

Polemics

By

William Wright

Liberalism

Liberalism is a poison and a threat to Western civilization. Why waste words with an introduction? This is something that is already known to all the world—perhaps even to those who benefit from it.

Liberalism is a religion of self-destruction for a faithless world. *By liberalism, I mean the interconnected series of formulas and concepts that includes identity politics, feminism, excessive notions of racial justice, and socialist values of care for the disadvantaged along materialist lines.* Above all, liberalism is *a culture of self-loathing and self-imposed guilt for imaginary crimes.* Each of these themes must be addressed in turn.

To pinpoint exactly why liberalism is so destructive is so destructive is difficult, as the reason ultimately lies in the way all of these values together are put into practice by society. However, if I were to single out two particular aspects of liberalism that are to blame, it is *the self-defeating attitude that the vital, dynamic forces of culture and life must be slowed or stopped for a safer, more comfortable society.* It is also *a refusal to find a higher, unifying purpose in our own immediate political and social identity.* Liberalism divides us and makes us embittered and solitary, while insisting that we are more obligated to a larger global community than to our own immediate community. In other words, liberalism places the center of our attention outside of our own needs and interests as individuals and as a community.

We must examine the immediate historical sources of this attitude of self-defeat, as this attitude is the real, living substance of liberalism. This attitude has its origin in the values established by the intellectual movements of the 20th century, whose themes included hostility towards the West, Marxist ideals of internationalism and a disillusionment with life in general.

Liberalism's effect on society collectively may be likened to depression in the individual. He mopes around, discouraged by his own blunders and the injustices done to him in the past. He blames the world for his problems and insists that *it* change in order to accommodate *his* infirmities. But when he is at last offered an opportunity to participate in his own life, he refuses, insisting that "all is vanity"—secretly, he is addicted to his self-defeating worldview. It is so much easier to condemn himself and the world. He risks nothing; he doesn't even have to try.

Granted, such cases of depression can arise from prolonged periods of idleness, inertia and over-indulgence. But the world is a rapidly changing place—it has become dangerous again. If we as a culture are to survive, we must adapt to these new circumstances. We must outgrow liberalism.

Tyrannical Feminine Culture

We can discuss concepts and ideas until the end of time, though I think that too much abstraction would not paint a complete picture of what is wrong with our society. Closely related to the attitude of self-defeat is another deep-seated spiritual issue. *This is the presence of an overbearing, tyrannical feminine culture that suppresses masculine impulses on a social level.* Masculine impulses have gradually been pushed outside the realm of social acceptability to the point that many men look outside of our own culture for something that they can identify with. *For many, we have become evil in our own eyes.* Needless to say, this phenomenon is highly destructive, and it is as much of a contributor to the social attitude of self-loathing as anything else.

To illustrate what I mean by a tyrannical feminine culture, consider the character and behavior of the individual tyrannical female, or, to use another term, the *female narcissist*.

Control over others is the only priority of the tyrannical female. She is willing to achieve control by any means available to her; nothing is beneath her. She is also willing to sacrifice anything to achieve control.

Her own emotions are the first sacrifice that she makes. Her emotions make her vulnerable, and so she refuses to allow herself to be carried away by them. She keeps only an outward semblance of emotion as it suits her needs; she herself remains unaffected.

Emotional manipulation is the tyrannical female's principal means of achieving control. From the time of birth, we all enter the world looking to our mothers for nurturing and care. In normal cases, a mother validates her child's emotions and demonstrates by example how properly to respond to life and hardship. This habit of looking to women for validation is carried on to some degree into adulthood, which is full of uncertainty.

The tyrannical woman preys upon this habit, granting some form of emotional support and validation only if she feels that her target has displayed adequate signs of submission. *The tyrannical impulse in a woman is a kind of perversion of the maternal instinct.*

Like Medea, she is even willing to injure or slaughter her own children if it serves her purposes. For example, she is not above shaming or punishing her child to restrict their autonomy. She does this even into the adulthood of her child—simply for the purpose of maintaining the relationship of control provided by Nature. The tyrannical woman sees her child as a possession that ought not to do anything or own anything out of his or her own volition. And woe to that child if they display any true talent—they will not be free from their own mother's jealousy. The tyrannical woman will attempt to undermine and sabotage the ambitions and talents of her own children. For the tyrannical woman, *if it cannot be controlled, it must be smothered and stifled.*

Genuine proficiency and excellence are the tyrannical woman's greatest fear. She rarely has any of her own, unless her impulse towards control amounts to a kind of perverse genius.

She will do everything in her power to control the genuinely talented person. If she cannot accomplish this, shame is her greatest weapon for smothering the expression of real worth.

If she is attractive, she will garner attention in every shameless way imaginable. She will also use her attractiveness as another means of control, extracting favors and services from the unfortunate. If she gives herself away, it is only to further some surreptitious end, and never out of love and genuine affection.

Today, the word “misogynist” is tossed around to no end. Really, it is used to designate the ideological opponents of the tyrannical female—anyone who challenges her social or political authority. The irony is that it is the tyrannical female herself who is the true misogynist. She hates the woman within herself—whatever is warm, kind and sensual in her own nature. She also hates other women who are warm and beautiful, as they threaten her control over the people under her influence. There is a difference between a self-confident, independent woman and a woman who refuses to relax and allow the forces of the world to play out on their own—the tyrannical woman is the latter.

See what happens when the tyrannical woman suddenly loses control in a way that surprises her and damages her ego. She will quite literally throw a tantrum, flinging around furniture or whatever comes to hand and abusing anyone that happens to be nearby. She reverts to a childlike display because she in truth is profoundly childish—she is incapable of allowing other forces or other people to develop, function or express themselves on their own without her insistent intervention.

To the lives of others, she brings nothing but misery, despair, emotional repression and maladaptation. She creates nothing; she contributes nothing. She only stifles what would otherwise be upright, healthy and proud without her incessant interference.

The tyrannical feminine culture of our time is the collective expression of the impulses of the individual tyrannical female.

Our tyrannical feminine culture gives first place to manipulative, unscrupulous women, and it serves as a breeding ground for more women of this type. I do not necessarily mean to say that feminism as a historical phenomenon is equivalent to our tyrannical feminine culture, but it has at any rate culminated in this state of affairs. It is at least a peculiarly modern expression of the tyrannical feminine on a collective level.

Tyrannical feminine culture stifles the masculine impulses that are carefree, laughing, amicable, active, dynamic and creative; these things are the natural enemy of the tyrannical female. Tyrannical feminine culture does so in the name of safety, security and caution, though *control over what might otherwise overthrow it* is its true aim.

Writers have used signs to point to this psychic malady at the core of Western civilization.

Livia Drusilla: a figure brought back from the obscurity of history by Robert Graves in his fiction, perhaps because he needed a symbol to stand for what he observed in modern society

(as Collingwood points out, history is a thing that is lived out in our minds, and we inevitably bring our own contemporary experience to bear in the process of assembling our understanding of it). In Graves' work, she is the arch-tyrant. She schemes and manipulates in order to put her stamp on Roman political affairs. She assassinates and ruins the people in her own family without pity or compassion. She mocks, torments and dominates her son Tiberius to the point that he becomes a twisted, sadistic monster. Indeed, Graves implies that the entire Julio-Claudian dynasty is a warped breeding ground for sadism, depravity and neurosis owing precisely to her influence. The male tyrant may make external circumstances a nightmare of bloodshed and slaughter, but the female tyrant makes the minds of others (men and women alike) an inner Tartarus of profound darkness, emotional repression, anger and despair.

