

## Social Engineering - Marxism

### **How Marxism Destroys Civilization**

The quality of a man is determined by what he abhors.

We think of Karl Marx as an economist, but for him, economics was only a means to an end, which was a new primordial religion, which comes from the social nature of man, so that it supersedes all classical man-made religions. Marx was a theologian.

Thus, Marxism becomes a general type of movement that wants to transform reality into a socialist utopia out of envy that some people have more than others (the spirit of Cane - the first murderer in the Bible who was jealous that God valued his brother Able more). Forcing history to its intended end. It is a core idea for many variations of the same theme in movements that evolve over time - classical Marxism, Maoism, Postmodernism, Woke movement. Marxism's idea is to destroy in the name of future creation, but it never creates. It never has the intellectual capacity to build because it is always much easier to destroy than to create.

Classical Marxism destroyed Russia, Maoism destroyed China, Postmodernism destroyed the West's academia (intellectual immune system), so the Woke movement can now literally destroy the West in the chaos and violence of inter-racial, inter-gender, inter-class, and inter-age wars. All social divisions will be exploited to bring about the destruction that is the first and final goal of Marxists.

Karl Marx introduced the idea of social engineering when he inverted the causal relations of Hegel's concepts (inversion of praxis).

Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel in his book *The Phenomenology of Spirit* introduces a new definition of spirit as a synergistic (a whole is more than the sum of its parts) social phenomenon instead of a transcendental phenomenon. Sociological phenomena are literally a spirit of society (as distinct from the Christian definition of the Holy Spirit), social constructs that move through history (and their constituents die out, but the whole collective moves forward and can be distinguished from the environment).

Hegel created a causal relationship between the idea, the state that follows the idea, and the people (the spirit) that will follow the state. In his view, reality was a cast system of kings, princes, barons, nobility, townspeople, peasants, so enlightenment had to come from above.

Marx, on the other hand, saw that change in social relations comes from social interactions and not from the central planner (which is paradoxical because the end result of the first implementation of Marxism in Russia was so much concentration of power and control that the government was forced to centrally plan almost everything). Marx knew that in order to change society, the work has to be done at the bottom (praxis, which was activism at the bottom), and once we change society directly, all the power structures will have to change sequentially, whether they like it or not. Marx discovered a very obvious notion that humanity builds civilization and like any artificially built construct it is susceptible to change. If nothing is set in stone, then a utopia is possible, which must be built on the ashes of current relations.

And this is where he was so wrong about the need for destruction. Society builds civilization from the bottom up, but as a layered structure, organic in nature, destroying the previous layer is counterproductive, and too

much destruction prevents any productive social endeavor. Social change comes from a new idea that starts to build something new and when it grows big enough it is invited to join the previous ideas. People have the full free right to choose this new idea because the old idea still exists. That's why every productive proposal expands, not limits, the variety of possibilities for social interaction. That's why Marxism is rotten to the core, because it proposes nothing as a substitute. It always falsely promises to propose something new and better only after the old way of doing things has been completely destroyed.

That's why any Marxist attack on society is not detected in time, because it is not attacked head first. It's like boiling the frog (if we put the frog in cold water and start to heat the water, the frog will be too weak to jump out of the pot when it realizes that the water is too hot). That's why it takes a long time to develop and the West has been relentlessly attacked since the 1960's and the Woke movement is just the final blow where the real violence begins.

Because Marxism is a movement, a destructive cult based on the sick notion that in order to build something new you must first destroy the old (that the social world is somehow a zero sum game and not a free market of ideas that can grow over time) and not a scientific pursuit, the end justifies the means. Marxists can and should (the cause justifies it and gives card blanche for any immoral act) lie, obfuscate and confuse and disguise their ideas when they are challenged.

Because without acceptance of their incoherent notions, there would be no chance of success, so no chance of destroying the current civilization (and hypothetically building a new, better one on its ashes with the hands of better - artificially adapted - people). And because the Marxist notions are incoherent, they must lie and obfuscate their proposal for change.

This is why modern Marxists (postmodernists in academia and woke race and gender activists in the streets) don't want to admit that they are just a new attempt to convey a destructive narrative derived from the metanarrative of Marxism. Because if they were to admit that, the people they are trying to convince would be more suspicious, because some of them already know the body count of previous failures to impose socialist utopia by force (especially in Russia and China).

### **Classical Marxism and Maoism**

The first iteration of this narrative used the economic analysis in Karl Marx's book: "Capital". This destruction needed a large enough group of people to be the destructive force. That's why it could start in Russia, where Lenin could find enough resentment and bitterness and envy. Because the Russians have been oppressed by the descendants of the Mongols for 700 years. The ruling elite has a vast majority of Mongol genes. In addition, Russia was still a feudal society.

