.

Notice, that while the rule of law is a very appealing principle its application has become more and more arbitrary, as illustrated by the numerous unsanctioned breaches of international law and the double standards often displayed by courts (whether you're part of the elites or the masses).

In any case, without a proper justice, without rule of law, we go back to the era of feuds and vendettas, when the world was dominated by an inextinguishable thirst for vengeance and the law of the strongest prevailed. That was the era of endless punitive wars, the law of Talion.

**So embracing the idea that the oppressed are entitled to become the oppressor is an immensely regressive and dangerous idea that turns the clock back on civilization.**

One of the first templates for this 'victim reversal dynamic' was established by some leaders of the Jewish community (not by the Jewish community as a whole). It became a very successful victim-hood operation, so successful that the **Holocaust reached sanctity status and became a cult**, albeit a secular one:

The religion of "the Holocaust" is a secular one: it belongs to the lay world; it is profane; in actuality, it has at its disposal the secular arm, that is a temporal authority with dreaded power. It has its dogma, its commandments, its decrees, its prophets and its high priests. As one revisionist has observed, it has its circle of saints, male and female, amongst whom, for example, Saint Anne (Frank), Saint Simon (Wiesenthal) and Saint Elie (Wiesel). It has its holy places, its rituals and its pilgrimages. It has its sacred (and macabre) buildings and its relics (in the form of cakes of soap, shoes, toothbrushes, ...). It has its martyrs, its heroes, its miracles and its miraculous survivors (in the millions), its golden legend and its righteous ones. Auschwitz is its Golgotha. For it, God is called Yahweh, protector of his chosen people.
~ R. Faurisson, The Secular Religion of ‘the Holocaust’: a Tainted Product of Consumer Society

In the end the sanctified holocaust is used to justify the oppression meted out by Israel. Notice the slip though. If you are against Zionism or Israel you're labeled an anti-semit. Similarly, when you criticize the proselytism of pro-LGBT organizations, you’re called homophobic, or when you criticize Soros-sponsored mass migrations of foreigners into an alien culture, you're a racist.

But the groups oppressed in the past (Jews, foreigners, homosexuals) are not the same as the political organizations (Zionists, Sorors funded pro-migrant organizations, pro-LGBT organizations) that are becoming the oppressors today. In order to reconcile this fundamental difference, an abusive amalgamation is necessary (anti-Zionism = antisemitism, anti LGBT = homophobic, anti mass-migration = racism). Notice the time slip too. Who among us was there during the concentration camps, the homophobic campaigns, the KKK rampages? If we were not there, how can we be held accountable?

For this unjustified accountability to take form, one more gross amalgamation is necessary: guilt by association. In the 40s some white individuals persecuted minorities and, since you are somehow related to them (via ethnicity, nationality, sex), you are therefore guilty. The logical flaw in the above reasoning is obvious, but when emotions are high enough (particularly guilt and shame), logic becomes irrelevant.

This process is not new, let’s have a poetry interlude and read this beautiful poem, first published in 1668:

**The lamb and the wolf**

A lamb her thirst was slaking
Once at a mountain rill.
A hungry wolf was taking
His hunt for sheep to kill,
When, spying on the streamlet's brink
This sheep of tender age,
The above was written almost four centuries ago. Some things have not changed much since then. The wolf invoked justice for an imaginary past oppression, but justice was just an excuse to commit an atrocity. In a similar way today, equality or justice are not the actual goals but pretexts.

But if it was never really about postmodernism or nihilism, why has there been such a fuss in the intellectual milieu around those 'philosophical' movements? The answer is simple: you can't get rid of the old society overnight. Culture is deeply ingrained in people's minds, if only because it is known territory, and because people are attached to family, religion, sex duality, art and so on.

Imagine someone one century ago wandering around and claiming that homosexuals should have the right to adopt children, that religions should be terminated, that families are oppression, that art is a turd in a can (and a pricey one)... such a person would have been dispatched to the nearest psychiatric ward.
Social justice or social injustice?

Social engineers had to proceed gradually. A **first step was to plant in people's mind the seed of relativism**: religion equals atheism, heterosexuality equals homosexuality, female equals male, parents having a child equals an individual buying a child, etc.

After equality for the acting minorities was reached, privileges emerged: over-representation of minorities in power positions (media, politics), overtly positive media coverage of the minorities, minority laws, open proselytism, *positive* segregation, *positive* discrimination and reverse discrimination, along with a never-ending denigration and weakening of 'traditional' values.

At this pace, it will soon be illegal to own a proper piece of art, people will be committed for heterosexuality, it will be heresy to consider that the planet is round, people will be jailed for racism because they support their country, meat products will be scarce and heavily taxed, tobacco will be banned, and of course pedophilia will be the hype of tomorrow, like homosexuality is the hype of today.