Lady Marchmain is a figure explicitly identified with modernity in *Brideshead Revisited*. She puts on an act of being soft and maternal, but she pursues ulterior motives. She is a devout Catholic, but she makes sure that others are aware of the sacrifices that she makes, and insinuates that they ought to feel guilty (and this is a favorite tactic of the tyrannical female. She will put on an exaggerated display of commitment to duty or self-denial with the purpose of making others feel guilty and obligated to her. This sort of tyrannical woman is a subtle master of emotional manipulation.)

In the name of care and concern, she controls and dominates her son until he breaks down entirely and becomes an alcoholic, destined to spend the remainder of his life in misery and poverty. It is even implied that Sebastian's homosexuality is the result of her domineering, overbearing influence. The tyrannical female breaks down and corrupts what Plato would call the gentle, philosophical nature and makes him into a submissive, self-destructive social outcast (witness the life of Arthur Rimbaud, a real historical personage!)

Nurse Ratched is a horrifying figure who, I am sure, is burned into the minds of many Americans even today. She is an emasculating presence who uses shame and humiliation to suppress any overt display of male sexuality. She is a stern, sadistic disciplinarian obsessed with regimentation. She uses her position as a nurse—a role typically associated with care and compassion—to exert control over the helpless. She drives men to despair and suicide. In the end, death or complete escape are the only ways to be free of her influence—and escape is a beautiful sentiment indeed.

The stifling influence of tyrannical feminine culture may be seen in how stale, derivative and creatively bankrupt our society has become. The public discourse centers around one of a few set topics. For the most part, films and literature today may only be about ideologically acceptable themes—the result is art worthy perhaps of a third- or fourth-rate Soviet propagandist. Information is carefully censored and sanitized, and any serious questioning of ideological values is strictly prohibited.

In my view, this is all the result of a pernicious and overbearing feminine culture. Indeed, *the leading individuals of our time are all men*. I mean those who contribute something positive, constructive and creative to society are for the most part men.

On the other hand, the most prominent women of our time—especially the women involved in politics and public affairs—seem only to display incompetence and corruption. They scheme, manipulate and deceive, and they even seem to receive praise for precisely this sort of behavior.

The vital, creative energy of our time is contained in the masculine impulses. It is precisely this that tyrannical feminine culture seeks to suppress. This creative energy cannot—it will not—be eradicated. Our future is being born in it.

As men, we cannot lay the blame entirely at the feet of women. *What is needed is nothing less than a spiritual transformation of society.* The masculine impulses have more or less lain dormant since the early 20th century, and are only now coming into prominence once again. As yet, they are still atrophied and underdeveloped, just as our generation is still uncertain of itself and of the role it will play in the world. *We must learn to trust in our own abilities and in our work, becoming self-sufficient, self-assured and ready to face the coming difficulties of this century.* We must not be too preoccupied with wealth and material comforts, finding fulfillment instead in our individual and collective purposes. We cannot necessarily rely on the support and approval of women—not at first, at any rate—but few accomplished men of history ever have.

And as for women, what is obviously necessary is a relaxation of this repressed, repressive culture of hysterical moral accusation. These new social forces must be permitted to develop according to our changing circumstances. To be more precise, they *will* develop according to our changing circumstances. The only question is *how* this will transpire.

The masculine impulses need not be vengeful and destructive. Like any nascent social force, the more these are forcibly suppressed, the more radical they will become in expression. In other words, *the more severely the masculine impulses are suppressed, the more violent, explosive and bloodthirsty they will become.*

I am not calling for new restrictions to be placed on women. However, we must recognize that the tyrannical female conceals herself behind the ideals of feminism, twisting them into a system of political and social control.

The External Consequences of Liberalism

There are immediate, practical and political reasons why liberalism must be overcome.

Thus far, we have examined liberalism's effects on the inward, spiritual aspect of our lives. It diminishes life and dampens the vital, creative energies of the human spirit—this is certainly true. But just as there are inward, spiritual effects of liberalism, there are also *outward, political effects that are equally destructive.*

Our society no longer functions with one will—with one set of agreed-upon goals—and we no longer take political actions that benefit society as a whole. Liberalism is in no small part responsible for this.

Perhaps this would be acceptable in a period of peace and stability. Indeed, liberalism was allowed to grow and attain its current proportions as a cultural movement in the period of relative peace when we faced no serious rivals—no serious threat to our civilization. It should be clear to all that this is no longer the case.

A new time of crisis is already upon us. It is not tomorrow, nor is it the day after tomorrow. It is today; it is now; crisis is erupting even as I write. And as our rivals organize their militaries and develop new weapons technologies, being fully prepared for war, we are stuck squabbling over past grievances and making high-sounding moral proclamations with no teeth, no substance. *We are handcuffed to old ideals from a past era that no longer serve our social and political interests.* Today, we face a new existential threat to our social order, and the stakes involved are nothing less than the stability, prosperity and cultural autonomy of our civilization. However, we find ourselves woefully unprepared and unready to face this new threat, and our rivals are acutely aware of our weakness.

As I have already indicated, there are two main ways in which liberalism inhibits us. First, it has served to divide society, pitting one group against another according to their own narrow interests. Second, it inhibits us from employing military and diplomatic force to further our strategic and material interests. We must examine each of these factors in turn.

I will digress briefly to make a point. As I understand it, at one time *neuroticism* was defined as an individual's inability to adapt and develop in a way appropriate to his stage of maturity. The reason for this usually lies in some unresolved inner emotional conflict from his past life, some insufficiency of the will. He refuses or is unable to accept or acknowledge some disagreeable event from the past that is in some way at variance with his idea of himself or with his values. As a consequence, he remains psychologically trapped in an earlier stage of development: unable to move on, the world and his own life pass him by. Meanwhile, he claws and tears at his psyche, reopening old, half-healed emotional wounds and causing nothing but self-harm.

No doubt the reader can guess my meaning. In America, we suffer from a kind of collective neurosis, a *neurosis in historicis*, an inhibitive error in the way that we interpret and integrate our own history as a society. As a consequence, there has been a catastrophic breakdown of social and political unity in recent years. With no clear way forward, we turn to the ready-formed and worn-out narratives of the past century. We insist on rooting out injustice, going so far as to find it where there is none. We accuse one another to no end, and demand ever more radical ways of reorganizing society to the point of endangering the elements of society responsible for real output and growth.

I do not mean to deny that there was ever injustice in our history. As a democratic society, we once had laws, institutions and a culture that enforced discrimination along lines of gender, race and sexuality. This was a gross contradiction of principle, as writers of past centuries have pointed out. *What I do positively assert is that these issues have largely been resolved to the point that a person can freely participate in society irrespective of gender, race*

or sexuality. Anything beyond this is a demand for special legal or social privileges, which seems to be precisely what these groups are aiming at—this must be addressed in its due place.

At any rate, *even if these injustices have not been fully resolved, we absolutely must turn our attention to the outside threats to our interests and our security.* No society has ever been perfect, nor will there ever be a perfect society. Our current political and cultural squabbling amounts to a kind of naïve utopianism; we are practically chasing after Cloudcuckooland.

If we do not move on from our blind crusade against injustice—if we do not find some grounds for cooperation—we as a society will not survive.

For example, we bicker over material benefits—wage equality, equality of opportunity and the like. However, without security and political strength, our prosperity will also erode away: there will be no wealth to argue over. We would all be wretched and destitute together—the most miserable form of equality.

In ancient Republican Rome, there was a kind of rhythm in their history: in times of peace, the plebians and patricians would be at each other's throats, fighting over political and social reform. In times of war, however, the two parties would drop their domestic quibbles and turn their attention to face the outside world as a unified body. It was this belief in a common political purpose that would make Rome great. Our Founding Fathers once looked to Rome as a model for our society, and now we must look to Rome once again. We must come together and cooperate, finding common purpose in the interests of our state.

