

Thoughts of a Beaver



Index

On Violence.....	2
On Power.....	4
On Revolution.....	8
On Echo Chambers.....	12
On Education.....	15
On Quebec’s Separation.....	17
On Rights.....	20
On Emasculation.....	22
On Statistics.....	25
On the Media.....	27
On Ambition.....	29
On Immigration.....	31
On Language.....	34
On Cronyism and Nepotism.....	36
On Nations.....	38
On Confederations.....	42
On Propaganda.....	46
On Morality.....	48
On Self-Sufficiency.....	50
On Equal Opportunity.....	52
On Democracy.....	54
On Free Speech.....	58

On Violence

Violence is the pillar on which all societies are built and its repression is tantamount to societal collapse.

For societies to function, there must be a set of agreed up rules, which we call laws, to govern all individuals which comprise them. Without those rules to abide by, individuals would likely work against each other and societies would collapse. Even assuming the good will of the individuals comprising a society, having laws allows us to determine the point at which a dysfunctional individual must be stopped by force.

Of course, laws are simply words. Spoken words or words on paper, but only words. Laws gain power through their enforcement, and enforcement is only possible through violence or the implied threat of violence. As an example, a man may pay off a speeding ticket because he thinks it's the right thing to do, but what stops him from deciding he doesn't feel like paying it is the threat of being forcefully taken to jail. And once in jail, what keeps him behaved is the threat of further confinement, which is achieved through violence.

Thus, without violence, laws cannot be enforced. If laws cannot be enforced, the laws mean nothing. If the laws mean nothing, then nothing stops individuals from acting against the well-being of that society. And if nothing stops individuals from acting against the well-being of a society, then the society will eventually collapse. It will take longer in societies where individuals are responsible, but it will happen eventually. What keeps the predatory, the sociopathic, from gaining full power over individuals aiming to make society function, is the threat of violence against them.

Thus, the notion that 'Violence is never the answer' is a laughable one. We teach (or rather, our governments teach) our children that violence is wrong, that they must never use it no matter what. The aim of this is to create a society of slaves who will never protect themselves when abused.

It is slave morality and we must emancipate ourselves from it. Yes, violence is acceptable, in certain conditions. It may not be desirable, but it becomes acceptable - nay, necessary - if one hopes to have a complex and functional society.

Otherwise, what you have is merely a parody of a society, a human organization which does not work for the good and improvement of humanity, but for the glory of its sociopathic leaders.

This, in essence, is the reason behind the west's continued descent into decadence. If the decent, righteous folks who constitute the majority of mankind refuse to engage in violence, then dysfunctional individuals won't hesitate to take what they want by force. Over time, this will allow them to gain positions of power where they will weaken the laws even further and allow even more dysfunctionals into positions of power until we reach a point where the common folk are dominated by a handful of psychopaths, refusing to defend themselves as they believe violence is wrong while letting violence be used to dominate them.

Once such a point is reached, the less intelligent brutes will begin using violence not because they want freedom from the dominating castes, but merely because no one is stopping them. The decent folk refuse to use violence to stop them while those in charge don't care. Worse, those in charge now hesitate to use violence to stop the brutes because it might set a precedent, teach the decent folks that violence is indeed the answer. This is how we wind up with riots all over the place and eventually, either when someone sees an opportunity to seize power or the decent folks finally have enough, civil war. Once the civil war blows over, people with power and the will to enforce laws will create their new state, with new laws, but none can tell if these laws will be the kind which allow a civilized society.

In conclusion, it is my belief that to prevent a total societal failure of the west, it is imperative to teach violence to people again. Teach them how to do it, when to do it, why they should do it.

Remember that it is not a prayer which will keep the darkness at bay, but a sword.

On Power

Before we begin, I would like to quote a passage from George R R Martin's Song of Ice and Fire" as it is not only relevant to this thread, but also very true:

"In a room sit three great men, a king, a priest, and a rich man with his gold. Between them stands a sellsword, a little man of common birth and no great mind. Each of the great ones bids him slay the other two. Do it,' says the king, 'for I am your lawful ruler', 'Do it,' says the priest, 'for I command you in the names of the gods.' 'Do it,' says the rich man, 'and all this gold shall be yours.' So tell me - who lives and who dies?"

"Oh, I think not," Varys said, swirling the wine in his cup. "Power is a curious thing, my lord. Perchance you have considered the riddle I posed you that day in the inn?"

"It has crossed my mind a time or to," Tyrion admitted. "The king, the priest, the rich man—who lives and who dies? Who will the swordsman obey? It's a riddle without an answer, or rather, many answers. All depends on the man with the sword."

"And yet he is no one," Varys said "He has neither crown nor gold nor favor of the gods, only a piece of pointed steel "

"That piece of steel is the power of life and death."

"Just so... Yet if it is the swordsmen who rule us in truth, why do we pretend our kings hold the power? Why should a strong man with a sword ever obey a child king like

Joffrey, or a wine-sodden oaf like his father?"

"Because these child kings and drunken oafs can call other strong men, with other swords."

"Then these other swordsmen have the true power. Or do they?" Varys smiled "Some say knowledge is power Some tell us that all power comes from the gods Others say it derives from law. Yet that day on the steps

of Baelor's Sept, our godly High Septon and the lawful Queen Regent and your ever-so-knowledgeable servant were as powerless as any cobbler or cooper in the crowd Who truly killed Eddard Stark, do you think?

Joffrey, who gave the command? Ser Ilyn Payne, who swung the sword? Or.. another?"

Tyrion cocked his head sideways. "Did you mean to answer your damned riddle, or only to make my head ache worse?"

Varys smiled. "Here, then. Power resides where men believe it resides. No more and no less."

"So power is a mummer's trick?"

"A shadow on the wall," Varys murmured, "yet shadows can kill And oftentimes a very small man can cast a very large shadow "

There are actually two lessons to take from this The first one is obvious, the other is not.

The first one is as plain as said in the text "Power resides where men believes it resides" This is an indubitable truth, something that even a brute can grasp We see it perfectly in the real world However, the implications of such a statement are far grander It means power is a fickle thing, something which you barely have control over and could slip from your grasp at any moment

There are ways more effective than others to secure power, yet in the end, the greatest source of power is ideas Ideas are what cause men to believe power resides in one thing or another Without ideas, it is merely the well armed, the strong who rule and have power and they rule only until someone else can kill them

The second lesson, however, is the truly interesting one. It's one which a careless reader may have interpreted as mere ass kissing written into the text: "And oftentimes a very smalls man can cast a very large shadow"

This is supposed to be interpreted as Varys complimenting Tyrion, a dwarf who is currently acting as regent lord However, reading between the lines, one can interpret Martin's true meaning, and it is something far more sinister, and the reason why the world's governments are so paranoid, so anxious to control everything.

When Varys says "a small man can cast a very large shadow", what he meant is that the most powerful men in the world are likely not kings, not rich men,

not priests and not even warriors They are likely unremarkable men with a remarkable ability to manipulate the world through ideas and their ability to spread them

Understanding this, one can now understand why the world's governments are scrambling to control the internet, to install surveillance, to track people, to control speech, they know and understand that truth, more than you can imagine And because they understand it, they also understand that they are at the mercy of a nobody somewhere Maybe just some bar fly who talks a lot in a popular bar frequented by a lot of people in New York, whose words get repeated until they affect people everywhere Maybe some woman writing a blog about her every day life. These "small men" are indeed "casting a very large shadow", maybe not even intentionally.

Once you understand this, you will understand just how little power many "powerful men" truly have. And you'll understand their paranoia, their urge to control information, their urge to control people.

On Multiculturalism

The world should be multicultural, nations shouldn't.

Different cultures and different languages will think differently, which in turn will cause a wealth of ideas to spring forth from humanity. It is thus critical to preserve cultures across the world in order to preserve thought.