So, how can we explain the sudden and massive emergence of the SJWs and those acting minorities with their attached flavor of proselytism, entitlement, aggression and even rage? What changes in our world and our minds can account for this **sudden unexpected shift**?
The hyper-narcissistic generation

'It is forbidden to forbid'

The revolution of the sixties created a society where everything was allowed. It was suddenly 'forbidden to forbid' (the slogan of the May 1968 revolt in France). This was naively believed to be the pathway to freedom.

But freedom is not about doing whatever you want, quite the contrary. Without rules, without boundaries, it seems that, more often than not, people regress to the infantile state that lies just below the surface of every adult, where he's the slave of his pettiest impulses, while, on a collective level, society regresses to barbarism where the weakest becomes the slave of the strongest.

The millennials are the first generation to be raised by parents who were born after the 'sexual revolution'. These parents embraced the 'hippie' culture and said 'yes' to everything their children asked. They did so because of the prevalent permissive environment but also because of narcissistic motives: they didn't want to be perceived negatively by their children, the parents' narcissistic image mattered more than the mental health of their children.
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Prevalence of single parent family

When the diabetic child asked for candy, the parents said 'yes' so that the child would love them, which was more important than the negative health impact on the child. Long gone was the old saying 'If your children don't tell you they hate you at least once a day, you aren't doing your job as a parent'.

FIGURE 10. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN UNDER AGE 18 LIVING WITH A SINGLE PARENT, BY YEAR, UNITED STATES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th>Whites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is also a financial factor that explained the narcissistic drift seen among the offspring of the hippie generation (millennials). Most people who embraced the 'hippie' culture were wealthy enough, they didn't have to spend 8 hours daily at a factory to pay the bills. This relative material affluence enabled them to say **yes to everything, including their children's material demands.**

In traditional families, the mother nurtures and the father sets boundaries. But we now live in a **fatherless society.** In the **US, since the 90s, a majority of children are raised by single parents.** In **more than 80%** of those cases, the single parent is the mother. You read that right, **being raised by your father and your mother is now the exception.**

To illustrate the influence of upbringing on the proclivities towards embracing authoritarian views, here is an excerpt of an article titled 'Who goes Nazi', written in 1941 by one of the most acclaimed journalists of the time: I think young D over there is the only born Nazi in the room. Young D is the **spoiled only son of a doting mother. He has never been crossed in his life.** He spends his time at the game of seeing what he can get away with. He is constantly arrested for speeding and his mother pays the fines. He has been ruthless towards two wives and his mother pays the alimony. **His life is spent in sensation-seeking and theatricality. He is utterly inconsiderate of everybody.** He is very good-looking, in a vacuous, cavalier way, and inordinately vain. He would certainly fancy himself in a uniform that gave him a chance to swagger and lord it over others.

- Dorothy Thomson

Even for those few children raised by their mother and their father, the latter nowadays rarely plays the role of the traditional authority figure. In many households across the West, the source of a father's legitimacy - the ability to feed the household through labor - has been **destroyed by increasing unemployment rates.**

![I don't need you, I have Internet](image)

In the past, if parents failed to set boundaries for children, other social interactions with peers, members of the community and neighbors could, at least partly, compensate for the parent's complacency. But, for millennials, the **internet has largely replaced real social interactions** and their attached notions of responsibility, consistency and honesty.
In the internet age, you can be as narcissistic as you want, and if some internet user points out your mistakes, you just move to another chatroom or forum where users share the same (often erroneous) beliefs as yours.

Not surprisingly, today most social justice hot spots are universities, a place where the poorest social groups are seldom represented. This generation - we might call it the 'lost generation' - is maturing and reaching the age of increased social and political power. These are the people who will shape our future society; they are the leaders of tomorrow.

This generation rejects otherness. Real diversity is their enemy because of two factors:

- the others, with their differences, offer different views and ideas that have the potential to shake the fragile foundations of the exoskeleton (see next chapters) built upon external authorities and therefore conditioned by external factors. From this perspective others are existential threats, putting the very identity of the individual in jeopardy.
- the others, in their otherness, have the potential to hold different opinions and therefore say 'no', which, in a very real sense, means suffering for the narcissistic individuals whose permissive environment taught him to equate validation of his whims as pleasure and disagreement with them as suffering.

Now, how can we reconcile the rejection of otherness with the numerous claims of SJWs about diversity and multiculturalism? Well, beyond those appealing words, what do the facts show? The 'diversity' SJWs call for is diversity of shallowness: appearances, sexual orientation, pronouns... while they support the erasing of biological differences (whether sex, race, handicap) and cultural differences (moral values, religions, etc).