A great confrontation is coming. I think it is not a question of *if* this will happen, but of *when*. Our rivals are the aggressors of this century, and their purpose is clear: they seek to challenge our place in world affairs. This threat is fundamentally different than the disputes we have had since 1945, as the powers we face have near-parity with us in terms of economic and military might. In contrast to the political situation of the Cold War, they are also apparently willing to utilize military force to challenge us directly. Militarily, we have already begun to adjust to these new circumstances in earnest. Culturally and ideologically, however, I fear that we are still thinking along the lines of the past century.

In the 21st century so far, we have styled ourselves the defenders of democratic values, and we have conducted our foreign policy accordingly. We demand to see changes in other societies to reflect the values and the way of life in our own society. We blundered into two costly wars and attempted to prop up democratic regimes to rule over unreceptive peoples. We conduct ourselves as though we were the Hapsburgs of the 17th century, who attempted to impose Catholicism upon the Protestant princes of Germany without regard for the sovereignty of the small German states. In a word, we pursue a *moralistic foreign policy*: we make our decisions and justify ourselves according to values informed by liberal-democratic ideology—all other considerations are more or less secondary.

This moralistic foreign policy has achieved next to nothing. Like the Spartans following the Peloponnesian War, we have only succeeded in draining our resources in trying to impose a static political order upon the world. If our purpose was to spread democracy and liberal values,

we certainly have not succeeded in that regard. Militarily, we were able to overwhelm our enemies. However, in attempting to impose democracy, we have only bred intense resentment against us and have radicalized anti-democratic groups.

If our moralistic purpose could not be achieved against dramatically weaker states, it cannot possibly be achieved against rival powers. Our rivals' regimes and their people have shown that they are fully resolved and prepared to resist, and they have the force of arms to back their resolve.

I am by no means advocating a wholesale abandonment of our way of life. What is necessary is a shift in the way we see ourselves and our place in the world, a change of paradigm.

The problem as I see it is that liberalism refuses to acknowledge the pursuit of power as a valid purpose for the state. We insist on seeing ourselves as a member of a global community working to maintain idyllic conditions of peace, equality and free love. Any serious student of history knows that this is fundamentally an error. *All politics are power politics. What we believe is simply how we justify the pursuit of power to ourselves.* We pretend to be moralists and crusaders for democratic values. In reality, we pursue strength and prosperity for ourselves. *This is what every political society is constrained to doing.* Our current interpretation of our values only inhibits us from doing this effectively.

In order to face the new era successfully, we must acknowledge the following:

1. America is in a position of power and influence.
2. A position of power and influence is good and desirable in itself.
3. The health and influence of our values depend upon the political power and influence of our state.

Our values do not exist independently of our society, and we have no cultural influence without political power and influence. We must be willing and able to do what is necessary diplomatically and militarily to preserve our position in the world. We must see the world as a balance of power, and not as a battleground of good and evil. Conflicts between good and evil are the stuff of fairytales and childhood fantasy; political affairs and human interactions are complex and morally ambiguous. We must make enemies and allies on the basis of what is politically expedient without regard for how other states govern themselves or order their societies. (Note, however, that I am not advocating the abandonment of our alliance with the European powers in favor of unlikely partnerships with our rivals. Our historical alliance with the other Western powers is a source of strength, and we share a natural affinity in terms of our shared cultural and political traditions. Our destinies are interwoven. To risk disrupting this alliance would be suicidal.) For lack of a better expression, this era calls for an *American Real Politik*.

What I am not Proposing

It is important to clear away what is stagnant, dead and inhibitory in Western intellectual life. However, it is just as important to clarify what is worth protecting and carrying forward into the remainder of this century.

I am not proposing a return to a former state of society. I by no means want to see a return to the laws and the mores of the 19th century, when social restrictions were placed on people on the basis of gender, race and sexuality.

In the 20th century, important strides were made in advancing toleration and the recognition of different ways of life. *Now it is a matter of preserving them.*

It is important to understand that the rival powers we face are fundamentally and unequivocally hostile towards our values and our way of life. I have heard that there is a certain argument stating that the values and institutions we have established are so deeply entrenched that they will persist even if another power rises to take our place. This is approximately as naïve as the Englishman who, in 1899, proclaims that the British Empire will endure forever, and that the coming century will be no different from the last.

The rival powers uniting against us represent *the great reactionary forces of the world.* A world held under their sway would be a world plunged back into darkness. Toleration, individual liberties and freedom of speech would all erode away, and in their place would arise irrational autocracy, oppressive materialism and spiritual bankruptcy.

I also am not advocating a revival of the extreme nationalism of the early 20th century. Increased social organization and acceptance of the military may become necessary, but this should not happen to advance the narrow agenda of a particular nation.

The era of nationalism is at an end. The idea of a nation served a purpose at a particular point in time, but we have now seen through the fictions that constitute a national identity.

This is not to say that a group identity is not necessary. Now we must find our identity in the ideas, culture and traditions that we maintain in common among ourselves and our allies. We only have to cultivate the absolute resolve to fight for them.

The principle of toleration is not incompatible with the pursuit of independence and power. Remark that *Persia, Rome and the Ottoman Empire* (to name a few) were all multiethnic, multicultural societies that tolerated the various groups that they contained. *Athens and Rome* were democratic societies that fought for independence and empire.

The association of democratic values with pacifism and altruistic self-denial is a modern innovation. It is true that war has become much more destructive, but now we are faced with the choice of either fighting or seeing our values and our society fade silently into history.

I call for *a renewed willingness to fight for our interests and an end to the fixation on identity politics that divides society.* The interests of the intellectual and the patriot now coincide. We must put aside our domestic bickering and stand united to face a common threat.

The Demonic Triumvirate

America is ruled by a demonic triumvirate. I do not literally mean that we are ruled by three. Rather, there are three *groups* that share the concepts, values and language of liberalism in common. These groups are *the liberal politicians, the liberal media and the academics*. These groups work in cooperation to clarify and articulate the aims and the doctrine of liberalism, and to impose liberalism upon society, regardless of whether it is willing.

I say that they are *demonic* because their values are ostensibly founded in care, concern and mutual understanding, though they use them to further their self-interest. I also say they are demonic because the values themselves are destructive towards the strength and stability of our society.

They *are* cynical and false; they do *not* mean our society well; they *will* destroy us if we continue to acknowledge their authority.

These three groups—again, the politicians, the media and the academics—effectively preside over a *democratic totalitarianism*. They use fear and shame to silence their critics. They cannot conduct open arrests on ideological grounds (although I am sure that they would like to), and so they threaten the livelihood of anyone that challenges them. They have created an atmosphere of uncertainty and dread, and all are forced to watch what they say carefully for fear of being censured. They accelerate the breakdown of social bonds between us; we look at one another with mistrust for fear of transgressing against their oppressive code of values (the academics “celebrate” the “diversity” of “voices”—they love it when new people speak up!—so long as these new “voices” agree with what the academics already believe). With social media everyone has become an informant. It’s so democratic! Everyone is now his or her own secret policeman with the authority to call down shame and destruction on any transgressors—even their own friends and family. Are any of them “true believers?” Well, it is better to accuse than to be accused.

For some fifty years we fought communism in Europe. But is this culture really so different from the *police states of the Eastern Bloc*?

Our society is guaranteed freedom of speech, and this is obviously a problem for our *politburo*. They get around this problem by *monopolizing freedom of speech*, using resources and infrastructure that few individuals could hope to match. Indeed, they effectively control the flow of information, and there are scarcely any alternatives to the narrative that they spin.