However, within one nation, multiculturalism leads to a schism of thought instead. In order for a nation to function, its laws must be in-line with the values of its citizens. If the said values are too disparate, then the laws become ineffective and the nation can no longer function properly.

A multicultural world is a rich world. A multicultural nation is a dysfunctional nation.

Thus we reach a conundrum: Is the unification of mankind impossible? Such a unification would require universal laws, a central management which treats all equally and can somehow represent the values of all. But as said, this is not possible in a multicultural society; therefore, the unification of mankind would have to pass through the institution of a single, monolithic culture for the entirety of humanity.

However, as discussed, the existence of multiple cultures is all that allows the existence of several different currents of thought. The establishment of a universal culture and language would then be a step backwards in thought, limiting mankind's potential.

Some solutions might exist, yet there is a better question to be asked: Why should humanity be unified? The answer here is that people believe that it is only through unification that we may achieve peace and end suffering, thus collaborate in the bringing about of a new golden age.

Though peace and ending suffering may be charming ideals, these people fail to understand that it is never in times of peace that humanity has striven, but in times of strife and horror. It is not collaboration and peace which heightens the human spirit, but competition and suffering. One could then argue that the unification of humanity is contrary to the ultimate goal of those good thinkers, namely its elevation.

The idea of ending war however is not without its merits. We have reached a point in human history - nay, we reached it decades ago - where humanity is capable of destroying itself in minutes before it even has a chance to consider the consequences of its actions. Thus, it might be well advised to have a form of collaboration between the nations of the world, even enemy nations, to establish "tenets" of a sort which would aim to prevent the extinction of

humanity. These tenets will likely be utterly amoral, and so should they. Their aim is not morality, but the maintenance of humanity.

On Revolution

When is the right time for a revolution and how should it be achieved?

To the first question, there are two answers: The ideological one and the practical one. Both answers are quite simple to state, yet not so easy to detect. Ideologically, a revolution should happen when the nation is ruled by a tyrant or when leaders' incompetence is damaging it. Practically, a revolution should happen when there is more to be gained than to be lost. The truth is actually both: A revolution should happen if the nation is tyrannical or incompetent and there is more to be gained than to be lost.

Yet, as said, it may be easy to say this, yet it's not as easy to determine when those conditions have been reached. When are leaders tyrannical? When are they incompetent? When do you know you have more to gain than to lose?

I'll start with the first and easiest one: When do you know you have more to gain than to lose? This one is simply mathematics yet oftentimes, revolutionaries overlook it. They'll oust their leaders with the belief that 'things could not possibly get any worse', then things actually do get worse. Evaluate: What services does the government provide? Is there justice in the nation? Who are our enemies and how would they react to a civil war? Can we keep the nation supplied in food, water, fuel and other goods without the current government? In the end, what good is it to get rid of a tyrant just to starve to death? Or to replace incompetent leaders with even worse ones? So, all the variables must be taken into account before engaging in a revolutionary act. As the saying goes, "Out of the frying pan, into the fire" would not be a good thing.

Next, how do you know your leaders are incompetent? This is seen through calamities; famines, pandemics, immense criminality, financial crashes, etc. Yet, these events could be completely out of the hands of the leaders: Even the most competent leader can't predict, prevent or end natural disasters which can lead to these issues. However, one can tell if they had prepared for such eventualities, how they react to such events, if they acted for the good of the nation rather than their own when those incidents happened. It goes back to the "profits/losses" equation: Can you tell with relative certainty that different leaders would have handled the situation better? If so, then it's time for a revolution.

Finally, tyrants. Believe it or not, detecting a tyrant is more difficult than you'd imagine. Even the most benevolent of leaders will have to take decisions which will harm a minority to help the nation. To these people, the leaders will appear as tyrannical. Yet here is the

key, isn't it? If the decisions always harm as few people as possible while benefiting as many as possible, then they're clearly not tyrannical. So, we can define a tyrant as a leader who takes decisions which benefit a minority to the detriment of the nation at large. We

can thus state the following:

"If leaders are taking decisions which benefit a minority to the detriment of the nation OR if different leaders would definitely be capable of taking better decisions AND there is more to be gained than to be lost from a revolution, then it is time for a revolution."

Yet how can a revolution be achieved?

People think revolution and they inevitably think "violence", yet it is not always necessary. In fact, most revolutions are non-violent, we simply call them something else: elections. Yet there are other kinds of non-violent revolutions. I examine three types: The violent revolution, the election and the quiet revolution.

The violent revolution is the one people have in mind most of the time when they think about revolution. Yet, it is the least desirable: A violent revolution brings about death and destruction. Simply put: The losses incurred by

a violent revolution are great and thus will likely outweigh the gains. Still, undesirable does not mean unnecessary. To know if a violent revolution is necessary, ask yourself two questions:

- Is a revolution necessary?
- Is it impossible to have a non-violent revolution?

If you answer yes to both of these questions, then it's time for a violent revolution. The first step here would be to obtain the collaboration of people who know how to engage in violence, namely the armed forces and the police forces. This is not always possible, yet if it can be achieved your victory is assured and in fact will be far less violent. When obtaining their collaboration however, make sure they have the same goal as you, namely improving the nation. This is difficult to achieve and can only be done through ideology, yet it can be done.

Once that's done, you should determine what needs to be destroyed and who needs to be killed. You want to avoid attacking the country's infrastructures as much as possible. If it's possible to destroy infrastructures which service the ruling caste you want to overthrow without destroying infrastructures which service the rest of the nation, then it's the first thing you should do. Aqueducts, power stations, oil fields, roads, bridges, etc. Destroy only what you cannot steal or disable. As for who should be killed, there are two kinds of targets: Leaders and followers. Followers should only be killed when necessary: When they attack you or to reach objectives. However, killing leaders (or at the very least capturing them) should be a priority. Many of the people who follow corrupt leaders will give up the fight once they are removed. Yet beware: The more followers they have, the more likely the power vacuum will be filled. Yet the more corrupt they were, the more likely they'll collapse when the power vacuum appears.

In the end, I'm no military man and so have little expertise to provide in this matter. If a violent revolution were to be necessary, it would be best for it to be conducted with a man of military experience. This would be why I recommend obtaining the collaboration of the army,

or at least the police. Even the collaboration of a minority of them would provide you with strategists and tacticians with the experience necessary to achieve results.

Yet, the more interesting revolutions are the non-violent ones.

We'll go over the first and best known type of non-violent revolution: elections. Whether you're a democracy or any other kind of republic, it is possible to remove the current rulers and replace them with others through an election. Rather than explain such a well-known process, I'd rather touch on when it's time to go for something else. Namely, when the voting pool gets limited to candidates which are all incompetent or tyrannical. The obvious answer here would be to present candidates which are neither, yet this is not always possible. So, when all candidates are incompetent or tyrannical and it is impossible to present a candidate which is neither, it is time to abandon elections as a viable option.

The other method I would like to propose is one which was witnessed in my society, and actually in quite a few others: The quiet revolution. The quiet revolution happens when the entirety of the population (or so close as to make no difference) stops listening to what the authorities say at once. This works best if the enforcing bodies, namely the military and police, collaborate with the population. In this case, citizens need to build new, alternate power structures to replace the old ones, to compete with them. As time passes and the new, better power structures actually do their job, the old leaders' authority will wane and the revolution will be achieved. However, a quiet revolution requires a very homogeneous population which is in agreement with the abandonment of the power structure. It is a hijacking of authority, so to speak.