This resulted in over 25 million deaths in the first half of the XX century. Joseph Stalin's decisions were responsible for the largest number of deaths: 23 million. First Lenin used the peasants as a destructive force to destroy the upper class for their wealth, and then Stalin used the same emotion of envy to destroy the wealthier peasants (kulaks). This reduced society to a mindless mass that was much easier to control.

The Chinese version of Marxism that devoured this ancient culture is a very specific one. It turned out that economic Marxism could be modified to destroy almost any feudal society, only the industrial ones had solid

lines of defense against it (in the form of an intellectual scientific method that could easily find and explain the flaws in incoherent Marxist theories).

Mao learned from the mistakes of the Communist implementation of Marxism, so he increased the attack surface on society. He used not only class politics but also identity politics. He condemned old and conservative ways of doing things and promoted new and revolutionary ways of doing things. If someone's parents were identified in the bad category, their children were automatically in the bad category. And then he told the children that they could be in a good red category if they became revolutionaries. In this way he could bring children into conflict with their parents. He took advantage of the differences in temperament and age between social groups.

Some of the same is used in current notions of identity politics in Western cultures when young people are indoctrinated in schools that being white is bad because white people have privileges that came from enslaving colonized nations. Young people know they are white, so they feel bad about themselves (the stick), and then they are offered an easy way out if they become activists who condemn white privilege. The carrot is that this also gives them more independence from their parents. Same method, different cultures and different times, same overwhelming success in converting young minds to Marxist destructive ideology.

Humanity's evolutionary success has come from our ability to cooperate, and even more from our ability to think abstractly. That's why almost every member of a society knows very deeply (almost feels) that a society should, even must, cooperate. So the idea of unity is understood and widely supported. People only don't know the rules of cooperation. Mao used this in 1942 to formulate a tactic for influencing society, which he called: "Unity, criticism, unity". First you set a high bar for unity (rules of cooperation that are very demanding for an individual), and if people can't live up to those standards, then you criticize them, and if they repent, the rules should set a new, much easier standard for unity (which was the plan from the beginning, and this set of rules will be gladly followed).

The modern version of this tactic is to exploit the weakness of Western civilization, which is to be open to discussion and to admit that we are not perfect human beings, an ability to admit our own mistakes. Contemporary criticism looks for racism or intolerance everywhere, and when self-criticism is imposed, something soft like sustainability and inclusion spaces and the feeling of belonging are proposed. Under this disguise, tolerance is demanded and the amount of suboptimal proposals that people have to tolerate increases over time and every time. When a person snaps and reacts to provocation and does not act according to the new standards, he is criticized as intolerant and new demands are forwarded as a form of redemption for virtual sins.

Similar movements were planted in North Vietnam, North Korea, and Cambodia. In Vietnam, the Communists started a war with South Vietnam. The situation in Cambodia was much worse. Pol Pot, a Marxist-Leninist and Khmer ethno-nationalist, killed nearly 2 million people. In the late stages of the Marxist Cultural Revolution in Cambodia, you could be killed for looking smart (people were killed for wearing glasses). Almost all of the old world had to be destroyed (all possible organizations that could take power and control away from the Marxists and condemn them for their atrocities) before the ruling class could start building utopia.

### **Critical Marxism and Postmodernism**

Marxists realized that what worked for feudal societies (Russia, China) wouldn't work for industrial societies, so they developed critical theory (Max Horkheimer's Critical Marxism). They had to criticize the basis of Western civilization to be successful. Max noted that capitalism didn't degrade the worker, it elevated him by allowing him to build a better life through hard work and savings. The working class couldn't be used because they wanted more fairness through capitalism and they became rich enough to start valuing the classical set of values (which made the nobility more sovereign in the past).

Since this revelation, Marxists have seen a new opportunity in the corporate elites, because the core of Marxism revolves around the idea of changing the world, and since the world doesn't accept this change, it must be destroyed so that we can have something new. So they had to find people who are influential enough and at the same time proud and stupid enough to be receptive to the idea of having a profound impact on the world (no matter if good or bad, but huge). The ideal candidates were the corporate elites. And the activists had to be recruited from the minorities, the outsiders of the norm, racial minorities, feminists, homosexuals (lesbians and gays), etc. But these groups were too divided to be a coherent voice, so they helped them organize and added some simple group identity signs like a Pride rainbow flag. This was a weakness for Western civilization because of its unusual tolerance of difference. They were able to expand their demands by expecting more tolerance, first for oddity, then for propaganda, and finally for blunt aggression.

The creators of postmodernism, Michel Foucault (everything is a carceral power, a control that limits freedom and movement) and Jacques Derrida and Jean-Paul Sartre, explicitly stated that they were Marxists. This solves the problem of origin. But they were not so original in their claim that all social relations can be explained in terms of power relations. Some of the medieval Christian ideologists (Gnostic heretics), who were more nihilistic than others, thought that this world should be described as the domain of Satan (the prince of power) in order to justify more the importance of life after death and the struggle to get there.