Another paradox is that while SJWs call for diversity, tolerance and equality, they appear as broadly intolerant. You're free to have whatever gender you want, and as many piercings as you like, but you can not think differently, much less oppose SJW ideology.

In the SJW world the only freedom you have is to agree with their vision of the world while getting rid of your biological and cultural identity.

The SJW ideology doesn't pursue equality of rights (where all individuals are
different but have the same rights), it pursues sameness, because they perceive differences as the root of oppression. Therefore to stop oppression and re-institute equality/justice, differences must be abolished.

If, as a 'normal' individual, you want to be a fully recognized as a citizen of the SJW's 'brave new world', you must first implement some major 'improvements': get sex-change surgery, cut off one of your legs, die your hair purple, cover your body with tattoos, and shove a crucifix up your backside.

The cult of the ego, narcissistic implosion

Because emotions have become stronger than reason and self-interest has overpowered common interest, today's minorities live in permanent denial of reality (the existence of truth, objective reality, male/female duality), which they have replaced with their subjective take on it.

In this sense not only have they 'killed god' but they now sit on his throne, each individual holding and imposing his own 'truth', his own 'reality'. I am reminded of this striking dialogue:

"How can one lose one's soul?"
"By sinning against one's soul."

"By a sensual life?"
"Oh no, in most cases that is a sin against one's body. You may suffer for it in this life or in some future incarnation."

"By treating others badly, then?"
"No, as a rule, even this is no sin against your soul. You will get your punishment for treating others badly in this or some future incarnation, although wanton cruelty to defenseless creatures, ratlike ingratitude, or an innate tendency to spy on others already reveal a certain degree of soullessness which may be due to sins committed against one's soul in former incarnations."

"Well, then, what is a sin against one's soul?"
"Using spiritual things for selfish purposes. Dragging God down to earth. Trying to put oneself on a level with the Creator."

- Theodore Ilion, Darkness over Tibet

The rampant narcissism we see all around us today has led to a narrowing focus on the self at the expense of others and the communities in which we live.

Indeed, before the 'modern era', individuals lived in highly integrated systems. They were part of nature (see animism), part of humanity (treat others as brothers), part of creation (son of God), part of a legal system (citizen), part of a transcendent system (God, heaven, Earth, hell), and part of a moral system (good, bad). Individuals had a deep respect for the past (cult of the ancestors) and a strong concern for the future (working hard to give a better future to children).
All these **essential bonds that gave the individual his identity and meaning on social, natural, theological levels have been severed.** The self has been isolated, dissociated from its environment.

Nature is denied. For the gender theorist, a human being is born free of any natural predetermination, including their sex. Humanity is demonized (the other is a source of oppression), rules and norms are rejected as oppressive, morality is denied because there’s no more common good since every event is analyzed only from a selfish and subjective point of view.

This narcissistic implosion has even led to a dissociation between the self and the body. Remember the 1968 slogan *my body belongs to me*, i.e. I can do whatever I want with my body?

In past times, the Church proposed a soul/body duality where both were supposed to live in harmony. Today that has been replaced by a self/body duality (an idea initiated by Locke and Descartes) **where the body is not the medium for incarnation but an object that can be freely used and abused** (see for example the latest craze for piercings, scarifying, tattoos and also the growing importance of transhumanism).

In the past the male/female duality was epitomized in **sexuality where the man and the woman met and experienced pleasure and procreation.** Then sexual pleasure and procreating were dissociated through contraception.

In the past, masturbation was a poor sexual alternative for 'real sex'. Today, the cult of the self and the narcissistic implosion have led to a growing number of individuals stating that they *prefer* porn masturbation over real intercourse. This has given rise to yet another 'sexual orientation': **pornosexual.** The **skyrocketing sales** of sex toys is another indicator of sexual activity becoming an solo 'past-time'.

A single 'parent' can buy children through **in vitro** reproduction, making true one of the ultimate narcissistic fantasies: self-engendering. Soon, for an extra fee, a 'parent' will be able to **tweak the genetics** of the child and customize him/her like a car. The process, called **germlining,** is already used to genetically screen human fetuses for 'diseases'.

Along with the **narrowing of focus from the individual as an integral part of**
the Cosmos to the isolated individual self, we witness a narrowing of
time from the past-present-future continuum towards the present
moment only. Today, elders are forgotten in nursing homes while people live on
credit, 'trading in tomorrow for today' in order to satisfy transient desires of the
present moment.

Ever younger people opt for plastic surgery to conform to some esthetic 'ideals' while
compromising their future appearance (64,000 cosmetic surgery patients in 2014
were aged 13-19). We've entered the dreadful times of speed dating, programmed
obsolescence, fast food, drone delivery, instant messaging, real time news feed, learn
a language in one day, lose 20 pounds in one week, etc.