To give a specific example, let's imagine a government has an office of roads. They manage roads. They do it badly. Now, a citizen says "I'll make my own office of roads!", receives donations from citizens and actually starts doing the job the old office of roads wouldn't do. Eventually, people stop paying their taxes to the office of roads and instead start paying them to the new one. The old gets replaced with the new in a non-violent way. As said, this is only possible if you have the collaboration of enforcing agents. If the old office of roads tells the cops "GO ARREST THAT NEW OFFICE OF ROADS" and they listen, then it becomes impossible to achieve a quiet revolution.

So, before violence, you should attempt elections or hijacking authority.

There is much more to be said on revolution, and I suggest you read up on it because it will unfortunately be very important in the coming years. People need to understand that revolutions are necessary, yet they also need to ask themselves two questions before doing so:

- Is it worth it?
- Can we do it without resorting to violence?

If we can educate people in this matter, I am convinced we can avoid many horrors in the near future. Denying the legitimacy of revolutions will not prevent them from happening; it will only prevent people from learning how to achieve them properly.

On Echo Chambers

The last two decades have seen an astounding rise in extremism everywhere in the world, including in supposedly first world nations. Not coincidentally, these decades match with the rise of the world wide web. This is because the internet has allowed the proliferation of a phenomenon which has become known as "echo chambers".

Echo chambers are a threat to the advancement of mankind through the intellectual isolation they promote. They prevent the exchange of ideas and ultimately allow tyrants to control the masses through careful cloaking of thought currents. They breed intolerance and ignorance. They are the death of the human spirit.

But how do we fight this? How do we stop this nonsense? How do we disarm this weapon? The answer itself is discouraging: It is almost impossible to do. People are naturally inclined to seek echo chambers. to seek people who validate them. In fact. those who seek conflict, even simple in the form of discussion, of opinions. are seen as mentally unstable. Yet there are ways to mitigate it.

First and foremost. free speech. Any attack on legitimate free speech must be seen as an attempt to build or strengthen an echo chamber. Whether through hate speech laws. the banning of books. movies and websites or through simple terrorism. those who attack free speech seek to silence opposing voices and prevent the flow of ideas. These people must be fought tooth and nail.

Secondly. education. We must teach our children to hear others' ideas. We must teach them about fallacies. We must teach them rational thought. We must teach them about tolerating differences (not necessarily accepting them. merely tolerating). We must equip them with the necessary tools to break away from the echo chambers forming around them. This will not necessarily be feasible however as not all people are capable of learning these and using them properly. However. by teaching the greatest number of people possible about these, we can limit the damage done.

Third, simply speaking out. Speak your opinions. Spread them. Do not hide them. Force people to hear them. The more people do this. the more opinions people will be exposed to and the less effective echo chambers become. Though this may be dangerous. the internet allows you to do this fairly anonymously if you want to.

In tum. this leads to a great reduction of the spread of ideas. As people are no longer capable of dealing with differing mindsets, trying to instill ideas in them becomes more and more difficult.

This is a terrible thing in any friend of humanity. as it means a regression. a loss. It means the impossibility of teaching others about different ideas as they refuse to even consider them.

Yet to tyrants. this is a dream come true. In facts, for most of history and in most of the world. including the 20th and 21st century western nations. those who would seek to dominate have used this to keep control over their population. By misinforming them. by keeping important ideas out of their reach. by limiting their ability to connect with others, they created echo chambers. Certainly not as exclusive and extremist as those we see on the internet. yet still very influential. Influential enough that those who differed from the norm would be exiled. imprisoned or executed.

Logically. the internet. through its ability to connect people. should have removed this weapon from the arsenal of the mighty. Yet. as explained. and against all odds. it has actually made it even more efficient. even better.

But what is an echo chamber? To understand what it is. one must examine how they are formed.

In real life. individuals must interact with one another in order for society to function. These individuals will sometimes get along, sometimes not. However, even when they get along. there are always slight differences. slight disagreements. This is easily overcome with a bit of tolerance: one can easily accept that other people will think differently. have different opinions. have different values. even if only slightly. So. despite their differences. individuals will learn to not only work together. but become friends.

On the internet. things are different. You are separated from those you interact with. You can choose who you talk to and if someone bothers you. you can ignore them with the click of a button. Unlike real life. you're not stuck with the people around you. There are billions of people on the internet and you can pick who you want to talk to. As people are no longer forced to deal with other people's differences. they simply don't. As they don't deal with different people. they do not grow a tolerance to dealing with different people. And as internet communities are built. this means people who do not agree with the community's "mainstream opinion" are immediately considered undesirable and removed by community managers. Ultimately. this means the people in these communities only interact with people who think exactly like them. And as this happens. their fallacious beliefs and aberrant behaviors do not get challenged and so they become more and more extreme.

This is where the term echo chamber comes from. Members of these communities do not go there to have an actual social interaction: they go there to have their beliefs repeated to them and validated. It's a form of self-gratification. and one which is dangerous to human civilization.

For you see. the effect of these echo chambers is not limited to the internet. As more and more of people's social interactions take place on the internet. the effect becomes more pronounced. A man who does not tolerate dissent on the internet is unlikely to tolerate it in real life too. Though more inclined to keep their minds to themselves in real life because of the fear of retaliation (or worse. a challenge to their ideas). their opinions of the people surrounding them still suffers. Someone who used to be that friendly coworker who has an annoying habit of

squeaking his chair is suddenly that unbearable asshole you can't wait to get away from when your shift ends. The nice girl who votes republican is suddenly a brainwashed neo-con. The coworker who takes breaks to get a smoke twice a day is suddenly your worst enemy.

And as this intolerance builds, so does extremism. Those with a different opinion are no longer merely different. they're enemies. And those who even dare to suggest that you might be wrong must be removed.

On Education

Education is the cornerstone of any successful political upheaval.

If a movement wishes for its ideas to actually change how society functions, it cannot merely limit itself to spreading its ideas amongst the adult population. Though it is how it will obtain power, it is not how its influence will last. Instead, it must instill its ideas in children. As children are more easily influenced, it is easier to not only open them to ideas, but close them to others.

A proper education will allow a political movement to turn today's children into tomorrow's adult followers.

The morality of this might seem debatable: After all, isn't it wrong to "indoctrinate" children? Yet this is merely falling victim to a language prejudice: Every education a child receives is indoctrination. Rather, the question one should ask is -What kind of education should children receive?' or 'What kind of values is it acceptable to indoctrinate?'"

The answer is, as usual, fairly simple: If Mayors the continued existence of the nation and its advancement, then it is right. Otherwise, it isn't. Issues arise when individuals disagree over how to better promote national prosperity and progress, which granted can be fairly difficult to discern.

However, though certain things may be debatable, others aren't. Promoting natality, fighting corruption, instilling civic responsibility are all undoubtedly good things to indoctrinate into children. The opposite is of course wrong. Therefore, one can easily claim that we can merely limit ourselves to teaching children which aren't debatable. Once they grow into adults, they can make up their own mind on the more debatable topics.

Now that this has been explained, I can get to my point, which is how one should watch what is being taught to their children. Corrupt political movements will not merely try to indoctrinate children about clear cut concepts, but also about debatable ones. This is how we get fundamentalists teaching children that abortion and homosexuality are wrong or liberals teaching them the opposite. If one allows that either of the groups is allowed to do such a thing, then one allows that the ruling government can teach children that the leaders are not to be questioned or other even less savory doctrines.

So, in conclusion, a proper education should prepare children for national responsibility by teaching them about concepts which are beyond a shadow of a doubt good for the nation. Meanwhile, it is the responsibility of adults to keep an eye open for 'questionable-organizations trying to indoctrinate debatable ideas into children.

If this is not done, it will be the end of critical thought.

On Quebec's Separation

This topic may seem unusual compared to others I've covered, as I usually touch on fairly universal concepts. However, I want to speak of Quebec's separatist movement for two reasons:

Quebec's separation from Canada would have far reaching consequences across the entire world, much more than most people would expect.

It concerns me personally as I am myself a Quebecer.