Although they become hysterical if there are any “threats to democracy” (really threats to their ideological dominance), *they are the ones most responsible for undermining our democratic institutions*. Disrupting their authority is essential not only for the power and stability of our society, but also for maintaining a free and open society.

It is worthwhile to examine each of these three groups in turn.

Liberal Politicians

Bumbling, incompetent, obstructionist. These politicians govern in the name of liberal ideals, though in reality they serve as *cultural figureheads* for liberalism.

What is it that they achieve in reality? They talk about love and compassion to no end, and I suppose we are to believe that they govern and legislate with love and compassion. However, note the oafish self-conceit of the men and the harsh, predatory, avian features of the women. Are these truly the faces of compassion?

They are *career politicians*, each and every one of them. It is best not to forget this. They wield power to flatter their vanity. When they legislate, they are concerned with advancement, reelection and legacy. They talk about the wellbeing of the people while making policies against the interests of the state, as though the two were not inseparable from one another.

They are addicted to spending money that no one has. They even have the gall to call this “stimulus spending”—something beneficial for the economy—while undermining the integrity of the dollar by increasing the national debt. Not even Louis XVI was this shameless and ineffectual.

The West is hurtling towards a crisis, and yet the liberal leadership seems to be living in a fantasy. Our military is the most powerful in the world, and yet it is not being used to deter the aggression of our rivals. Under their governance, we have surrendered the initiative entirely to men who explicitly want to challenge American power. They have no plan, no vision for the future, and their policy is completely disconnected from reality.

What is needed now is effective leadership and decisive action, and the liberals—for all their alarmism and feet-dragging—are incapable of providing this.

Liberal Media

The liberal media controls the political narrative in the country. They effectively drown out all other sources of opinion—or they try very hard to do this. Their purpose is to control public opinion to suit their political agenda, regardless of whether or not it is good for the country.

Take the Coronavirus disaster as an example. In contrast to the panic surrounding the Coronavirus, The H1N1 pandemic of the late 2000s was quietly swept under the rug because it didn't suit the media's political purposes.

However, when the Coronavirus began to emerge in late 2019, the media created panic and hysteria *before there was a single case in North America*. Their purpose, of course, was to control the results of the 2020 election.

They got their candidate in, but the cost has been terrible. To control the public discourse is a grave responsibility.

Public opinion is to a democratic society what the conscious mind is to the body. And indeed, most people are not politically-minded; they look to some source of authority for an interpretation of political affairs. The interpretation they are given directly affects their individual perception of the wellbeing of society, and of their own wellbeing by extension. Any doctor can confirm how disastrous a morbid, pathological outlook is to the health of a patient. I obviously do not dispute the physical existence of the virus, but the *interpretation* of it may be compared to a severe hypochondriac fit in an individual, a complete psychosomatic breakdown of society. (Think of the phenomenon of “long COVID.”)

I do not need to remind anyone of the economic consequences of this crisis or of the social unrest that coincided with it. These were only the outward manifestations of what was essentially a crisis of mass interpretation.

Note how affirming the severity of the Coronavirus is now a matter of ideological affiliation. In the very apt words of a friend, the Coronavirus has virtually become a “social justice issue.” The liberals use the same moralistic tone when discussing the virus, and critics of the vaccine or vaccine mandates are targeted with the same moralistic vitriol. A liberal *must* maintain that the Coronavirus is very severe and that it is the top administrative priority, just as a conscientious Catholic *must* affirm that the Pope is, indeed, infallible in certain cases.

In the name of the purported severity of the virus, the liberals are using the opportunity to cow their opponents and society in general into submission, stripping away liberties with mandates, and targeting those who oppose them.

This is all only to illustrate the destructive influence of the liberal media. To politicize the severity of the Coronavirus any further would be a mistake. The greater mistake, however, would be to continue to give undue attention to an issue that society has largely moved on from. There are far worse things than a chest cold. World war, economic depression, hyperinflation, famine—all of these things can be averted with swift and effective political action.

Evidence of Central Planning

I do not want to pass by another issue regarding the media that troubles me. There seems to be every indication that *the combined efforts of liberal news sources are coordinated*. For instance, early in 2020, I remember that the major liberal news networks abruptly shifted their attention to “stopping Asian hate.” I have no issue with Asians; that is not the point. I only mean to point out that this is evidence of central, coordinated planning of how the major news networks use their resources to shape the public narrative. If this is so, how can they possibly criticize state-run media? At least a state-run media network promotes political unity and social stability.

In other words, there seems to be evidence of *the malicious, coordinated use of public influence to shape opinion in order to benefit narrow, factional interests at the expense of the*

public interest. In all likelihood, the Coronavirus fiasco was a *planned, coordinated* attack on social stability to serve a political purpose.

A rational, independently-minded citizen should think twice before trusting the credibility and intentions of the mainstream media.

Academics

Special attention must be given to the academics. Whereas the first two groups offend deliberately and for the purpose of their self-interest, the academics advance the cause of liberalism out of *institutional obligation* and *authentic belief*. They are to some extent the “true believers,” the ones who make liberalism a living, developing thing.

Here I must digress to illustrate my point. As a rule, social institutions have some rite of initiation, some process that separates the initiate from the rest of society and confirms them as a member of a select, more or less insulated group with its own special purposes, conventions and values.

For instance, when I was in Bergen, I heard a story that young men seeking to join the Hanseatic League were bound, tossed into the bay and made to swim back to shore as a rite of initiation. If they drowned, they drowned—it was the hazard that they took upon themselves to join.

While this might strike us as being unreasonably cruel today, in the academy there is a similarly cruel rite of initiation—indeed, it is ironic that fraternities are put under such heavy scrutiny for hazing. The academic rite of initiation is the *writing and defense of one’s doctoral thesis*. It is an intellectual rite of passage rather than a physical one. In the process, the doctoral candidate is *put under the constant intellectual scrutiny of their peers*, and is gradually *stripped of their intellectual freedom*. This is the price to pay for entrance into an institution where a contemplative, studious way of life is socially acceptable, much like a monastery of the Medieval era.

Already I can hear a collective cry of protest. Most academics are decent, intellectually sensitive people who would chafe at any suggestion of intellectual constraint. However, to my academic critic, I propose the following thought experiment: at your next symposium and in front of a room full of your peers, stand and proclaim with force and conviction that “the word of Muhammad is correct; the strictest form of Sharia Law must be observed; women must wear veils and coverings from this day forward.” What do you suppose would happen?

The censure of one’s peers is a powerful thing, and even if one is never *actually* reprimanded, simply to imagine it is enough to cause pain. The path to a PhD is long, and in the process the candidate is surrounded at all times by people in a place where liberalism is effectively religious law. Even if he or she has inner reservations at first, to be constantly constrained in expression for fear of censure means that they will gradually begin to accept the principles of liberalism in thought. The Ottomans had a low threshold for accepting a person’s

conversion to Islam: they only required the convert to move their finger. Their assumption was that, through consistent practice of outward devotion, the inner part of the convert would eventually accept the faith.

In the academy, ideological scrutiny is much more rigorous. In addition to the constant, silent force exerted by their peers, a candidate's writing—the outward manifestation of the inner contents of a person's soul—is also under constant scrutiny. Beginning in the classroom and culminating in the writing and defense of a thesis, the PhD candidate's writing is subjected to constant attention: they must write according to what is expected, or they will not be admitted among their peers. And even after this, they are expected to write and publish academic articles which are placed under peer review—not so much a way to ensure the validity of their writing as it is a way to ensure that what is said is in keeping with academic orthodoxy.