Without past and future, there's no more hope, no more historical perspective, no
more learning from past mistakes, no more long-term planning. There are no more
regrets, remorse or responsibility, no more historical pattern recognition. The
individual falls into the meaningless void of the ubiquitous present moment.

However, not all millennials are experiencing this narcissistic implosion; not all
millenials are staunch SJWs, so the generational factor can't be the only cause for the
rise of SJWs.

Is there any fundamental difference between those who accept, and
vehemently enforce, the authorities' views and those who reject them?

Authoritarianism

This excerpt sheds an interesting light on the above question:

May the reader please imagine a very large hall in an old Gothic university building.
Many of us gathered there early in our studies in order to listen to the lectures of
outstanding philosophers and scientists. We were herded back there - under threat -
the year before graduation in order to listen to the indoctrination lectures which
recently had been introduced. Someone nobody knew appeared behind the lectern
and informed us that he would now be the professor. His speech was fluent, but there
was nothing scientific about it: he failed to distinguish between scientific and
ordinary concepts and treated borderline imaginings as though it were wisdom that
could not be doubted. For ninety minutes each week, he flooded us with naive,
presumptuous paralogistics and a pathological view of human reality. We were
treated with contempt and poorly controlled hatred. Since fun-poking could entail
dreadful consequences, we had to listen attentively and with the utmost gravity.

The grapevine soon discovered this person's origins. He had come from a Cracow
suburb and attended high school, although no one knew if he had graduated.
Anyway, this was the first time he had crossed university portals, and as a professor,
at that! "You can't convince anyone this way!" we whispered to each other. "It's
actually propaganda directed against themselves."

But after such mind-torture, it took a long time for someone to break the silence. We
studied ourselves, since we felt something strange had taken over our minds and
something valuable was leaking away irretrievably. The world of psychological reality
and moral values seemed suspended as if in a chilly fog. Our human feeling and
student solidarity lost their meaning, as did patriotism and our old established criteria.

So we asked each other, "are you going through this too"? Each of us experienced this worry about his own personality and future in his own way. Some of us answered the questions with silence. The depth of these experiences turned out to be different for each individual. We thus wondered how to protect ourselves from the results of this "indoctrination".

Teresa D. made the first suggestion: Let’s spend a weekend in the mountains. It worked. Pleasant company, a bit of joking, then exhaustion followed by deep sleep in a shelter, and our human personalities returned, albeit with a certain remnant. Time also proved to create a kind of psychological immunity, although not with everyone.

Analyzing the psychopathic characteristics of the "professor's" personality proved another excellent way of protecting one's own psychological hygiene. You can just imagine our worry, disappointment, and surprise when some colleagues we knew well suddenly began to change their world view; their thought-patterns furthermore reminded us of the "professor's" chatter. Their feelings, which had just recently been friendly, became noticeably cooler, although not yet hostile. Benevolent or critical student arguments bounced right off them. They gave the impression of possessing some secret knowledge; we were only their former colleagues, still believing what those "professors of old" had taught us. We had to be careful of what we said to them. These former colleagues soon joined the Party. Who were they, what social groups did they come from, what kind of students and people were they? How and why did they change so much in less than a year? Why did neither I nor a majority of my fellow students succumb to this phenomenon and process?

~ A. Lobaczewski, Political Ponerology

The process described above is very similar to what retired Professor of Psychology at the University of Manitoba Bob Altemeyer studied for decades. Time and time again, he noticed the same surprising results.

Through the use of questionnaires and scales, he discovered a subgroup consistently exhibiting a high degree of adherence to the traditions and social norms that are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities, and a belief that others in one’s society should also be required to adhere to these norms.

Specifically this subgroup of subjects rated consistently high for the three following items:

1. **Authoritarian submission** — a high degree of submissiveness to the authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives.
2. **Conventionalism** -- a high degree of adherence to the traditions and social norms that are perceived to be endorsed by society and its established
authorities, and a belief that others in one's society should also be required to adhere to these norms.

3. **Authoritarian aggression** — a general aggressiveness directed against deviants, outgroups, and other people that are perceived to be targets according to established authorities.

Altemeyer coined the term 'authoritarian followers' for individuals who rated high for the three variables above.

Notice in particular the third variable: authoritarian aggression. The followers not only follow the authorities but they are also the prime enforcers of the established order. They are prone to submit to authorities but also to display aggressiveness towards those who oppose their views.

**Authoritarian followers are not intrinsically good or bad.** They just conform and enforce the established order. If the established order is good, they will be a force for good; if the established order is bad, they will be a force for bad.

Altemeyer discovered authoritarian personalities decades ago and initially called them 'Right Wing Authoritarians' (RWA), probably because at the time the dominant authority was right-wing and therefore it was the ideology that appealed to authoritarians at the time. Further down the road, Altemeyer discovered that there were also **Left Wing Authoritarians** (LWA).