The postmodernists took this notion and transformed it for their own use. Now the secular world was the civilization and the sacred world was the future utopia. There is also the notion of struggle. In the name of struggle, we endure the "temporary" inconveniences and the lowered standard of living (because of destruction and because of bad centrally planned decisions). That's why modern Marxism is a form of cult that wants to destroy "what is" in the name of the future "could be" (but they never bother to actually design and present the "could be" and prove why it is better).

The postmodernists had to create a new, more potent variant of the same intellectual virus of the past. So they had to change a few elements. New movements always start with a critique of the last attempt (like the critique of the last ruler in every communist country) to destroy the world and design a new recipe for future social utopia.

By the 1960s, classical Marxism was already discredited and owned by the Cold War enemy, the Soviet state. They couldn't use it. Maoism was specific to Chinese culture and therefore not applicable to Western culture. That's why postmodernism used an intellectual mimicry of the pinnacle of modern science (at that time), which was Einstein's relativistic theory of gravity.

Dialectical criticism should:

*"reveal obscure effects of class struggle in any given text by reconstructing the historical conditions—particularly the ideological conditions—that yielded it."*

It developed through dialectical criticism, which states that every perspective is relative (Fredric Jameson: "Marxism and Form"). Compared to Einstein's notion that there is no particular place to judge universal perspective on space and time. But Jameson went further and stated that there is no "one size fits all" method to judge reality as fixed or closed except as a constant struggle between opposing forces.

We all know that the world is constantly changing and is fluid in that sense, so reality is certainly not fixed. But the second notion that it is "not closed" is actually a notion that there is no objective truth that we can say about reality.

This second notion, like acid, dissolves any critique, any science, any stratification of merit, knowledge, or contribution, turning it into a mystical (intellectual postmodernism) and later a romantic activity (Critical Race Theory and Postcolonial Theory in relation to race, and Woke in relation to gender multiplication and Queer Theory). It denies the existence of justice because it is always a consequence of a person's net worth, which must be based on a true evaluation. Without truth, there is no objective value of a person, so no one can get what he or she deserves. Postmodernism becomes an attack on reality itself, because reality is a consensus about what we know about the world, and what we know is a subset of hypotheses that are true.

Postmodernism has gaslighted all of Western culture. Gaslighting is a term for the constant undermining of one's perception of reality. If truth as a concept is false, then the underlying truth of any axioms doesn't exist, so reality itself is supposed to be flexible and constantly changing based on social interference and even individual perception. The result can only be one thing: global confusion that rises through fear to mass hysteria and a sense of being lost.

Postmodernism was necessary as a prerequisite because you can't mold societies into false self-destructive ideas when they know what is true, when they know that the proposed action will lead to destruction and is not productive. So the first thing that has to be done before the society can be molded according to the central plan is to destroy the mechanism that builds the consensus of truth. To negate all the previously tested truths, all the meticulously built achievements and discoveries of the past in one fell swoop, one must kill truth itself.

The most destructive version of a dispute about what is true is a total denial that truth even exists. When such doubt spreads, everyone begins to suspect that they know the truth better than others. So everyone starts speaking a different language, and instead of a humble pursuit of truth, we have a competition between conflicting views that can't be discussed productively. This is similar to the old biblical story of the Tower of Babel. If you want to destroy the human ability to build, create a separate language for everyone. When consensus is impossible, cooperation is impossible, and everything starts to get violent because that's the ultimate argument when you can't come up with anything more sophisticated.

The respect and recognition of universal truth is the basis of almost all morality. That's why societies without truth demoralize in time and no discipline can prevent it and no additional action is needed. Meaning cannot exist or arise from absolute nothingness due to lack of universal truth, so individuals who can't find truth in their lives can't focus on anything and die from lack of purpose and self-discipline. They become weak and

morally flexible so that their goals can be twisted at the whim of those in power, leading to self resentment and self destruction.

After postmodernism, one doesn't know what reality is in the deepest sense. It's not the idea that black is white or white is black (the absence of truth means that one is blind and can't see any light, not just any color). Then people turn to the next source of reference. Reality is shaped by those who have the most power. This is what Marxists want, because it gives much more power to the people with power. They want to shape society from the bottom up and become its rulers (not leaders) because in this chaos they will inevitably rise to the top.

In this way, the whole of society is served on a silver platter to the new leaders of the state, who now get to decide what reality is. This turns society into worshippers of the state, and that is why the struggle for power in all Marxist regimes is so fierce, because the stakes are so much higher.