Granted, in the sciences this process is indeed a way to ensure accuracy and validity of research results. *But in the humanities*, this process effectively functions as a way to weed out unacceptable interpretations.

This gets to the essence of what I consider to be one of the primary social functions of the academy—I am not simply trying to denigrate the academics. *The academy is the gatekeeper of the entire realm of human interpretation*. Interpretation dictates attitude towards life, and hence what thoughts, feelings and behaviors are socially acceptable—the humanities are not nearly as harmless or insignificant as our society seems to think.

Take the idea of equality as an example. Science tells us that there are basic biological differences between all living things that fundamentally determine how we behave. *The idea of equality is an interpretation of life*; It tells us that these differences are to be ignored politically and socially, and that our laws and institutions must be organized to reflect this interpretative tenant.

We even go so far as to say that a person can publicly proclaim to be a certain thing, and that, in the name of equality and justice, society is *obligated* to recognize them as such. Most other cultures—past or present—would call this madness or absurdity. This is the might of interpretation.

Interpretation is the fundamental, determining force in human affairs. I could cite any number of other examples to illustrate this point. Religious law, for instance, was once the organizing principle of society. It caused wars, shook nations, changed the face of the world. Even today, it complicates social matters such as abortion. Science tells us how precisely pregnancy occurs and how it may be safely terminated, but *if* this thing should be done is a matter of our attitude towards it, a matter of *interpretation*.

But to return to the discussion at hand, the academy is the gatekeeper of interpretation, but liberalism is the master of the academy. It is its intellectual sultan that has its academic serving-men do its will.

Philosophy, literature and religious texts—anything containing human emotional or psychological response to the outside world—are all processed and assigned an interpretation

that is in line with liberal values and principles. They are made to fit with academic values; to use an expression of a former instructor of mine, they “make it good” (“good” being what accords with liberalism in this case, in other words, a purely relative term).

From the philosophers and writers that they agree with, the academics articulate doctrines, and these doctrines are eventually fed to the politicians and the media. These doctrines form the basis of the *policy* of the politicians, and the *narrative* spun by the media. (To use an example, *Gender Trouble* by Judith Butler is responsible for many of the notions about gender roles and identity that are currently popular. This book in turn finds its arguments on the philosophy of figures such as Friedrich Nietzsche.)

Now, I do not mean to say that the academy and the academics are bad and that they should be abolished. This would be a dangerous and even a suicidal proposal. Many academics are essentially decent people; they are only *institutionally constrained* to holding onto attitudes and interpretations that no longer serve society. In point of fact, intellectual institutions such as the modern academy serve two very important functions.

First, they provide sanctuary and a social context for intellectually disposed people. The world is a rough, harsh place, and it is unkind to the intellectual. Intellectual activity requires a degree of passivity and repose, and intellectual institutions provide this. In the academy, intellectuals are permitted to carry out their work in peace, and the work of the intellectual has become indispensable for modern society.

Second, intellectual institutions serve as *repositories and protectors of intellectual progress*. For instance, Buddha was the intellectual innovator, but the *Buddhist temple* has preserved his teachings from generation to generation and across entire continents. Just so, Plato’s Academy preserved Platonic teachings, the Christian Church preserved the principles of religion, and the modern academy carries forward the spirit of the Enlightenment. Without intellectual institutions, humanity would undoubtedly backslide into barbarism.

Somewhat ironically, the intellectual institution is *essentially conservative in nature*. The academic is basically a porter of the attitudes of past eras.

This is why, from time to time, intellectual and interpretive assumptions must be challenged—so that society can adapt to changing circumstances.

Intellectual Movements of the 20th Century

The doctrines and formulas that constitute contemporary liberalism are founded in the attitudes set forward by the writers, artists and intellectuals of the 20th century. I said that the academics are essentially the porters of past values and thought, and this is true. Indeed, most of the leading academics today were alive as the major social movements of the 20th century took shape, and they carry the values that they fought for in their youths to the present day. The precise tenants of liberalism may change from decade to decade—growing and becoming ever

more radical in their demands on society—but the core values of liberalism have not changed dramatically since the last century, having been set down by the leading intellectuals of that time.

As I see it, there were three generations of intellectuals—three waves of intellectual activity—that shaped the intellectual character of the 20th century in the West generally, but in America particularly. These generations are difficult to delineate precisely, as their productive periods overlap and they share overlapping thematic concerns, but we can make broad categorizations on the basis of *major political and cultural turning points*. As a rule, the intellectual character of a generation is determined by its most vital and urgent expenditure of creative energy in response to some pressing need, deficiency or contradiction in society. In other words, the intellectual character of a generation is determined by the period of its youth.

I suppose this is somewhat abstract. To give two examples, Henry Miller was alive and productive until 1980, but he is best remembered for challenging sexual mores of the early 20th century. Jean-Luc Godard is alive even today, but his most influential work was from the '60s and '70s.

But to return to my classification, I said that there were three waves.

The first wave was international and essentially European in character. These were the existentialists and the Marxists. Their task was to get to grips with the decline of European influence and empire, as well as the destruction of the world wars. They pointed out the moral contradictions of Western colonization, and they rebelled against bourgeois materialism as well as the authority of the modern, industrialized state and its warlike tendencies. They also worked to tear down the moral conventions of the Victorian era, especially the repressive sexual mores of that period. They were fixated upon the psyche—the vital, unconscious activity of human life—innovating psychoanalysis and literary representations of man's irrational desires and motivations. Identifying and exposing these hidden forces of life helped to end the moral conventions set up against them.

In Europe, this intellectual movement continued until the '60s and the '70s, but it was largely over by the late '80s and early '90s as decolonization came to completion, as economic conditions improved, and as the strength and influence of the Soviet Union continued to decline, eventually leading to its fall.

The second wave took place in America, and its thematic concerns were chiefly American in nature. With the end of the Second World War, America stood as the dominant Western power. There was an accompanying intellectual break with Europe with this new generation of writers and artists. These were the Beats—principal among them was Jack Kerouac—and their task was to search for spiritual meaning and direction in a society that was unfolding and realizing itself, having nearly reached the height of power. I do not think they achieved spiritual enlightenment. However, drawing upon the currents of America's past literary tradition, they did romanticize intoxication and the pursuit of pleasure, which has remained the most prominent feature of American culture (alongside our love of moneymaking).

I would go so far as to say that this was an ahistorical movement. The most prominent texts from this generation contain naïve acts of value-creation, comparable perhaps to what a shaman might have done for a tribe that relocated to a new place. In the writings of this generation, there is a conspicuous lack of cultural awareness, and scarcely any attention is paid to questions of independence, pride or status in relation to other people (compare this to French literature and media, and you will see a dramatic contrast, figures such as Arthur Rimbaud being an exception). Indeed, in their writing there is a tendency to ignore differences of status among people altogether.

In their writing, pursuit of pleasure becomes something more than a personal imperative. It become all-encompassing; everyone becomes a pleasure-seeking agent, and the pursuit of pleasure becomes the basic, unspoken preconscious assumption underlying every activity and social interaction. History, culture, custom, politics and law fall outside of this sphere of awareness as things abstract and inapplicable to the immediacies of life (not long ago, I heard that a young American went to Istanbul, a place with nearly 2000 years of history. He reported that it was terrible—the night clubs and bars there were no good.) In short, theirs is a world-idea spun by the lotus eaters.

The third wave was also American. It featured little original thought. Instead, this generation incorporated the thought of their immediate predecessors and extended the influence of these new values through mass social movements. The “hippie movement,” drug culture and free love were all products of this generation. This generation also gave rise to the civil rights movements, which brought the fundamental values of equality in American culture to further conclusions. Influenced by Marxism, they also had a special preoccupation with economic stratification and social ills of a material nature. (In the 21st century, there has been a shift to an overriding preoccupation with psychological wellbeing as Marxism has fallen out of vogue.)