I won't explain the history behind Quebec separatism, the pros and cons, its legitimacy, the cultural aspects of it or anything you would know to make an informed decision on whether Quebec should separate from the rest of Canada or not. Instead, I will focus on two things:

1. Why it is inevitable.
2. Why it is important to the rest of the world.

So first, why is Quebec's separation inevitable?

As explained previously, for a nation to function, it must have one common culture. It can have "sub-cultures", but there cannot be two major cultural groups within it or else issues arise surrounding the very laws of the nation. In Canada we have two major cultures:

1. The english canadian culture, which is composed of several very similar sub-cultures and is almost identical to the American culture.
2. The french canadian culture.

We could also count the native cultures yet their numbers are so small as to be unable to tip the balance. Though relevant, I'd rather stick to the topic at hand rather than explaining why I don't consider the native cultures of Canada to be "major cultural groups".

Anyway, the initial intent of the English conquerors back in the 18th century was to assimilate the "canadiens" and make them into proper English citizens.

As can be seen today, these efforts have thoroughly failed in Quebec and continue to fail. And so we're left with two cultures which, though far from polarly opposed, are still too different to form one unified nation. However, Canada, instead of acting like a confederation of different nations, acts as if it is one nation, submitting the smaller culture (Quebec) to the larger one (Canada). As can be expected, this causes discontent, never mind tribalist attitudes from both sides.

So, now that we have examined how Quebec will not be assimilated into the greater American culture surrounding it, one has to think about the future. No matter how powerful and prosperous a nation might be, it would be foolish to assume it will never face adversity. Now, imagine what would happen if a disparate "nation" like Canada were to face such adversity. Say, an invasion or a major catastrophe. The first thing that would happen is that the two cultures would turn away from each other and the separation of Quebec would happen, all naturally.

And so, we can state that, unless things change and french Canadians somehow get assimilated into the greater American culture, Quebec's separation will inevitably happen if pressure is applied on Canada in one way or another. The only thing that's in question is how this separation will happen: Will it be through a democratic process, through a violent revolution or through something even less predictable, such as a complete dismantling of Canada in the face of a catastrophe?

No matter the way in which it happens, we can be assured that if we wait until it happens on its own, the people of both Quebec and the rest of Canada will suffer immensely as the power structures disintegrate around them.

But why does this matter so much? We're talking about one province of 8 million. Why would it affect the rest of the world? Well, there are several reasons, and none of them are pleasant to think about.

First of all, one has to know that many of Canada's provinces have expressed the desire to join the United States of America if Quebec were to separate. Even without such explicit statements, it would appear as the eventual outcome. And even one province joins the United States, then it is only a matter of time until the rest follows. This would give the United States almost complete control of everything north of Mexico, including large portions of the Arctic. It would also give them access to Canada's resources, namely its fresh water, its iron, its gold and diamonds, its oil, its forests... The list goes on and on. I don't think I need to explain how certain rivals of the US would react if it gained access to all this. Yet if that was all, then Quebec's separation, though important, wouldn't affect 'the entire world'. No, there's more.

Second of all, we have to understand what Quebec's separation means to the rest of the world. This would send a message to many, MANY populations around the world, or rather two messages:

1. It would confirm that it is indeed impossible for two different cultures to co-exist within one nation governed by common laws. If even a peaceful, industrialized nation like Canada couldn't do it, what hopes do others have?

2. It IS possible to achieve separation.

These populations would then become very motivated to achieve the same. You could expect more separations to follow around the world, many through civil wars. And still, there are more reasons why this would affect the whole world.

Third of all, you have to understand that the rest of Canada will not sit idly by and let it happen. During both referendums where Quebec's citizens voted on whether they would leave Canada or not, the federal government was preparing an invasion of Quebec to "secure and protect strategic facilities and resources" in the eventuality of a victory of the separatists. This would mean civil war in Canada. Do you think the United States would sit idly by and let it happen? No, they would quickly get involved and attempt to "pacify" the region and forcefully annex Canada. However, this would also likely cause upheavals in the United States and likely trigger a second American civil war. You can only imagine the impact this would have on the world. So, not only would the United States gain access to Canada's resources and territory as explained before, but it would be done in a way which would cause civil uprisings.

And last but not least, we have to consider what Quebec's situation would be if it managed to gain its independence. We're talking about a territory several times larger than most European nations peopled by only 8 million souls, loaded with resources of all kinds and without an army.

Unless Quebec were to find a way to convince the United States to defend it, which is unlikely to happen if the rest of Canada joins the United States, then it will be very vulnerable to foreign invaders. If the United States act to defend Quebec from them, it will not be an act of friendship but an act of self-defense, in which case they would immediately seize control of Quebec, with all the consequences explained earlier.

And so, you now understand why Quebec's separation is inevitable and why it will have far reaching repercussions around the world. At this point, instead of arguing about whether Quebec should separate or not, Canada should be preparing for it so it happens smoothly and with as few issues as possible. Otherwise, it will result in tremendous misery for all involved.

On Rights

Rights are not protected by law, but by the citizen's willingness to use violence against the authorities when they are not respected.

We often talk about rights. In fact, George Carlin had his own routine concerning rights, where he questioned the legitimacy of rights as an idea and eventually came to the conclusion that either you have all rights, or you have no rights at all. His explanation was mostly aimed at being humorous, but I think it is important to examine what rights are and why we have them, or rather why a government would feel inclined to let us have them. I propose the following answers:

1. Rights are what the citizens of a nation are entitled to as long as they follow the conditions following those rights, namely following the law. It is not laws which dictate what rights citizens have, but their rights which dictate what laws are possible.

2. The reason a government would rather let its citizens have rights is to avoid violent conflict. Violence is undesirable because of the inevitable destruction it brings and so by knowing what the government is not allowed to do unless it wants to face a violent uprising from its citizens, violence can be averted. They are essentially a way to have "civil discourse" if you will.

Let us examine the first answer I give, namely that rights are what citizens are entitled to as long as they follow the law, and that laws are designed around rights, not the other way around.

First of all, a citizen who follows the law should expect his rights to be respected. And even if there is an accusation against him, certain rights also protect him in that they allow him to have a proper defense and the such. Without rights. citizens would essentially be constantly at the mercy of their government. They would have no official power to oppose the authority in any way. However, as long as they have rights and they are respected. then the citizens are capable of defending themselves against potentially abusive authorities.

Likewise. this is why it is not laws which should determine what rights you possess. but rather the rights you have which should determine what laws can be created. If laws can change rights. then the government can decide which rights you have and they are essentially meaningless. On the other hand, if laws must be designed around pre-determined rights. then the government does not have the power to create laws which violate your rights.

Yet all this is meaningless unless the citizenship is willing to enforce its rights.

So we reach the most important point I am making here. which is the necessity of the citizenship's willingness to engage in violence if the government denies its rights.

You see. one must ask himself what forces the government to respect rights in the first place. If they ignore them. if they trample them. what ill will befall them? Who will stop them? The answer here is simple: The citizenship must stop them, and the only means by which they can achieve it is through violence. Some foolish souls may claim that merely electing a new government will change things. but voting is in itself a right and if a government is willing to remove one right, it will not hesitate to remove another. And if one party does not suffer dire consequences for attacking the rights of the citizenship. then the other parties have no incentive to restore those rights. Thus, paradoxically. it is violence which gives rise to rights. And rights arise and are respected in order to avoid violence.

Governments themselves have an incentive to respect rights. As said, violence is destructive and it is far more efficient to arrive at a peaceful solution. which involves respecting the rights of the citizenship. Though it could ignore said rights. this would be at an undesirable cost.

Or rather. it should be. which brings me to my ultimate point.