If there's no truth, the only thing that has any meaning is power and control. If ideas don't have a fixed meaning, they can be hijacked by the people on top, and as a result only they tell everyone else what things mean. So the question is who gets to say what things mean.

The guards of the Gulag (Marxist-Communist concentration camps) thought they were doing something necessary for a better future, in addition to being cruel and privileged. Many of them committed suicide after the death of Stalin when they learned that it was all in vain because they were not building a better society in dealing with the enemies of the state. The Marxist-Stalinist state was corrupt to the core and had no greater goals than to stay in power longer and with greater control over the population (and the guards were merely the tools to achieve just that futile temporary state).

Changing the definitions of words and giving the ruling Marxist elite the power to decide the meaning of words is the most common theme in the metanarrative of Marxism. This reduces the ability to communicate, which is crucial to a coherent civilization. That's why (because it's the ultimate destructive force) Marxists can't resist it in every iteration. We see it in Russia, China, Pol Pot's Cambodia, postmodernist academia, and in the Woke movement (especially as it relates to gender).

Everything important, everything worth pursuing, is defined and redefined by the state, which then redefines human identity (making it weaker and more flexible). The ultimate drug for the Marxist is total control over people, which can be achieved by hollowing out their identity. They become the arbiter of what it means to be human.

Gender activists claim that identity is defined by the individual, and if someone thinks he or she is the opposite sex, then by definition that is true. Paradoxically, the ability to attack human identity based on attacking the truth itself and attacking the consensus on the meaning of words proves quite the opposite. That identity is not only based on the individual and is a social phenomenon on top of the individual effort to build his own identity, because changes in social relations change individual identities against their will. Stable identity of individuals in a society is often killed by relativism.

The degree of control a communist ruling class had over communist society was physical, psychological and ideological, so it was almost total. It wasn't economic though (so current Central Bank Digital Currency CBDC projects want to add it to the pile) which is why it collapsed which is the paradox because Marx preached economy

but his economic solution was so bad that the practical implementation of his ideal always ends in bankruptcy (and if communism is not revoked it goes deeper into famine like in North Korea).

It turns our discussions into a power struggle (whoever talks faster, more, and with more artificially created virtue has more right to speak). This power struggle leads to groupthink and a dichotomy between oppressor and oppressed (which intellectually justifies the class struggle of classical Marxism and the contemporary notion of race and gender struggle). Victimization takes away morality (you no longer need to restrain yourself from violence because you are defending yourself in a sense), so it gives you the power to destroy. That's why Marxism feeds on the weaker and less socially justified part of society, because it's easier to impose a victim position on them.

This then becomes a zero-sum game of who gets to be on top. There are no rules in this struggle, and often the higher ground is held by the narcissistic personalities because they have enough audacity to promote themselves. People who not only don't know what it means to be humble, but who are also incapable of feeling any kind of shame for promoting their mediocre accomplishments in front of others.

This power dynamic founded the modern feminist movement, which used the notion that everything in history revolved around the power that patriarchy provided. So in their twisted and inaccurate view of gender relations, men have had the power for most of history (so now they want women to have all the privileges without any social responsibility). Which is definitely not true, because for most of history there was no power dynamic, but cooperation - the reality was so bad. Even in the sense of social relations it's wrong because men and women always worked together for the good of the family (future generations) even when the economic conditions were favorable. For most of history, women were deified because they gave birth to new members of the tribe. It was not until about 10,000 years ago that humans realized the importance of males in procreation, and only since then have males had the social advantage of being just as important in passing on genes and being physically stronger.

So now the feminists are pushing the idea that it is time for women to rule. And that literally means to rule over men, so any notion of equal rights for women has been replaced with women's privileges as the ultimate goal, as reparations to the men's privileges of the past, hence the name of the movement feminism - which literally means that women are the most important. And even if they really meant equality as their agenda, the notion of women's superiority is forced upon the activists because they use the word "feminism" as the name of their movement. The meaning of the movement that comes from its name is an inevitable and deliberate consequence of framing it in this way. Whether one admits it or not, words have meaning.

Women are not more important than men, which means that men are not more important than women. But for the Marxists, the main goal was to wage war between the sexes in order to dissolve the most important cohesion of society. This cohesion is so important because our fertility rate depends on it. And since they have mostly succeeded in creating conflict between the sexes, we will soon be facing economic collapse because of the population collapse that has already taken place (the growth of the total population is a mirage because it is caused only by the extension of the average life span).

### **Woke movement**

When postmodernism's psi-op (psychological operation) was complete, the latest, this time literal, Marxist ideology could be introduced disguised as postcolonial, racial and gender struggle.