As stated, the leading academics and intellectual authorities of the present day came from this third wave, and to examine the values that emerged from this generation is to examine the very foundation of contemporary liberalism.

At the time that this generation was emerging into the world, their values were new, fresh and full of vital energy—the energy of youth. They were fighting an older generation whose values had become dogmatic, stifling and no longer necessary to society. They had the feeling of doing what was morally correct, and the resistance they encountered only heightened their sense of identity and purpose.

Now, however, the situation is reversed. What was a young and exuberant generation in the 20th century has become the older generation that is now passing away. I will not dispute that certain of the changes they brought about were necessary for bringing the values of equality into their fullest realization in American society. However, today their values have become just as dogmatic and inhibitory as those of their fathers—Saturn has replaced his father Night.

There is no new or fresh energy in the values that they jealously protect. They set up unreasonable and absurd social restrictions and obligations. In the last estimate, their only

purpose now is to protect the advantageous social and material arrangements that they set up for themselves in their youths.

Whereas the fathers of this third wave prevented them from having fun, the values that constitute liberalism are, once again, a threat to the existence of our civilization. In particular, their values of obstinate, unconditional pacifism and refusal to permit the state's pursuit of power are now especially harmful, as I will discuss in detail.

In the following sections, I will discuss the broad thematic principles of the three intellectual waves of the 20th century which are now directly harmful to us in our present circumstances. I do not mean to say that these themes and values are absolutely wrong, nor do I mean to denigrate the remarkable men and women who wrote and innovated in the first intellectual generation of the 20th century.

Once again, I only mean to say that these values *are no longer applicable to our present circumstances*. They may have been an authentic and appropriate response to the circumstances of the 20th century, but they are no longer appropriate today and must be adjusted. (On the other hand, certain intellectual trends needed to play out in order for us to recognize their futility. Marxism, for example, now almost appears comical in hindsight. Intellectuals of the 20th century detected the absence of a satisfying spiritual component in life, and an excessive, overbearing materialism in society. Their answer was—more materialism. As Carl Jung once wryly noted, those with unfulfilled spiritual inclinations may respond with an exaggerated materialistic outlook.)

Hyperintellectualism

In “The Dead,” Gabriel Conroy describes his generation as being “hyperintellectual.” I can think of no better term to describe the intellectuals of the early 20th century.

There was a great deal of theory-mongering, and it was as if they were striving to outdo one another in complexity and abstruse formula in explaining the phenomena occurring in the world. For example, Marxist theory in the 20th century spun itself and grew ever more complicated and unwieldy. It is a deeply unsettling experience to step into the Marxist section of an academic library. So many hundreds of books on interpreting economic circumstances—what could it all possibly amount to? Is there anything in those hundreds of thousands and millions of pages that is truly applicable to life?

The tendency, I fear, was to locate the operating forces of the world *outside* of the human mind, or else it was to interpret human experience in a tortured and needlessly complicated way. The irony is that the work that was truly lasting and influential from the 20th century contained concise and compelling interpretations of human experience—in other words, the same way that Homer has been lasting and influential.

What is needed for the 21st century is a return to simplicity. We should employ a *practical phenomenology*, one that observes inner experience and is able to relate this effectively to our circumstances.

Negative, Nihilistic Attitude towards Life

Speaking generally, the intellectuals of the early 20th century shared a negative, cynical attitude towards life. There are many possible reasons for this, and it is difficult to offer a truly comprehensive explanation for why this was.

The optimism and energy of the Victorian era had begun to exhaust itself by the turn of the 20th century, and a loss of a sense of social purpose was beginning to set in. The modernization of society demanded a higher degree of social organization, and the emphasis placed on productivity and regimentation was (and still is) inimical to the lifestyle of the intellectual. The First World War was hugely traumatic—the cost and the destruction of the war were unprecedented, and nothing was gained from it on either side. There was a resulting decline in the national energies of the nations of Europe, and there followed economic depression, political turmoil and another world war.

But above all, there was *a loss of a sense of spiritual commonality in the West*. As I have indicated, this was accompanied by a swelling of the strength of the mercantile, bourgeois element of European society, which imposed *an excessively materialistic worldview on the West*. (Incidentally, my main criticism of Marx is that his historical materialism served only *to confirm the materialistic assumptions of the European bourgeoisie*. As an intellectual, his dissatisfaction with bourgeois society was natural, and I also think that many of his observations regarding capitalism and social structure were mostly correct. *His main error was the solution that he proposed to the problems of modernity.*)

It is impossible to deny that physical, material circumstances do have a major bearing on our lives. However, *the spiritual dimension of our social existence is what binds us together on a deeper, more fundamental plane of emotion and psychic connection*. The spiritual dimension in life gives us a sense of context and purpose, and bids us to set aside our individual egos and participate with one another in a spirit of trust, innocence and mutual understanding.

At bottom, an intellectual is a *profoundly sensitive individual in matters of spirituality*. By the late 19th century, it had become apparent that *the obligating force of the old metaphysical moral and spiritual ideal was beginning to decline*. Two millennia of certainty in spiritual matters were coming to an end. The effect this had on the intellectuals of the 20th century was understandably catastrophic.

The rug had been pulled out from under them. They had been abruptly kicked out of their father's house and into the cold, left to fend for themselves (so to speak). The work had begun to construct a new kind of spiritual meaning.

The first generation of intellectuals of the 20th century responded as a young man in his early 20s might respond when he finally realizes that he has to make a living for himself: they became bitter, downcast and fed up with the world.

Nihilism, existentialism, modernism or post-modernism—call it what you will. *What was essential was the attitude that these intellectuals took towards life.* Through tone and theme and philosophical formula, they proclaimed it to be “vanity of vanities,” “full of sound and fury, signifying nothing.”

Make no mistake, these intellectual men and women were strong, brave and extraordinary in several respects. But the time has come to grow past this “pale, sicklied o’er” attitude towards life.

To be alive is an extraordinary thing. It takes bravery and strength to acknowledge this, as we must also face the possibility of death.

Life is not extraordinary simply because it is full of mild pleasures and affirmations from others—a life containing these things alone would be somewhat hollow and superficial. Life inevitably includes suffering, struggle and the denial of what we desire from the bottom of our hearts. To be defeated is to resign in the face of these difficulties, and to refuse to try any further.

Anyone who is truly accomplished knows that these difficulties must be encountered with quiet personal courage and persistence. Overcoming them leads to growth, development and the discovery of who we really are as individuals. After all, it is only by *not getting what we want* that we discover *what we truly want and how to get it.*

Henry Miller knew this far better than me. In the face of poverty, extreme solitude and desperation, he carved out a place for himself in the world as an artist—the most uncertain of all professions. He remained strong enough to keep his independence and to say *yes* to life in spite of hardship. In my view, he surpassed his American peers in bravery and is a model for the intellectually disposed.

Although we have lost a great deal of spiritual meaning, we must continue to work towards finding it anew. Above all, we must stand up and defend ourselves, our traditions and our civilization.

Hostility towards Western Civilization

In the 20th century, it was fashionable to claim that “Western civilization is in decline,” or to say that Westerners were sickly and unnatural as a result of their culture. Intellectuals of the last century would call for the end of the West, the “deconstruction” of Western culture, and the collapse of Western political and social institutions. Western nations were demonized as evil and oppressive colonizers with no authentic culture of their own. (At the very least, there was a call for the triumph of communism, and the end of political struggle. Today, however, we see that the world is the same way that it has been since the time that Thucydides wrote his history: it is a collection of states vying for dominance and influence by any means necessary. Marxism only

served as a new kind of justification for this essential striving after power. At best, we can hope for one Power that holds all of the other states in check. The Marxist fantasy is over; now we must face reality.)