**What matters is not the meaning of the ideology but its predominance.** Yesterday it was right-wing conservatism, today it is left-wing liberalism.

Because what matters for authoritarians is not so much the substance of the ideology (the ideas and values it defends) but its predominance and legitimacy, they can embrace with the same ease the oppressing majority of yesterday as they embrace the oppressing minority of today. You may find the same authoritarian personality harassing homosexuals in the 1980s (when homophobia was more prevalent) and
harassing heterosexuals tomorrow, because it’s the new dominating doctrine.

The **authoritarians didn't change their minds**, they've always supported the dominating authorities. The only thing that changed is that in the past the dominating ideology was conservatism and today it is 'liberalism'.

That probably explains why, around the 1990s, Altemeyer started to notice a drop in the percentage of RWAs relative to the total number of subjects. He explains this unexpected trend by the fact that he was becoming famous on campus and students were trying to hide their authoritarianism when filling the questionnaires. Another explanation is that in the 1990s the dominant ideology was shifting towards the liberal left, thus the RWA population was shrinking while the LWA population was rising.

**Exoskeleton or endoskeleton**

Altemeyer dedicated a lot of time and energy to understanding what makes someone an authoritarian. While he discovered several **causative factors** like upbringing, genetics, level of education and having children, he never managed to nail the core reason.

Attempting to understand the cause of this fundamental difference, **Andrew Bard Schmookler** came up with the idea of moral endoskeleton vs moral exoskeleton. It was a student of mine (in an adult education class about "America's Moral Crisis") who came up with the apt image. It didn't matter much to her, she said, whether her society has a lot of enforced rules. **She's got her moral beliefs firmly inside her - a kind of endo-skeleton**, she said.

It becomes clear why such people - with intense moral concerns combined with a reliance on external moral structures to keep one's own forbidden impulses in check - would support a state that enforces moral rules and a social culture that stigmatizes those who violate those rules. It really is a threat to them - a threat to their own inner moral order - when the society around them fails to be clear in its rules and strict in its enforcement. **For one whose moral structure is cast in that exo-skeleton form, the absence of external moral authority seems necessarily to imply the outbreak of moral anarchy.**

The above is particularly interesting if we connect it to the very origin of today's minority proselytism, particularly LGBT advocacy. Gender theory derives directly from **egalitarian feminism**. The basic idea being that, if there is no more sex (male/female duality), there can't be any more sex inequality.

Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir
Two pioneers of this ideology were Jean Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir. Jean-Paul Sartre, the father of existentialism, developed his 'being-for-others' theory based on one fundamental idea: the identity of an individual is solely based on how others perceive him.

It doesn't end there, and Sartre adds a rather negative spin to this idea when he states that the "Jews exist as such only because of the way they are perceived by anti-semitic people."

De Beauvoir didn't develop her feminist ideas in a vacuum; she just applied Sartre's theory to women. In The Second Sex, she states that, "One is not born a woman, one becomes one," and explains that femininity is nothing but a condition imposed by masculine eyes."

Like all convincing lies, Sartre starts with a grain of truth: others do have an influence on how we perceive ourselves. But it would be a lie to claim that it is the only factor. Can you see some striking similarities between Sartre's idea and the authoritarian/exoskeleton personality where the individual's inner landscape is defined by external factors? No wonder those ideas resonated with people, particularly authoritarian follower types. Sartre also lies when he states that external influences can only be negative. How many times has an external factor - a good father, mother, friend, teacher etc. - had a positive influence on us? For Sartre and De Beauvoir, such events never happen. Through a gross generalization of their own negative projections, they deemed all external influences as oppressive.

Those two 'great thinkers' of the 20th century encouraged people to believe that, in the name of freedom (freedom to be whoever you want to be: a man, a woman, a squirrel), you are entitled to deny any immanent truth (the man/woman duality for example), and reject others as the source of oppression, imposing on you an identity that is not yours. If we apply those two principles to the letter, we will end up in a totally narcissistic bubble ruled by fear, hate and blatant lies.

Do you see the fundamental paradox at the core of the existentialist authorities: you’re a supposed to reject any external authority because it is a source of oppression, but Sartre and De Beauvoir are external sources of authority, so shall we reject them too?

At this point, we’ve established some correlation between authoritarian followers and moral exoskeleton, non-authoritarian followers and moral endoskeleton. The next logical question is: from whence came this moral endoskeleton/exoskeleton?

'Young' souls and 'old' souls?