Latest iteration of Marxism has evolved into a highly aggressive movement that wants to attack and destroy the West. Aggression is associated with high neuroticism (a tendency toward anxiety, depression, self-doubt, and other negative feelings). It is mediated by envy. Techniques used are similar to the Maoist Cultural Revolution, attacking everything traditional, and in the Woke case, focusing on attacking being normal.

Instead of economic analysis, they use the racial analysis of critical race theorists. While communism (when described by Marx himself) could be summarized as the will to abolish private property, critical race theory could be summarized as the will to abolish whiteness (understood as a form of property that enables systemic racism). Where white supremacy is the equivalent of capitalism, and it's not the belief that white people are superior, but that they have access to the better places in society without contribution and through conspiracy, and they use that position to exploit everyone else. In communism when activists wanted to destroy or control something they called it bourgeois and in race theory they call it racist. When the Marxists take control of something, it is automatically not racist.

Modern iteration still has economic notions (Marxists always want money) but the communist goal of "caring and sharing" is hidden under the hood of reparations for slavery or climate (WEF enforced Environmental, Social, and Governance ESG standards). To justify climate-related reparations on top of racial reparations for slavery, they introduce post-colonial theory, which proclaims that Western nations must repent for colonialism. They say that only colonialism explains why the underdeveloped nations are underdeveloped and poor and don't have modern economies with huge energy production. They oppose the industrialization of underdeveloped nations because they hate any activity of the human species (they think that nature in a form of deity of Gaia is more important than humanity). That's why they forbid the production of fossil fuels (coal mining or oil production) and instead propose wealth transfers to finance the status quo and give more control to the people who decide about the distribution of money.

Post-colonial guilt in Western societies is used to accept violent and uneducated migrants. Marxists promote the unconditional distribution of money to the economic migrants from the old colonial countries. Most of the migrants do not contribute to the economies of the European countries, which is the goal of the Marxist agenda, so that the West is more vulnerable, weaker and poorer. So that it is easier to influence and destroy.

This movement also has a very dangerous aspect that is destructive to culture. Marxists see almost all Western culture as colonial culture, so they want to destroy it (decolonize Shakespeare or decolonize history). They actively condemn even the greatest works of Western culture and they are very active in changing the history that is taught to children in schools (that white people are responsible for all the evil in history).

Queer theory discusses what's normal, but not by proposing something new or different, but by destroying the meaning of gender and opposing the dichotomy of sex (against all physical evidence, including the biology of chromosomes). They claim that society is corrupt because it defines what's normal and what's weird or abnormal, and it's a form of oppression against some minorities. Because, in their view, everyone can define their identity individually without social negotiation, queer becomes an "identity without essence". So they publicly admit that



the subjective idea of being a certain gender has no objective or even additional justification other than subjective feeling.

Queer propagandists have taken over some parts of the educational system, where they constantly confuse young people about their sexuality and force the lie that gender is a matter of internal opinion. They've "produced" hundreds of different genders and teach about them in schools. After the misinforming "education" they try to send the children to their parents for puberty blockers, and lately some schools try to medicate the children with blockers without the parents consenting or even knowing. When puberty blockers are administered to children, they cause a lot of damage in the organism (osteoporosis) and psyche. This leads to deeper confusion, that's why nowadays there are more and more people who don't know what their sexual orientation is and even try to change to the opposite sex (which is not possible at the current level of medical knowledge). Genital mutilation, plastic surgery and hormone treatments can't change a person's sex. They can only change the appearance (but not completely, as many other features can't be changed, such as male bone structure). The transitions done on adults under the false premise that they are safe (they cause cancer and other medical problems) is criminal fraud (because people are lied to and not presented with full information about the consequences of a medical procedure). The hundreds of mutilations of children (under the age of consent) is an evil on a much higher level. Gender transitions performed on minors between the ages of 13 and 17 should be treated as a pure criminal act, but they are promoted because each transition costs over a million dollars and the entire gender industry becomes a substantial source of income for doctors and pharmaceutical companies.

The gender activists use the excuse that if we don't let kids change their gender, they will commit suicide, but there is no data to support that. Mainly because transitioned people have a very high percentage of suicides. So we don't know if transitioning increases the suicide rate or if people who already have a death wish are more susceptible to trans activism.

Woke is a mechanism for promoting equity. Equity (as defined by George Frederickson) is based in economics and revolves around socialism, with one definition being "a managed political economy in which shares are adjusted so that citizens are made equal". As if that is not scary enough (because it administers the redistribution of property by force), this notion has evolved into a deeper meaning of social and cultural redistribution. For example, equality in a corporation means that every leadership position must have equal representation of men and women, but also equal representation of race and gender (trans, etc.), and so on. So that every group and subgroup is equally represented in society (which removes the notion of an individual identity and replaces it with a group identity). Individuals are represented by the qualities of the groups they belong to, not by their specific characteristics.