Perhaps there was some grounds for bitterness towards the West in the last century. Today, this is completely irrational.

We are the West. To call for our own destruction is sheer and utter madness. Our life, our joy, our love, our thoughts and our values all depend on the health and security of the political bodies that comprise us and contain us.

At bottom, those very anti-Western intellectuals themselves depended upon the health and security of the West. Who would give them money, fame and adulation otherwise? How else could they live their lives, think their thoughts and make their criticisms? Perhaps in a Marxist utopia, but then they would no longer be necessary, and such a place is Cloudcuckooland anyway.

It was well and good for Sartre to pose in Tiananmen Square seventy years ago so that he could make his ideological statement and receive praise from his leftist friends. The West was still in a position of unassailable strength back then, and China was still rural and underdeveloped. Today, however, it is modernized and predatory. It has its same old backwards customs, and it is eyeing the West with the full intention of claiming power so that it can impose its values upon us. To treat the “victims of colonization” like innocent babes in the woods is no longer a feasible option, a sentimental luxury we can no longer afford.

Humanity has progressed and quite literally evolved as the result of our intellectual culture and our traditions. We can try to wish this fact away and “celebrate cultural diversity,” but it is the plain and simple truth. A regression to a former stage of cultural development is no more desirable than the collapse of our financial institutions. (Incidentally, the academics and liberals who “celebrate diversity” do so in a way that is completely superficial and meaningless. Eating foreign food and wearing foreign costume on occasion does not constitute an adoption of another culture. Would they be willing to set aside their wealth, their technology and their independence in order *truly* to participate in a foreign culture? Would they be willing to obey foreign marriage customs and observe foreign religious law? Would they allow themselves to be raped and enslaved by foreign tribesmen like a character from a Paul Bowles novel? I hardly think so. Western “diversity” always presupposes the priority of Western traditions and customs. Note, for example, how liberals want to topple traditional social structures in other countries in order to spread feminism and equality. These are the same people who have made saying the very word “colonization” a mortal sin!)

The future progress of humanity is dependent upon the survival of Western thought and Western tradition. I am firmly convicted of this.

Perhaps it is out of place to say that we must wage wars of aggression and expansion. However, for the hundredth time, *we must do whatever is necessary to defend ourselves, our values, our political structures and our traditions.*

The Romanticized Pursuit of Pleasure

The second wave of intellectuals of the 20th century—the Beats—searched for every form of pleasure in their attempt to find spiritual meaning. What was it that they found? Alcoholism, heroin addiction and sexual debauchery. Jack Kerouac drank himself to death in a spirit of Christlike innocence and naivete.

Obviously this is wrong! It is a waste of life, youth and talent. In spite of this, reckless, self-destructive pleasure-seeking continues to be idealized in our culture. Artists and normal people alike seem hell-bent on destroying themselves chasing after ever more intense sensations.

Speaking abstractly, there is an unnerving ambiguity of purpose when a modern human being is alone with nothing to do. In extreme cases, being alone with nothing but one's thoughts and feelings—haunting associations from one's past life—can lead to despair and desperation. It is as if this form of self-destructive pleasure-seeking originated as an attempt to escape this existential dread. I think it is in this same spirit that deeply sensitive people—artists and young talents—take up the most radical forms of pleasure-seeking and end by killing themselves in one way or another.

To be clear, I am not proposing some Platonic society of extreme temperance and austerity. This is a recipe for madness; some form of empty-minded pleasure and release is necessary for life. I certainly am no saint. But speaking from experience, *there is no final insight to be found in ever greater extremities of pleasure*. As any veteran substance user can tell you, experience with one extremity of sensation will only leave you seeking another, greater extremity of sensation. It is certainly no cure for desperation and despair. I hardly need to remind anyone of the addict's spiral downward; such narratives are embedded in our collective cultural experience, and they are the *direct result* of the idealization of pleasure-seeking.

In early youth, sensations are new and fresh. There is an acute pleasure in having new experiences and discovering new dimensions of life. But life continues past one's early 20s; this is not the *only* period of one's life, nor is it even the best.

Youth is the period of struggle and uncertainty; adulthood is the period of independence, self-knowledge and confidence. There are new things to discover as one grows older. For instance, it is possible to take pleasure in one's work, in learning new things, and in improving what one does. To paraphrase Goethe, intoxication is “an illusory pleasure.”

Childlike Trust

There are two other trends in the writings of the second wave that I find unsettling. One is *the tendency to place blind, unconditional trust in other people*. The other, closely related, is *the tendency to surrender autonomy and independence for the sake of pleasure*.

If we are to speak in terms of pleasure and pain, there is *absolutely nothing* more miserable than to have one's autonomy stripped away and to be exploited by stupid, selfish people. To give independence up willingly for the sake of pleasure and nothing else is profoundly, indescribably moronic.

Trust should be given out with caution. At any rate, it should be given out from a position of strength and self-sufficiency. Flinging oneself into the care of others without confidence, self-assurance and a secure place in the world is a recipe for being exploited. Even friends cannot be fully trusted if one is weak; no one is completely free from self-interest and a personal agenda.

Plato wrote that most people are neither very good nor very bad, and that extremely good or bad people are rare. This is probably true enough. Nevertheless, it is important to keep in mind that people have a tendency to behave in their self-interest, especially in today's world, which is excessively materialistic and sexually hyperactive. This is obviously an unfortunate state of affairs, but it is the reality that we face.

What is true for the individual is doubly true for the political collective. *To lose power and cultural autonomy is one of the worst things that can happen to a society. To be politically dominated by another society is the absolute worst thing that can happen.* The arts of politics, strategy and diplomacy have been sorely neglected and ignored by our society. These are the tools of collective political independence, and they should be discovered anew.

I am not saying that we must live in suspicion and mistrust of one another. On the contrary, we must find some grounds for trust and cooperation, and we must also rebuild our social bonds. The alternative is to be dominated either from within or from without.

The Idea that Other Cultures are Preferable to Western Culture

Also in the writings of the second wave is the suggestion that other cultures and other ways of life are preferable to a Western way of life. This is plainly wrong for several reasons.

As I see it, Western culture has two main components:

1. The overriding desire to achieve an advantage over others
2. The resulting intellectual willingness and discipline to carry an idea to its furthest possible conclusions without regard for tradition, religion or social custom

These are the only common features of Western culture from the time of the Pre-Socratics, to Plato, to St. Paul, to the Enlightenment and Kant, to Nietzsche and to the present day.

The Greeks started us on a path of intellectual and evolutionary progress which has drawn us out of archaic wretchedness and superstition to a point where we have nearly become conscious of the precise nature of our existence. We have begun to unravel the mysteries of space and time, and we can manipulate the world in new and extraordinary ways.

I repeat that our continued progress as a species depends upon the continuation of the Western tradition. To lapse into superstition, a dogmatic and obsessive attention to custom, or a fixation on the desires would be disastrous.

What's more, society has come to depend on the continuation of the Western tradition.

To give an example of what I mean, in the tech industry, computing and new ways of sending and receiving information have effectively formed our present epoch. These technologies resulted from a thought experiment intended to test certain philosophical points about the foundations of mathematics—an intellectual exercise which in turn depended upon the epistemological insights of the 17th and 18th centuries. The Western tradition drives man inwards, and the more he discovers about himself—the more he breaks down and improves upon his old understandings—the better he is able to make his way in the world, and the fitter he is against his rivals. In short, any serious hostility towards the Western tradition would be suicidal.