There is certainly a myriad of factors influencing our moral compass (nutrition, genetics, pollution, education, cultural background, childhood experiences, traumas etc). In this section I will address the following question: could our moral compass be an emanation of the soul, the conscience?
Samsara, the buddhist cycle of reincarnation and its six realms

Since some people are authoritarians while others are not, does this mean that some people have a different 'soul' quality? According to several Eastern traditions, souls experience incarnations and follow an evolutionary process, for example incarnating in animals precedes incarnating in humans. It’s a bit like Darwin's evolution of the species theory applied to souls.

Taking this idea of 'young' souls and 'old' souls, some souls could be said to be new to human incarnation, with others having gone through a number of human incarnations.

Of course, this is only speculation, nobody can prove or disprove the existence of the soul. Nonetheless this hypothesis puts an interesting light on some phenomena that have puzzled me for years.

Let’s focus on four modern minorities: flat-earthers, vegetarians, gender fluidity advocates (pro-LGBT), and atheists.

How would a newly incarnated individual perceive the world? Fresh out of the animal kingdom, would he tend to see the world in 2 dimensions (flat earth) while someone more accustomed to the human realm would see the world naturally in 3 dimensions (round earth)?

Would a newly incarnated individual be reluctant to eat the creatures that in his most recent incarnations were his 'brothers' (vegetarians), while an individual with more 'history' as a human see no problem in eating the meat of animals?

Would an individual newly incarnated as a human see gender as a fluid arbitrary concept, while an 'old soul' - having spent numerous human incarnations as the same gender - have developed a very strong gender orientation?

Is it possible that young souls would reject the idea of god and life after death because they, unaccustomed to the reincarnation process, believe there is no life after death, while old souls - having repeatedly experienced that their body is only a temporary vehicle - have an innate 'knowing' that they will survive the body's inevitable death?
This speculation sheds a very different light on those heated discussions you've probably witnessed (or had!). Consider the flat earthers who are totally convinced that the earth is flat, the vegetarians who religiously believe that eating meat is murder (cannibalism?), the individuals who change their sexual orientation as easily as you change t-shirts, and the atheists who are so totally convinced that there is no life after death.

**What if what they believe is completely true, but only for them?** What if that’s truly the way they perceive reality? What if it is a genuine reflection of their own 'young soul' condition?

But aren't we 'all born equal'? Yes, in one sense, but perhaps not in some fundamental respects.

**Hystericization by psychopaths in power**

At this point, we understand better how nurture factors (pampered millennials) and nature factors (moral endoskeleton) have led to a situation where a whole generation is ripe for being manipulated into a narcissistic frenzy aimed at very wrong targets.

Psychopaths in power hate what makes us human, they hate genuine love, a sense of belonging, beauty, spirituality, transcendence... because they can not access those higher spheres. So maybe they don't 'hate' those things, but rather are completely indifferent to them, which would probably produce a similar result.

Psychopaths in positions of power attempt to impose on us an anti-moral vision of the world, where hate, violence, murder and lies are the new 'positive' values. To do so they rely heavily on a controlled media who praise this dark vision of the world along with scientists and experts who back up this paradigm with dodgy papers.

But the influence of the media and 'experts' is not enough to make people accept the morally unacceptable. So the psychopathic elite also rely on the narcissistic and/or authoritarian part of the population to support and enforce their views.

According to Altemeyer the three psychological traits that are the most **prevalent among authoritarians** are **fear**, **self-righteousness** and **faulty logic**.

Coincidentally the whole manipulation campaign led by the elite through the SJWs is based on those very principles:

- fear, of the oppressors who threaten our life
- self-righteousness, where the SJW are made to believe they fight for justice
- faulty logic because of the huge chasm between reality and the way SJWs are made too see it.

This ponerizing process didn't grow linearly, but went through several plateaus and sudden bursts. During the 1990s, the postmodern/nihilistic concepts that had been around in academic circles for years was widely disseminated in all branches of society. **Millenials represent the first generation to have been subjected from birth to this psychopathic vision of the world.**
In addition to academia, psychopaths have infiltrated other key sectors of our society (media, justice, politics), and have slowly infused them with their twisted vision of the world.

This is what we are witnessing today: **psychopaths in power hystericising hordes of narcissistic individuals to engage in a destructive rampage in the name of social justice**. The millenial generation just need the authorities to determine the next fashionable scapegoat onto which they can express their narcissistic rage.

Notice that this hystericising atmosphere works not only on SJWs but also on the those that oppose them. The latter end up throwing the proverbial baby out with the bathwater and today we witness anti-Zionists denying the reality of the holocaust, anti-LGBTers denying that homophobia was ever a real problem, anti-feminists claiming that women have never been oppressed, etc.

**When the two camps are highly hystericized and hold such extreme, subjective and antagonist views**, the planet is ripe for major conflicts.

BBC presenter Savile was alleged to have been involved in 589 cases of pedophilia.