### **Cancellation and Censorship**

Marxists are very aggressive (because they believe that only power struggle rules the world) and logically incoherent in their ideas, that's why they have to suppress freedom of speech. Moreover, they think it's normal to lie in order to manipulate others into believing false and incoherent notions, because what people believe doesn't come from the degree to which they know the truth, but from the manipulation of various ideologies imposed on the masses.

Marxists prefer a female type of aggression because most activists are women (so it's more natural for them) and because it's easier to disguise this type of aggression in front of the masses and harder to defend against it because some simple people think that aggression can only be physical. Men tend to express themselves aggressively mostly through open violence (to establish dominance and recognition of their abilities) and women mostly through social reputation destruction with covert operations (gossip, lies, censorship and social cancellation).

That's why activists have instituted practices such as demanding that academia fire scientists for their private opinions expressed on social media. They also try to destroy the social reputation of anyone who disagrees with them. Social media has made possible a new form of censorship called "cancellation," in other words, the removal of a social media account by the social media company itself.

Cancellation is an Internet-age euphemism for censoring or silencing a political opponent. It uses the discussion group tradition of canceling the user who can't or won't be moderated by the administrator of a discussion forum or social network. For the first time in history, a centralized social network allows ideas to flow from the bottom up and, most importantly, horizontally. In the radio or television era, only the people who were allowed to comment on the news had a public voice. Since Facebook, Youtube and Twitter, everyone can have a voice (if it's not censored by the platform itself).

Since social media toppled governments in the Middle East after food prices skyrocketed in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis (because banks and insurance companies were bailed out with taxpayer money) and Twitter allowed Trump to win the U.S. presidential election, social media companies have been under constant scrutiny and government demands for censorship. They are important enough now.

The Woke army of people demanding cancellation on social platforms and also in the form of layoffs from workplaces is the mainstream of Marxist activity in the last decade. The employer is even targeted if they don't comply. The family is also attacked in the same way, and the angry mob demands that the family publicly condemn the person and publicly disown him.

In addition, legislation has been introduced (Bill C-16 in Canada) that attempts to implement compelled speech to use pronouns about a person only from a subset chosen by that person. This gave many people immense power because identity is not only defined by the individual (it is a social endeavor), but the law introduced a sanction for not being complicit in a lie (a delusion created by the individual). Words have meaning, and once you start using different words, your thinking changes (this is especially visible when you try to express yourself in a different language, then you start to see the importance of different ways of formulating thoughts). So the power to force a person to use a particular lie was the power to invade his thought process to influence his mind. That's why George Orwell in his book "1984" emphasized the power of the government to change the definitions of words and then use them only in a certain way. Once you allow your government to change your vocabulary, the independence of your thinking is lost.

And the most outrageous thing about compelled speech is that it forces everyone to lie to themselves. A totalitarian state is not totalitarian because the dictator creates a few unjust laws and allows the unchecked violence of his police state, but because he forces everyone to lie. If you lie to others, and if you lie to your family, and if you lie to yourself, you entrench totalitarianism even more deeply than the police.

The silliest idea (a lie) about forced pronouns was that a person can own his or her pronouns. These words describe what a person is from a biological-scientific perspective and from a social perspective - how a person is perceived from the outside. Nothing about pronouns is owned by an individual. A person can't own pronouns any more than they can own their adjectives. A person can be called brave or beautiful or fat or ugly, but the point of reference is how their opinion relates to the actual fact and how that person values other people's opinions and how many people agree with that assessment of that person (social consensus). None of this is owned by that person, by that individual.

Fortunately, this has become less of an issue in the last year. People are starting to see the absurdity of the Woke notions and especially the compelled speech part (that went far enough). After Covid and after Elon Musk bought Twitter, the censorship is much less aggressive, but it can still affect even presidential candidates (Kennedy's discussion with Jordan Peterson was removed from Youtube). Shadow banning where the account is not suspended but is very hard to find, or where it is impossible to share someone's posts, is still a problem because it is much harder to track these cases.

The next phase of cancellation moved from the level of rhetoric and censorship of free speech to economic cancellation, which is debanking. Closing someone's bank account and preventing them from opening a new one at another bank. Banks are doing this more and more lately, and they cooperate by blacklisting a person so that he can't open an account in any other bank in a country or countries. This will become more and more common once Central Bank Digital Currencies CBDCs are introduced (because it will be much easier to freeze someone's money).

### **Marxist Extremist Believers**

Beware of people who are easy to scare, because you may underestimate how seriously they take the situation and how easy it is for them to be bloody and violent (it is almost an automatic reaction).

People with low verbal intelligence are very common in this left-wing totalitarian activism. So the believers are not so bright. They are mostly female, because the will to change (destroy) the world in pursuit of utopia comes from the sense of compassion, from the need to take care of the weak and poor in order to compensate the wronged (social justice). This particular trait of caring for the weak is more of a female trait, which is understandable because women have to be that way to protect and care for the very young children.