This is why everything is going wrong with the west right now. This is the root cause of all the issues which we are faced with: Governments are not respecting their citizens' rights. yet these citizens are unwilling to use violence to defend themselves. Rather, they sit back and grumble quietly. telling themselves that it's preferable to lose those rights than to engage in violence.

It is not.

It is unacceptable for any man who believes that he has any rights to allow these abuses to take place. Though it is important to make sure that rights have been violated before taking action so as to make sure one is righteous. once it is truly determined that a citizen's rights are not being respected, it is the duty of all to rise up and oppose their government. Those who sit down and begrudgingly accept these repeated outrages are no better than slaves and deserve no better fate than slaves.

And so. remember this, and plan accordingly. Once your government thinks they can take away your rights, it is time to hold on to them as tight as possible with one hand while thrusting your spear with the other. Otherwise. you are nothing but a slave and deserve to be treated as such.

On Emasculation

The wiser among you already know I'm not speaking of literal emasculation, but figurative.

There has been a movement in the last few decades to emasculate society, or more precisely, the middle and lower class. I am not merely talking about men, but about suppressing attributes which are classically considered masculine: Belligerence, leadership, decisiveness, rationality and action. Instead, their feminine counterparts have been promoted: Amicability, obedience, compromising, emotionality and passiveness. Even anger has been suppressed, as if it is an unnatural emotion and that feeling it makes you inferior. As if feeling anger towards tyrants, crooks, liars and criminals is inappropriate.

The truth of this statement is self-evident, yet some would likely demand proof of such a state of affairs, as if one would need to analyze thousands of pictures of the sky to determine that it is indeed blue. Yet one does not have to look far to find evidence, especially within western schools where "masculine" traits are almost always considered undesirable and even punished, unless a child is in an expensive private school. Even rationality is only rewarded as far as it allows people to make society function. And I need not mention the ridiculous concept of "toxic masculinity", which would have merit if it hadn't been stretched to the point of encompassing all masculinity.

But when did this all begin? And why is it happening?

Quite simply, it all began with feminism. It was not the aim of feminism, yet its cause was hijacked by people with interest in doing so.

Of course, the goal of feminism in the very beginning was not the emasculation of society. Its objective was the empowerment of women, namely promoting the idea that women had a right to vote in a democratic society, that they should have equal rights, that they should be allowed to occupy the same jobs as men, etc. If you know my opinion on democracy, rights and equal opportunity, you'll understand why I actually see nothing wrong with the original cause of feminism. In a true democracy, there is no justification for depriving half the adult population of the right to vote. Saying otherwise is denying the very reason democracy exists, which is that in a republican government, limiting the numbers of those who can choose their leaders increases the risk of corruption immensely.

What is important however is not what feminism wanted to achieve or whether it was right or not. What matters is the impact it had on society, namely women entering the work force in large numbers and getting into positions of authority. Now, whether "feminine" and

"masculine" traits are inborn or learned is irrelevant, and any attempt to take the discussion in that direction is merely an attempt to derail it. What matters is that men exhibit the masculine traits and women exhibit the feminine traits. And now we're getting to the "why".

You see, as women entered the workforce, employers (read: the upper classes) quickly noticed the difference between the male and the female employee. In case you don't understand, review the masculine and feminine traits I listed earlier. What I mean is that female employees are more obedient, are less likely to argue with their superiors, are more likely to ask their superiors for directions when they're unsure of the course to take, are less likely to fight for better conditions and better pay, etc. Likewise, politicians made a similar observations. Female voters tend to be more emotional, they tend to favor security over rights and freedom, they're less likely to question what their government does, etc.

Note that in both cases, it certainly is "tends" and "more likely". Not all women are more emotional than rational, not all women are submissive, not all women are indecisive. Likewise, not all men are rational, not all men are belligerent, not all men are decisive. It doesn't matter however; what matters is that women are more likely to have the feminine traits, which the upper class noticed. And to them, these traits are desirable in a lower class. It makes their employees, their citizens easier to manipulate, to control, to dominate.

And so, the upper classes, under the guise of taking up the fight of social justice, changed the course of feminism. It was no longer about empowering women. No longer would feminism say "Women are just as good"; rather, it became "society must accommodate women". Then it became "Men need to change". And now it's quickly becoming "Masculinity is bad".

So, what can be done? That is a question I am unable to answer. It would seem obvious to say that masculinity needs to be promoted again, that we must fight back against "equal outcome" and bring back actual "equal opportunity", that we must denounce what is being done. But how to achieve all of these? A mere sensitization campaign would immediately be shot down. I propose three solutions:

1. Instead of directly saying that masculinity is good, the "masculine" traits should be promoted, in a completely neutral way, as in without mentioning feminism or gender politics or anything of the sort. Leadership, decisiveness, action, rationality and even belligerence must be shown as positive traits.
2. Attempts to demonize these traits should be shot down. Force those who do so to explain why they think its wrong, and why they think their opposite are good. Meanwhile, promote the negative aspects of the "feminine" traits.
3. Finally, and in my opinion the most devious yet most entertaining solution, would be to teach our daughters to hold the masculine traits. This might seem strange, yet it would turn the emasculation of society on its head. As these girls grow into women and exhibit the "masculine" traits, they will quickly learn how these marts, necessary for anyone who wishes to elevate themselves in society, are constantly suppressed. As women become the victims of this campaign, the idea that opposing it is misogynistic will shatter.

These solutions are certainly not perfect, and I myself see many things wrong with them, yet they're the best I can come up with. Still, we must either act to preserve our masculinity now or watch as our children and grandchildren are raised into pseudo-slaves who do not question the upper classes and believe that they do not deserve more than what they're given.

On Statistics

Sanity is not statistical.

George Orwell wrote those words in 1984. Back then, the meaning of this phrase was that it does not matter how many people believe in the truth; the truth remains the truth, regardless. However, Orwell had something to say about statistics in that same book:

But actually, he thought as he re-adjusted the Ministry of Plenty's figures, it was not even forgery. It was merely the substitution of one piece of nonsense for another. Most of the material that you were dealing with had no connection with anything in the real world, not even the kind of connection that is contained in a direct lie. Statistics were just as much a fantasy in their original version as in their rectified version. A great deal of the time you were expected to make them up out of your head. For example, the Ministry of Plenty's forecast had estimated the output of boots for the quarter at one-hundred-and-forty-five million pairs. The actual output was given as sixty-two millions. Winston, however, in rewriting the forecast, marked the figure down to fifty-seven millions, so as to allow for the usual claim that the quota had been overfulfilled. In any case, sixty-two millions was no nearer the truth than fifty-seven millions, or than one-hundred-and-forty-five millions. Very likely no boots had been produced at all. Likelier still, nobody knew how many had been produced, much less cared. All one knew was that every quarter astronomical numbers of boots were produced on paper, while perhaps half the population of Oceania went barefoot. And so it was with every class of recorded fact, great or small. Everything faded away into a shadow-world in which, finally, even the date of the year had become uncertain.

His point here, simply put, was that one should be wary of statistics. And he was right. Statistics released by any governing body, and especially those released by interest groups, should be viewed with a strong dose of suspicion

Statistics are how reality is manipulated. Statistics are how governments and interest groups build narratives. Statistics are how they can make you say that black is white. Statistics are the embodiment of lies wearing a fresh suit of legitimacy.

This may seem preposterous to some, but a mere questioning quickly shows the truth of it. How do you know statistics are truthful? Because a specific person or organization said them? Why does that make them true? Are you of those who think "You think people would just do that? Tell lies?". Well let me tell you, they do. People who want power over you have a vested interest in lying to you, in concealing the truth, in keeping you misinformed. The less you know, the better. Or rather, the more what you know is in line with what they want you to know, the better.