With the support of hystericized authoritarians, psychopaths in power attempt to make us normalize deviancy and accept the unacceptable. Pedophilia is, of course, part of the agenda. And it has been so for a long time. Think about it: the tangible differences between a man and a woman are greater than the tangible differences between a 14 year old and an 18 year old.

If they manage to brainwash the masses to the point that they believe the male/female duality is just a social construct, imagine how easy it will be to blur the line between a 18 year old and a 14 year old and, subsequently to enact a law that reduces the age of sexual majority, i.e. legalize pedophilia.

And **this abomination will be promoted in the name of equality** (everybody has the right to express their sexuality, even towards children), **love** (which is stronger than anything, including artificial age barriers), **and freedom** (sexual freedom).

The normalization of pedophilia is already under way through the very same tactics described above (the victimization of a minority). And it is not an obscure pro-
pedophile website that holds this view but the very respectable and, incidentally, institutional nest of pedophiles, also known as the BBC:

The British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) is playing with fire by allowing an anonymous author to publish articles on its platform that aim to minimize the utter depravity of pedophilia [...] the BBC seems to agree with this author that pedophilia isn't necessarily a disorder to be treated with disdain, but rather a sexual orientation like homosexuality that simply requires "help."

Such views held and promoted by the establishment media have been nurtured and promoted for decades by schizoid and psychopathic 'thinkers'.

The above mentioned Sartre and De Beauvoir couple along with Derida, Foucault and Deleuze created what is known as the French theory, which laid the foundations of postmodernism. Yes, France brought stinky cheese to the world, and a theory that is even stinkier.

I am tempted to suggest the following possible sequence of events:

Existentialism/postmodernism >>> there's no truth, no difference, no morality >>> we are free to choose any sexual orientation and sexual identity >>> normalization of pedophilia.

Of course, this is only speculation. Sure, if the founders of the existentialist/postmodernist 'philosophy' had been openly advocating pedophilia, it would be a more convincing case, but such intelligent and honored individuals would never do such a thing, right?

WRONG. Each one of the five preeminent Western 'thinkers' of the 20th century mentioned above took official positions defending pedophilia. In 1971, they signed a manifesto protesting the sentence given to 3 men who abused children as young as 13 years old.

But maybe their promotion of pedophilia was just an aberration, or taken out of context? Not at all. Six years after their first manifesto later, in 1977, they signed a manifesto to drop the age of consent to 13 years old.

Sartre and De Beauvoir not only talked the talk, they also walked the walk. ...this supposedly high-minded duo [acted] as serial seducers bent on their own gratification and as a couple who used their apparently lofty philosophy as a springboard to excuse their multiple liaisons, often with under-age teenagers who were broken by the experience.

- Carole Seymour-Jones, A Dangerous Liaison
Sartre famously said: 'hell is the other people'. I doubt that 'hell is other people', but I'm pretty sure that Sartre and De Beauvoir were hell for other people, especially teenagers.

At this point we understand better how under the guise of political correctness (equality, justice, freedom), psychopaths in power hystericize the masses in general, and authoritarians in particular, in order to further their nefarious agendas, including the normalization of pedophilia.
To better hystericize their targets, psychopaths use various tools: deception, lies, fear, and self-righteousness, as described above. Their wishful thinking and self-aggrandizement having no limit, they’ve also started playing a very dangerous game that seems to have inadvertently opened a Pandora's box.

Archetypes are powerful universal principles that can manifest in human culture and behavior.

While analyzing the social justice movement, University of Toronto professor of psychology Jordan Peterson suggested that one mechanism behind the whole dynamic was the ‘female hero archetype’.

The hero is the one who tackles systemic suffering. He's the one who goes out and slays the dragon that makes everyone miserable.

There's nothing wrong with heroes. Quite the contrary, they inspire, transcend, provide role models, teach us about courage and sacrifice, and they free us from oppressing dragons.

It goes horribly wrong, however, when the hero focuses on the wrong dragon. And that's exactly what is going on right now. Today we witness hordes of social justice warriors, a majority of them females, on a crusade against injustice and suffering. There's nothing necessarily wrong with that, but the elite have smartly redirected their justified anger from the right target (the elites, MSM, and crooked banksters) towards convenient scapegoats: the white man, the church, heterosexuals, traditionalists, and patriots.
The female archetype is a very powerful one. It's deeply wired in the living system and it's one of the reasons why we are still alive. It's a fundamentally altruistic principle where, in the face of major threat, the mother is fully willing to sacrifice her own life in order to save her progeny, i.e. the perpetuation of the species is more important for the living system than the preservation of one individual.