The second trait that characterizes the followers of Marxism is malignant narcissism (unreasonably high sense of one's own importance). This is understandable because these people are trying to change the world, but they also have the audacity to be so sure that their remedy for the existing problems is so good and absolutely foolproof that it justifies the destruction of what has been built by all previous generations (before even a shred of evidence is provided that their proposal works better). And the most irritating part is that the proposed solution or remedy is not even properly stated or discussed by them because it is just wishful thinking without the real plan of application.

The stupid (mostly inexperienced young people who may one day be wise) are so susceptible to activism for a Marxist idea because these kinds of activities are the most socially visible and at the same time the easiest to express. You don't have to do almost anything. Show up at a protest. Stick to the street or destroy a painting with

a hand full of paint and you are famous. You don't have to build anything, you don't have to think about anything, just repeat the slogans and you're perceived as a fighter against oppression, a fighter for a better world. You just have to be loud and expressive and you will be visible, you will be noticed like Herostratus, because the society in which activists live is so tolerant.

It's the easiest way to gain a moral high ground from which inadequate people can judge everyone around them and teach them slogans. They don't have any arguments of their own. They just repeat what they have heard from their masters. No effort. You can be lazy all your life and live as a parasite, demanding something that has to be done by someone else. You're at the bottom of competence, knowledge and morality, but you have control over others. Marxist ideology serves young people and stupid old people the feeling of cheap social success on a silver platter.

We all feel good, feel that dopamine rush when we move up in the social hierarchy. We can't help it, because this need is so ingrained in our genes.

Activists state their wish list (for example, that the poor should earn more for their work), but they don't point out where this money should come from (of course, you can rob the rich, but the money will run out in a year or two, and what happens after that is never answered by them). Any attempt at discussion is considered as an attack on them, because Marxists don't believe that the exchange of ideas leads to the truth. For them, there is no truth because objective truth doesn't exist, and anyone who doesn't share their "obvious" (from their perspective) beliefs is their enemy. From their perspective, any kind of discourse is a manifestation of imposing power rather than an attempt to get to the heart of things. Their belief system is so alien that it's very hard to understand from the perspective of a person who wants to build on truth and leave some kind of legacy.

The vast majority of the population is still not convinced how in a world the uneducated, self-centered, whining activists who want to save the whales, the forests, and Gaia are the seeds of genocide as we witnessed in the last century. But there is a connection because a precursor to genocide is a heightened sense of victimization. When someone feels victimized by slavery, racial privilege, patriarchy, or even gender discrimination (whatever that means, and the meaning is expanding every day), they are very afraid of everyone else. People have committed massacres out of fear in the past because fear justifies and compels action, it creates a "get them before they get you" attitude. When a group feels cornered and afraid, the choice is so easy that there is almost no choice not to use violence.

### **Climatism**

Climatism is a Marxist cult that believes that the warmer climate caused by human activity will harm nature. Even harm is a sin for the cultists, who see nature as more important than humanity and worship it as a new form of God.

This intellectually shallow movement is particularly perverse because it assumes that humanity is a form of cancer on the pristine face of a planet and that any human activity is bad. Bringing children into this world is bad because they will consume and exhale carbon dioxide. From the cultist's perspective, the world would be a better place without humans, who constantly shift the fragile balance of the biosphere, so humans deserve to die. All humans exhale, so all humans deserve to die.

This is an anti-human movement. The worst of its kind, because its goal is not to simply destroy civilization (like all previous Marxist movements), but to eradicate humanity completely. They are traitors to our species.

They twist and corrupt the idea of ecology into a kind of cult. They use only superficial forms of communication and mostly disrupt and destroy in the name of limiting human impact on the planet. They wage guerrilla warfare against humanity. They feel like partisans enlisted in nature's special forces. They hide behind the scientific consensus on the casual relationship between anthropic CO2 emissions and global temperature rise, so it's very difficult to properly address them. They masquerade as representatives of the scientific community, but when asked difficult scientific questions, they revert to their activist roles (that they are only doing what they can for the cause of helping scientists raise awareness of the global warming problem). And lately they have started calling global warming a climate catastrophe.

They use a real problem that is still manageable and amplify it significantly to elevate themselves to the position of truth-tellers, preaching wisdom about the impending climate catastrophe. This puts them in an ideal position to justify any action on the pretext that it is necessary for the cause (raising awareness).