Opposition to the Military

Following the end of the Second World War, America was involved in several smaller wars over influence and ideology. These were not total wars—wars in which the existence of society was under threat—and yet we still enforced a policy of conscription. I freely admit that this was unreasonable and unnecessary. There was resistance against conscription and military authority, and this was, once again, entirely reasonable at the time.

America is meant to be a free and open society, and to fight for personal liberty at a time when America was strong and secure is perfectly in keeping with our values. I probably would have done the same.

However, *political circumstances have changed, and we are no longer in the same position as we once were following the end of the Second World War.* We now must view the military as a necessary implement for our independence and our security. It is a friend and an ally, and we must rely on it if we are to continue our intellectual tradition.

Opposition to Industry and Resource Exploitation

Clean air and clean water are a necessity, and nature is worth preserving. No one wants to live in an over-industrialized Victorian hell.

However, we must also take the interests of the state into consideration. A healthy economy is the foundation of a strong and secure political society, and we need to encourage production and economic self-sufficiency, especially in view of the fact that our rivals have no qualms against unbridled industrial expansion.

Identity Politics

Identity politics spawned from the values established by the social movements of the late 20th century. It is a set of interrelated political ideas that centers upon distributing social and material benefits to certain groups on the basis that they were oppressed in the past. This is done in the name of equality.

I do not deny that injustices were done to these groups in the past, but identity politics represents a political overcorrection that does more harm than good to society. *Fixating upon past injustices causes division in society and diverts our attention away from the external enemies that threaten our society as a whole.* We expend our national energies fighting one another while our rivals are organized, socially and politically cohesive, and are *already in the process of carrying out their plans to disrupt Western power.*

When, precisely, will we decide that adequate reparations have been made to these formerly oppressed groups? This will never happen so long as there is an advantage to be gained from the exploitation of identity politics, and so long as we remain addicted to our compulsive feelings of guilt.

What's more, *identity politics are founded upon contradictory moral principles.* We have reverted to old ways of moral thinking, but the only result is an unequal system of distributing social and material benefits—a kind of inverted aristocracy. And like the aristocracies of old feudal Europe, this political arrangement is vehemently defended on moral grounds, but the real motivation is to retain legal, social and material advantages.

Identity politics demands that one group restrain themselves and their pursuit of self-advantage, while other groups are permitted to pursue their self-advantage at the expense of others. The gross incongruity of this arrangement should be immediately apparent.

To give this argument in greater detail, we can parse out the moral imperatives underlying identity politics in the following way:

1. There is an assumption that it is morally wrong to pursue self-interest openly
2. There is a demand that the core of American society—white, middle class, traditional families and individuals—restrain themselves and the pursuit of their self-interest
3. On the moral assumption that it is right to serve others rather than oneself, this is done in service to historically oppressed groups—the “wretched of the earth.”
4. These historically oppressed groups are permitted to pursue their self-interest openly. They are even morally permitted to glorify fraud, deception, cheating, open sexual debauchery and murder—in other words, what Plato would define as “injustice.”

Injustice is condemned to permit injustice. How democratic!

Our needs and desires were once subject to moral restraint in service to the divine, something beyond the realm of human affairs. Today, we still revert to that old moral habit, but we restrain ourselves in service to other human beings. Human beings are not gods. If they see

the opportunity to gain an easy advantage, they will seize upon it and take as much as they can. Our pity and compassion are leveraged against us.

There is a further moral issue related to our values of equality. It is true that our social and political structures are historically determined. However, our immediate experience is ahistorical. Pleasure and pain—satisfaction and misery—are felt in the here and now, without reference to history; conscious historical knowledge only gives context to our immediate sensations.

While we can look at history and identify conditions of social and political injustice—conditions that violate our values of political equality—to demand that one group restrain their ability to find satisfaction in life in the here and now to compensate for historical injustices *is a violation of the principle of equality*. Making good for past injustices should be constrained to ensuring that everyone in society has an opportunity to find satisfaction in life; *anything beyond this is an act of revenge and is not conducive to cooperation and mutual understanding*.

In other words, *yes I am a white, heterosexual male; yes I am explicitly disadvantaged by identity politics; and yes I am pursuing my own self-interest by criticizing these concepts*. This is perfectly natural. What is *unnatural* is to feel guilt for pursuing my own self-interest. This is in keeping with the principles of modern psychology, which tell us that feelings of guilt are destructive and unhealthy.

What is blatantly in violation of the principle of equality is to say that I cannot pursue my own self-interest for vague moral reasons while other groups may do so freely and openly. To say that I am somehow different on the basis of my sexuality and the color of my skin, and that my emotional needs, desires and interests are not worthy of being recognized by society while only women, minorities and homosexuals have needs that are worthy of being recognized is a *system of inequality*. We have learned from our past mistakes. I make no demands on others to surrender the way of life that they find fulfilling, and I hope that no such demands will be made in the future. At the same time, however, *as a human being* I cannot surrender my own right to doing what I find necessary for living a fulfilling life.

For the hundredth time, I am not arguing that we need to return to the mores and legal restrictions of the 19th century. However, we do need to recognize that *in fighting historical injustice, we have overstepped ourselves and created a new system of injustice that violates the principles of an equal, democratic society*.

The World Today

There is a question that haunts the mind of every student of history. *What if Britain or France had intervened when Hitler sent troops into the Rhineland?* What if they had intervened when Austria was annexed? What if the Sudetenland had not been awarded to Germany, and what if Germany had not been allowed to seize Czechia? The allies finally drew the line when Hitler demanded land from Poland, but by then it was already too late. The world was plunged

into a war that cost millions of lives and wrought untold destruction in Europe and in Asia. These hypothetical questions will forever remain hypothetical.

Today we see history repeating itself. The passivity of the Western powers is shocking; clearly we have not learned from the lessons of history.

It is March 1st, 2022 as I write this, five days since Russia invaded Ukraine. I fully expect that Kiev will fall either tomorrow or the next day, and if not within the next week. By the time this is being read, Russia will undoubtedly either have installed a pro-Russian government in Ukraine, or they will have annexed the country into their territory. The West has imposed sanctions on Russia and is sending arms to aid the Ukrainian military, but this is as good as doing nothing. In fact, when sanctions were first threatened in the leadup to the invasion, I imagine that, for Vladimir Putin, this was effectively an invitation to attack and a guarantee that he would have a free hand in Ukraine while the West would stand by and do nothing. Humanitarian rhetoric is well and good, but strategically it achieves nothing.

What will the consequences be of this invasion? Ukraine will lose its independence, and thousands of civilians will have suffered. These things are, indeed, terrible, but they are not the point. Nor either is it even particularly significant that Russia will have gained a great swath of territory. The economic costs of the invasion will outweigh the benefits of territorial expansion, and I imagine that the Ukrainians will prove restive and disruptive to Russian order.

The greatest significance of the invasion is the challenge it represents to Western power. In this, Vladimir Putin has already succeeded spectacularly. He has proven that a 17th century-style invasion can be undertaken by the Eastern powers, and that the West will stand by and do nothing.

These psychological consequences will be terrible. It will embolden our rivals and bring them closer together diplomatically. An Eastern Alliance is already forming, and its explicit purpose is to challenge the power of the West.

I call for an end to our domestic bickering over privileges and historical injustices. We must recognize that *social cooperation and military readiness* are necessary to halt the aggression of our rivals. Russia has made it clear that it will listen to nothing short of military force, and no amount of high-sounding rhetoric will change that. In order to prevent world war, we must take a hard line against our rivals. Only in this way will we save ourselves and Western civilization as a whole.

END OF PART I