Like animals, human beings have this deeply ingrained instinct. When a woman faces a great threat towards someone she loves more than herself, she can switch into a very particular 'mode'. One manifestation of this 'mode' is what modern science calls \textit{hysterical force}. You probably heard the stories where a mother who sees her baby stuck under a car somehow manages to lift the car and save her baby. Many accounts tell this same story. In such a situation the mother is focused on saving her baby and not on recording her superhuman feat, therefore such reports are, unfortunately, only supported by anecdotal evidence. Some scientists have tried to explain 'hysterical strength' as an outburst of adrenaline but I don't think that even with a massive injection of adrenaline a woman can lift a car. It is just mechanically impossible - her muscles (like those of a man) cannot physically exert such tremendous force.

So if it's mechanically impossible, then another kind of force must be at play. Maybe it's what martial artists called 'chi', a permeating energy that an individual can channel given the proper state of mind, where the intent (saving my baby) and the emotions (drive to save the baby) become stronger than anything, including the belief systems, i.e. the representation of reality ('I can't lift a car').

Notice how this state transcends rationality, it's not about facts or reality anymore; it's all about a massive surge of intent and particular emotions. \textbf{This is the kind of tremendous and dangerous force today's social engineers are playing with.} It can be used for good: saving a baby from a real threat, or it can be perverted and used to destroy imaginary threats. Psychopaths in power hystericized many women and men (the female archetype applies to men too but probably in more
subdued ways), fabricated artificial 'dragons' that threaten their 'babies', and right now those uncontrollable forces are being unleashed in front of our incredulous eyes.

The 'White March against darkness' gathered 650,000 people in Brussels

A mother will only switch to this 'mode' in the case of a perceived direct death threat to her baby. A minor threat is not enough. That's why the discourse of acting minorities is so exaggerated and focused on security and threats; the need for 'safe spaces', feminists seeing rapists everywhere, LGBT activists seeing homophobic people everywhere. As a result, those who don't belong to a minority grouping (and there are still quite a lot) are depicted as an existential threat that must to be annihilated before it annihilates the minorities.

The female archetype has its male counterpart. the good side of the male archetype is about providing, strength, and rationality. It's thanks to this archetype that buildings were built, fields harvested, territories and communities protected. But it can be just as easily corrupted as the female archetype.

The numerous wars of the 20th century are an illustration of this corruption, where hysterically men mixed up 'providing' with 'looting', 'force' with 'barbarism', and 'rationality' with 'heartlessness'. The results were devastating. The female archetype is probably even more powerful but, to my knowledge, it has never been subverted on a global scale.

Our dear elites really should reflect on the Dutroux case, the partial uncovering of a broad pedophile ring in Belgium, which brought the whole country to the verge of a very real revolution that was finally tamed by a transparent media cover-up when an isolated predator was blamed.

My point here is that if anything can unleash that ferocious protective mother instinct, it is the threat of the normalization of pedophilia and all that it entails. So while the psychopathic elite hystericize the SJWs and 'activate' the female archetype against the silent majority, they should be very cautious that nobody sees the pedophile shoes hiding behind the curtain, otherwise their evil machinations might backfire in an epic way.
Conclusion

In this article we have seen how oppressed minorities become oppressing minorities, why this divisive vision of the world appeals to some millennials, particularly those who may have authoritarian follower traits (the latter being probably correlated with the moral exoskeleton/young soul hypothesis). Also, we have seen how this generation is being manipulated to enforce the destructive agenda of a psychopathic elite who are playing with one of the most dangerous forces, the female archetype.

Although this perspective seems quite dramatic, when you think about the roots of all this SJW nonsense, it boils down to a fairly simple problem: it’s all about differences and how we address them.
One way to deal with differences is to perceive them as **complementary and integrate the best of both sides**: thesis (one side of the argument), antithesis (the other side of the argument), and synthesis (which transcends the apparent opposition and brings us closer to truth). That’s the principle of **dialectics** made famous by Socrates and Plato. Disagreements are resolved through rational discussion, and ultimately, the **search for truth**.

The same applies at a collective level. All great achievements of humanity - cathedrals, medicine, space exploration - were the result of successful cooperation between individuals with complementary talents.

The other way of addressing difference is through opposition and division, which inevitably leads to a world dominated by mistrust, hate, conflicts and wars. A world dominated not by equality of rights, but by **sameness**: an army of clones incubated in their narcissistic bubbles.

So, is there a solution? As usual, knowledge protects. A lot of people still ignore this destructive tidal wave that has already started eroding the foundations of our society, so we’d better get up to speed and fully grok the horror of the situation before it is too late.

If we grow sufficiently aware of the current situation, one question will remain though: will we have enough knowledge and love to defend ourselves without resorting to the same aggression as that displayed by the dominating minorities and thus stop the never-ending cycle of vendetta?

---

The love between Romeo and Juliet ended the feud that divided the Montague and the Capulet | Romeo and Juliet by Sir Frank Dicksee (19th Century)
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