They always use intermediate levels of violence. They use physical violence, but they never openly attack anyone so that they can be protected or portrayed as peaceful protesters or awareness activists. They block highways, they block airports, they block roads, they even destroy valuable paintings (like Monet's "The Garden of Giverny"). They attack people personally if they have the conviction that those under attack have not done enough for the climate. It gives them a free pass for any atrocity, and I predict that the destruction of the finest art of Western culture will soon be especially common. Marxism especially despises the works of art of Western civilization because it was involved in colonialism.

Taxing CO2 emissions from energy sources is not enough for them. They want to additionally limit travel, even local communication (15 minute cities), air communication with additional taxes and bans on short flights. After the success with Covid lockdowns, they will try to impose climate lockdowns, limit the amount of food by banning beef production under the false pretext that it emits more greenhouse gases than eating bugs, and impose CO2 emission limits on each citizen. The final stage is a total ban on car ownership and the imposition of travel restrictions (making everyone a peasant who can't leave his village).

Climatists emphasize colonialism because it is a good justification for denying developing countries access to modern and reliable energy sources based on fossil fuels. They can't just deny poor people access to energy because they would lose the moral high ground, so they propose climate reparations. These "reparations" would be justified on the pretext of colonial exploitation, and the condition for receiving them would be not to use fossil fuels (the cheapest sources of energy) and to remain dependent on remittances. These reparations would be a flow of money at least partially under the control of the climatists, because they would be climate-related, so they will feed on it and expand the "costs" of the climate movement's operations. They need to keep poor countries energy hungry under the pretext of the negative climate impact of growing energy production. This way they can keep control over money-sucking activities that weaken their worst enemy, which is Western culture and civilization.

In the name of reverse colonialism, they try to justify illegal immigration - mainly to European countries, because they see it as a good argument for the climate emergency. The flow of people from Central Asia, Africa and the Middle East to Europe in the name of jihad and unemployment benefits they call climate migrants. For them, it serves a triple purpose. First, it makes the climate argument more legitimate because people are leaving countries with higher average temperatures. Second, it makes them feel better about being involved in anti-colonial activities, helping to colonize Western countries by foreign cultures (they see it as a form of historical justice served). Third, it weakens Western countries economically, because the migrants have to be supported by the work of the natives. It also dissolves Western culture and antagonizes it through diversity (when more cultures have to coexist in the same geographical location).

Diversity of opinions in a single cultural framework always helps to assess the problem from different perspectives, so it is a positive form. However, the diversity of the cultures themselves makes communication and coordination much more difficult, and when values differ, cooperation becomes impossible, and when differences cannot be resolved, the next step is always violence. Society is stronger when it is more coherent, so strength lies in unity, not in diversity.

Climate cultists are the worst of all types of Marxists because their ultimate goal is not only destructive and totalitarian, but genocidal.

### **We are all susceptible to Marxism**

We are so susceptible to Marxism because we live under the false premise that most people are trying to build civilization and the small minority who are trying to destroy it are already in jail. Marxists disguise themselves well as people who are critical of the current way of doing things and just want a better world for our children.

Sometimes their actions are not so obvious and it is hard to tell how they are motivated because they look harmless. Most of their actions look immature, and we don't see them as a threat, even if we don't believe what they say. The childish activists use our empathy as a shield against retaliation. That same empathy weakens our mental defenses, diffuses our will to respond. But the consequences of activism are always destructive, and that is how we can judge their intentions (or the intentions of the people who are in charge and control the activist groups).

Marxists mostly use and put stupid people (activists) in front of their protests and activities (useful idiots as communists called them). That's why a normal person is not convinced that the danger is real and mostly ignores loud and full of emotional outbursts childish forms of expression. It resembles innocence or harmless delusions. This is the weakness of every decent person. They shield themselves with adult children who are not worthy of decisive action and aggression. They constantly move the Overton window of social discourse, and sooner or later people are forced to defend obvious rules and the most precious parts of their civilization.

For the last century and a half, human civilization has been under attack by people who are convinced that they can change society. By people who are impudent enough to think they have a prescription for making society better. By people who despise the achievements of humanity so much that they think they have to nullify and destroy what was in order to impose something new.

These people learned from Marx how to change society and they act through his method because they are bored and mainly because they can. They express themselves through this immense power to influence and change the world (New World Order or similar ideologies) because Marx discovered how to change social relations. His bottom-up activism is still very powerful. We are under his influence. Unfortunately, it works.

Marxism uses the weaknesses of the messengers (activists) and the victims to exert influence without open violence through provocation. If you know you are being provoked, you can act accordingly (without open violence). Any open violence as a form of defense is not recommended because they want to propagate their propaganda about how victimized they are. Any simple measure of self-defense will be quickly used against anyone. Defenders of civilization must refrain from violence and act wisely without ignoring the problem (because Marxist provocations are still an attack).

But there is still hope. Because when we understand the problem, solutions can be developed. We must first see the disease in order to begin to look for the cure.

**Stilgar**