Of course, this does not mean all statistics are lies. In fact, it's why so many statistics exist; they bury the relevant statistics in a mountain of useless ones, and the relevant ones are the falsified ones. That way, they can keep an air of reliability while lying when it matters to them. Or better yet, they won't be lying, merely misleading. This is why, as an example, inflation rates seem to remain fairly equal to wages in the western world while the price of everything from housing to food has skyrocketed in the last fifteen years. If someone points out this fallacy, the ones peddling this bullshit will claim that's because the price of certain goods isn't taken into account because "they vary too much".

All important statistics are either likewise falsified in such a way by playing with semantics or presentation, or they're outright fabricated.

Does this mean statistics are pointless? Of course not! A governing body has great use for them, both to understand what decisions need to be taken and whether they're efficient or not. Crime rate statistics are useful to know whether you need better equipped police forces and where. Birthrates are important so you know how many schools you need, how much time your population must spend parenting, to know if measures need to be taken to encourage procreation. Even a very limited and libertarian government must need statistics to know whether its army is efficient or if there's a health issue in their nation.

Likewise, how acceptable is it to falsify statistics? I've spoken of propaganda before, how it is needed to simplify an issue down to a palatable level for the populace which has concerns other than grander political schemes. However, one of my points then is that propaganda must not lie. It may simplify a lot, it may dodge more profound aspects of a debate, but in the end it must tell the truth, otherwise it risks being unveiled as a lie, causing a loss of trust from the population and a great loss of effectiveness for future propaganda campaigns. So, statistics released by a responsible government should neither be misleading or false.

And so remember: Question, question, question. For if half the population of your nation goes barefoot, you should definitely question your ability to produce shoes.

On the Media

The media are the people's eyes and ears. Hence, whoever controls the media controls what the people see and hear and therefore what they know.

There's an unhealthy attitude in modern society, which is one of blind trust in news media. The source of this trust is multiple; from mere naivete to indifference, from news media which were historically reliable to confirmation bias. From the moment where they can speak and understand the world around them, citizens of the western world are trained to believe that what the news tell them about the world is true. Worse, they are trained to believe that doubting what is said on the news is tantamount to insanity.

But why? What guarantee do we have that what is said on the news and written in the papers is truthful? Who controls the quality of the content? And who controls them? In the end, we hand the mantle of guide to a pleiad of individuals who are no more trustworthy than the common man. In fact, you should consider them even less trustworthy, for, as said, whoever controls the media controls what the people know and therefore, people with vested interest in controlling the masses will definitely do all in their power to take control of the media. And as you can guess, these people cannot be trusted.

But how do they even create a semblance of legitimacy? If they were always reporting on doubtful matter, people would catch on, right?

Of course they would, and that is why a large portion of what you see on the news is actually the truth. What you have to understand is that they tell you the truth about things which are irrelevant in the grander scheme of things. They'll report on car accidents, on meaningless crimes, on sports, on celebrities, on the weather. Reporting the truth on these topics helps give an air of legitimacy to news organizations and so people are less inclined to question them when these bullshit peddlers do have an incentive to lie, as in anytime political matters are involved.

And this is the issue when it comes to the masses: For some reason, it has become common belief that if a man tells the truth about one thing, he will not be lying about another. As if people either say the truth or lie all the time. The fallacy in this previous statement is obvious to all, yet it is still subconsciously held by the majority of people. Thus, the key from freeing the masses from the control of the corrupt media of our times is to remind them of this fallacy. Force them to question the news whenever it is questionable. Show evidence of when the news lied. Evidence of governmental interference with news reporting. And do it impartially: Remember that the fact of the media's unreliability remains the same regardless of who

controls it. Making people question the reliability of the mainstream media simply to redirect them to just as questionable alternatives will not help our cause.

Finally, one very important action people must begin taking to understand what is wrong with the media is to know who controls it. The ownership of all major media corporations is public knowledge and thus available to all. By finding who owns which corporations and determining what links them together, it becomes possible to understand which group controls the media, and thus who is not trustworthy. It will allow you to know who is your enemy. To understand who wants to control what you see and hear. Who wants to control what you know. Who wants to control you.

Does this mean all news media should be abolished? After all, they are apparently nothing more than a tool to manipulate the masses. The truth is that either different news media organizations should be independent of each other and of their nation's power structures altogether, or they should all be under the control of the government. Which one is preferable depends on the government form. In a democratic society, independent news organizations are preferable so as to allow the public to form their own opinion. In more autocratic governments, nationalized news media are preferable so as to keep the masses unified, though as explained before, a wise leader would do well to keep his populace well informed so as to keep his nation powerful.

In the end, remember these facts: The media can be used to control your view of the world and therefore control you. It is necessary to determine who controls the media in order to fight back. And news media needs to be telling the truth to the people in order to keep them informed, and thus to keep the nation informed.

On Ambition

Human ambition is what drives the world forward, and so it is crucial to preserve it

But what is ambition in the first place? Let us define it as the drive to obtain more power through achievement, to create, to improve. Here we must separate ambition from mere envy: Envy seeks to obtain what others have. Ambition seeks to obtain something by creating, earning it. That ambition is important is then self-evident: Without it, nothing gets done. At most, what was created before changes hands.

However, there has been a noted attack on ambition in the last few decades, not to say the last century. Anyone who has tried to achieve anything has had to experience it. People will tell them that what they're doing is wrong, or to stop them, or worse, to steal their achievements away from them. These people can be divided in two categories: The envious and the greedy. By examining these two characters, we will understand what has been holding back the ambitious and thus, the progress of mankind.

Yet how do we fight this? As time passes, and the ambitious are shot down again and again by the greedy, less and less is achieved. Civilization reaches a slump, where progress is stalled in the name of keeping the greedy at the top.

The solution is twofold: First of all, we must reduce the number of the envious as much as possible. As the ambitious are shut down again and again by the greedy, more and more people begin believing that hard work and ambition are pointless and thus wrong, and so join the ranks of the envious. By showing them the truth, by showing them the importance of ambition to society, and how it is being crushed not by its own failure but by the overwhelming masses of the greedy and the envious, we can salvage them. As the ranks of the envious are reduced, the greedy will have less and less support and eventually, their power will wane.

The second part of the solution is less tasteful. The greedy will not be deterred and will hang on tooth and nail to their positions, doing everything in their power to interfere. Those who do must be dealt with swiftly and violently. They must be seen not merely as inconveniences, but as enemies of humanity, men willing to debase her so as to remain unopposed.

Once this is accomplished, society must figure out a way to never let the greedy gain this much power again. This will be achieved through education, no more, no less. Children must be taught that the advancement of mankind is the greatest virtue of all, and that it can only be achieved through creation and improvement, not through restriction, theft and destruction. If this can be achieved, then mankind will emerge from this age of stagnation and find a tomorrow brighter than it could have ever imagined.

The envious are by far the more numerous, yet the less dangerous of the lot. To them, what the ambitious achieve is not grand, it is a personal insult to them. The fact that they have not achieved as much makes them feel inferior, and so they shower scorn upon the ambitious. The same accusations will repeat themselves endlessly: Arrogance, selfishness, misanthropy, greed, etc. They see the work of the ambitious not as progress, but as self-engrossment.

However, the envious are usually impotent. They'll cry to the four winds that the ambitious are to be hated, yet the only ones who will listen are those who already agree with them, for the same reasons. In the end, the work of the ambitious will be done, will be needed or desired, and the envious will have no other option than to watch. The only power the envious have is the one given to them rather than the one they have worked for, yet there are plenty willing to give them this power. They are the greedy.

The greedy are a much greater menace. They are those who already possess much, and see the ambitious as a threat to what they own. And yes, the ambitious can also be the greedy. So, what makes someone not merely ambitious, but greedy?

In this case, it is the belief that others do not have the right to ambition. Two ambitious men may compete, but only the greedy will consider competition to be wrong. When faced with competition, the ambitious will work harder, try and achieve more, etc. The greedy, instead, will try to forbid them from even trying. They will try to have laws passed to stop them from achieving anything. They will conspire together to shut down the ambitious. They will recruit the envious to their cause, try to have them interfere with the work of the ambitious in the name of morality or some other such tripe. Their aim is not to create something better than the ambitious. Rather, it is to prevent the ambitious from creating something.

The greedy are those who would damn us all in the name of their ego.

On Immigration

Immigration is the expected result of freedom of movement. yet that does not mean it should not be controlled.

Immigration is a fairly recent reality in human history. Though it has always been possible for people to move from one nation to another. it's only in the more recent centuries with the development of better means of transport that it has become a significant phenomenon. The ever advancing technology has made it easier and easier to physically move from one destination to another. and better socioeconomic conditions has convinced more advanced nations to facilitate this process for several reasons.

However. too few dare ask: what does a nation stand to gain from immigration? Too often. allowing immigrants in is not seen as something which should be a profitable endeavor. but as a duty of the host nation and a right of the immigrants. My aim here is to deconstruct this perception: A nation should not be obliged to take in immigrants. it should not feel any obligations towards foreign entities except through diplomatic agreements and it should concern itself with its own welfare and that of its citizens before considering that of foreigners. Does this mean immigration should be forbidden? Absolutely not. Not only do I believe that it is quite possible to have constructive immigration. but I believe in the concept of freedom of movement, where an individual is free to decide where he wants to go and live. within reason of course

There are many ways to classify refugees. such as economic. family. refugees. etc. These classifications are meaningless to my argument. except for that of refugee. which I will cover later on. Regardless of their reason. good leaders would always ask themselves: "Does the nation stand to gain from the immigration of these people?" How can we determine this? There are two main aspects to consider in this regard.

First of all. the immigrant's background. Though different nations have different cultures. some nations are far more alike than others. Immigrants who come from a nation which is very similar to the host nation are likely to have little trouble adapting and integrating themselves. Likewise. the greater the difference. the more difficult the assimilation. Therefore. it is preferable to take immigrants who come from nations where culture and life standards are similar first.

And yes. I speak of assimilation. When an individual moves to another nation, he should not seek to preserve his previous national identity. Refusing to assimilate to the local culture and forming ghettos is little more than a form of conquest, where a part of the host nation informally becomes the land of another's. If immigrants cannot assimilate. we obtain

multiculturalism. and as I've explained before. multiculturalism is undesirable. not to say harmful.

Secondly, one must consider what the immigrant will do in the host country. Is that person going to work? Will they be able to provide for themselves? Are the resources available to support that person? What will they contribute to the society they join? What kind of job will they occupy? An individual whose intention is to live on the good will of the host nation should never be allowed in.

Before moving on. let me add that the same can be applied to the families of migrants. An individual may be fit for immigration, but if that individual would be unable to support their close ones who move with them. then the outcome for the nation is a loss, and so this person would not be a suitable candidate

But what about refugees? Don't we have a moral duty as humans to protect and rescue those in peril?

I say: According to whom? By what standard? And why would it be acceptable to harm your own people to save others. who are sometimes the architects of their own misfortune? No nation has a duty towards any refugees. Rather. it is the nations which these people are fleeing who are to blame, as they are attacking their own citizens. Assigning blame might seem petty and pointless. but it isn't. The fact is that when there are refugees. the reason for it is war in their home country. And thus the solution to that issue is not to give them a new country. but to end the war in the old one.

This does not however mean that refugees should never be taken in. As before. the same reasoning applies: What does the nation have to gain by letting these people in? However. in the case of refugees, an additional dimension is added as one must consider the harm it would do to the nation they are fleeing. If the refugees' home nation is an enemy to the host nation, then taking their people away peacefully can in itself be a boon. However. this aspect must still be weighed against the other. Weakening your enemies is pointless if it is done at such an expense to your nation that you grow even weaker than they do.

We can thus see that the question of whether a nation should take in immigrants is far simpler than one would think, and that most nations should be taking in far less than they are right now. So, why? Why are they doing this?

The excuses given are multiple. The first one is that developed countries' birth rates are too low. Yet why is the solution more immigrants instead of promoting reproduction in the population? Then, were told that we are letting in skilled 'workers in. If we are low on skilled 'workers. why is the solution more immigrants and not forming more skilled 'workers at home? Then were told. because who cares about contradictions, that it's because were short on unskilled 'workers as the local population apparently refuses to take those jobs. If so, why is the solution more immigrants, and not better wages and working conditions? And at last. once backed in a corner. the globalist will speak of some imagined duty towards the greater human race. as if it is our duty to accommodate the rest of humanity at our expense.

The true reasons for immigration are multiple. from simple naivety to outright evil. Yet, if I were to determine one common goal for all globalist leaders. it would be that they wish to go

back to the days of an ignorant, poor and powerless pseudo-slave worker class. By flooding their nations with immigrants who accept lower wages, longer work days, worse working and life conditions and who won't complain, they force their population to compete with them, and thus prevent social progress. And by social progress, I don't mean the immaterial and abstract gobbledygook some would claim as social progress such as brotherly love, "equality" (read: equal representation and outcome) and multiculturalism. I mean concrete, objective progress, such as actual equality (before the law, actual equal opportunity), greater wealth, better life conditions, longer life expectancy, etc. Their hope is to not only stall social progress, but to regress it and return to the days of 'wealthy aristocracy who had all the rights and no responsibilities while those who worked saw but a meager return on what they actually produced. They want to enslave their population, and mass immigration is one of the means to do it.

And so remember: No nation has any duty towards foreigners. Immigration should only be allowed if the nation has anything to gain from it. And there is no problem in your nation which can be solved by replacing its population with that of another.

On Language

Language is not merely a tool for communication, it's a tool of thought.

What I'm about to explain could fill a book, and if it interests you I highly recommend reading up on linguistic relativity. My aim however will be to keep this short and easy to understand, as I wish to reach as many people as possible.

Did you know that there are African tribes which can't tell their left from their right? They don't have words for these concepts either. Did you know we did not have a word for the color blue for centuries? Or orange? They were named in relation to other colors. Orange was red-yellow. Once the fruit was discovered, its color was named after it. If a concept is not named it is not possible to think about it, at least not properly. Likewise the philosophies of different cultures are most affected by the language of their people. Nietzsche noted it, and he was not alone.

What is important to understand is that you cannot truly understand a concept unless you can name it, and this affects how you think.

You will notice in recent times attempts to legitimize certain dialects which are simplified versions of a certain language. Such efforts are an abomination and must be stopped at all costs. By limiting the vocabulary of people, whether it be simply their ability to name things or subtler things such as the separation of the subject in persons (first, second and third) or verb tenses, what becomes limited is people's ability to think. Though such dialects can be an interesting field of study, they should never be promoted as being legitimate, or being equal to fully developed languages.

In fact, we often speak of evolution of language. This is a misnomer; evolution does not go in one direction. It is merely an adaptation. What we should seek for language is not evolution, but advancement. We want our languages to grow, to have more words, to have better ways to express our thoughts in more coherent manners. The appearance of bastardized dialects goes against this. If linguists desire to help the advancement of language, instead of singing the praise of the malformed sentences of a few brutes because of their distinction from proper language, they should be identifying concepts which lack names, developing new verb tenses and promoting the preservation of the integrity of their language.

Likewise, language can be used to manipulate people. Orwell touched on that a lot in 1984, and he is far from the only person who has. I mention him however because of a concept he described in his book known as "crimestop". Simply put, crimestop is the ability which people have of stopping "bad

thoughts” before they can form. Even out of context, this sounds like a terrible thing, yet most people are unaware that they themselves engage in crimestop without realizing it.

This is a concept which I call “thought stopping language”, which is a subset of thought stopping techniques. Thought stopping techniques are used by politicians, leaders and very much everyone in a position of power to prevent people from thinking about what they’re told, and thus prevent them from disagreeing with them. The most common ones are chanting and ridiculing. Chanting is, as the name says, getting people to chant a mantra or a slogan loudly. If you wonder why this is a thought stopping technique, try and do even basic math while singing the chorus of “Tubthumping” by Chumbawamba at the top of your lungs over and over. As for ridiculing, human beings are normally afraid of ridicule, especially public ridicule. By attaching ridicule to an idea or concept, people will automatically be repelled by it.

Thought stopping words are even more devious. They are the result of ridiculing, but to the point where no active ridiculing is necessary for people to avoid thinking about those concepts. Derision and stigma are attached to those words and thus saying them will cause your audience to stop listening to you, regardless of what you were saying, of whether what you were saying was true, or of context. In this way, tyrannical create protected classes, protected concepts, protected thoughts. The government would never work against you, because that’s a conspiracy, and conspiracy theorists are crazy! Black people in the United States do not have a higher crime rate than white people, because that implies a difference based on race, and that’s racism, and racism is bad. Democracy is perfect, because questioning it is anti-democratic, and anti-democracy means tyranny. So on and so on.

So, what conclusions may we draw from this?

First of all, when addressing people, especially about certain contentious topics, it is important to use the right language. I am not implying that they should be lied to or that the truth should be hidden. However, if you sue a thought stopping word, you will turn them against you, regardless of the merit of your ideas. Thus, you must identify thought stopping words and figure out how to explain your ideas without using them.

Second of all, we must create words to define concepts which are missing from our language, one example of a word I created is “libition”. Ambition is currently defined as the desire to achieve something. However, I decided to split that concept in two: “Ambition”, which comes from the latin “ambire” which means “going around” or “encircling”, would mean the desire to achieve something productive, to create, to learn , to grow. Opposingly, “libition”, which comes from “liberum” which means “free”, would be the desire to achieve something destructive, usually at the expense of another. Already, with the appearance of this word, we can better separate businessmen in two categories: the ambitious, who wish to create things and to produce, and the libitious, who want to take what others produce and claim it as their own, who want hand outs.

Merely doing both of these will help us greatly when it comes to fighting back against those who wish to diminish the human spirit so as to better bind it. Learning how thought stopping language works will allow us to go around it to reach the people ensnared by their lies, while the creation of new words will arm us in the war of ideas.

On Cronyism and Nepotism

Meritocracy is the only valid system. Any other is doomed to eventual failure

Such a statement might seem self-evident to many, yet many won't believe it either. These, people seem to think it is possible to survive indefinitely on a system where the competent are enslaved by the incompetent. It is not so. Nature itself works that way: in order to survive and to propagate yourself, you must be able to feed yourself and protect yourself from harm. Humans may seem out of reach of the laws of nature, but they are not. Humans must still feed themselves, they must still protect from harm, and all the goods and technologies you see around you had to be made by someone. None of what you see around you merely appeared at your wish. Someone had to think for it, had to put it there for you, even if that person was yourself.

Keeping this in mind, we then understand that in order for society to function, people must work. They must think. They must produce. And the more people work, think and produce, the better society works. And the better society works, the more people are motivated to work, think and produce. It's a virtuous cycle, where one enjoys the product of one's own labor, hence is encouraged to be productive and intelligent.

However, cronyism and nepotism stand in the way of this simplicity.

Cronyism and nepotism are the idea that people should not be rewarded based on their contribution to society, on their work and intelligence, but rather on who they know, who they're related to, who they're friends with and what they think. A system where efforts and talent are less important than friendships, blood ties and blackmail.

Though not diametrically opposed to meritocracy, it nonetheless interferes with it immensely, as you'd expect. When cronyism and nepotism reign, people quickly become less interested in working and learning, preferring to make the right friends and obtain embarrassing information on people with positions of power to use as blackmail against them. Furthermore, as time passes, those who refuse to participate in this obscene system find themselves destitute. Their hard work and their intelligence do not pay off; instead, what they produce is stolen from them, often at gun point, or at the implication of a gun pointing at them. Furthermore, even those who manage to both be hard working and intelligent yet also have the good friends and family ties quickly become disillusioned, realizing that they are sustaining a system of leeches.

The eventual outcome of such a system is mere logic. You do not need to have the power of divination to see that it is unsustainable, and thus will eventually collapse upon itself as production falls off while the population remains as large as ever. Just because people stop

working does not mean that they no longer need to eat and remain safe, and having friends and family will not make that food and safety appear in front of you. Society is doomed.

And this is my warning to all those who may read and who seek to sustain a system where anything but merit is rewarded: You are working against yourselves. Anything you do to delay the collapse of that system will merely be a sacrifice, a sacrifice of individuals and resources which will no longer be available to you when the inevitable happens and you need to rebuild. And you will run out of things and people to sacrifice eventually, make no mistake. And at that moment, you will face the abyss and it will be too late. You will be swallowed up and out of the darkness you left behind, if there are any left, they will rise up and rebuild out of the rubble you left behind. It has happened before and if you do not change your course, it will happen again.

Understand this: No sustainable system can be anything but a meritocracy of some form. We might disagree on what merit might be, the specifics and the details. But the undeniable fact is that anything else is societal suicide in the long run, something which no one will profit from.

Cronyism and nepotism are the death of human civilization.

On Nations

This one is probably going to get the libertarians' panties in a bunch, but bear with it.

Before we broach this subject, we must define a few things. Namely, what a nation is, what laws are and what a government is. Or rather, what they should be ideally. One thing you should not do is that in reality, many "nations", "laws" and "governments" do not fit these definitions. That should not be a reason to dismiss these definitions as wrong but rather a reason to question the legitimacy of said nations, laws and governments.

A nation is a society occupying a more or less well defined territory by a common set of laws enforced by a common government.

A law is a social rule agreed upon by the great majority of the people of the nation. Laws are different from mere social etiquette in that it is considered acceptable to enforce them through violence.

A government is the entity within the nation which creates and enforces laws. Because of this role, it is considered as representing the nation and thus also takes the role of managing international relationships.

These are bare bone definitions for what nations, laws and governments are. As said, many of them do not fit these definitions and thus bring their legitimacy into question. Now that we've established these, we can begin asking interesting questions, such as "Should the government take greater roles?"

We often assume that the government should be "as small as possible", but why is that? My aim with this post will be to quickly go over what the aim of a "welfare state" is, why it fails, why a "smaller government" is better and why it is yet still sometimes acceptable for governments to engage in greater projects than the barest management.

So, the bare powers of the government should be the creation of laws and their enforcement. Because of this position, they also get to manage international relations, so they also have some power over the military. To examine what a "welfare state", AKA a nation whose government provides many services to its citizens does, we'll add powers and responsibilities to the government. In a democratic society, the government is considered to be controlled by the people and thus anything controlled by the government is supposedly controlled by the people. We know that isn't true, but bear with me. We're examining why it isn't true, so we must first act as if it is to reach a logical conclusion.

So, let us say we task the government with managing, say, cars. The government will provide cars and fuel to the people. However, to do this, the government would need money,

either to buy the cars and fuel or simply to produce them. To get that money, the government needs to tax the people. Furthermore, in order to know who needs a car and fuel and who doesn't, they must be able to keep records on the people. They must know who has a car, where they live, how much fuel they use,

what they use the car for, etc.

And that's not all! Now that everyone is pitching in through taxes, people want those cars and that fuel to go to good use. So the government starts regulating what kind of car you can have, what kind of fuel you use, how much fuel you can use, what you can use the car for, where you can go with that car, how much you can use the car, etc. Never mind that simply by providing the car and fuel, they decide what kind of car and what kind of fuel you get.

So, here we can see how allowing the government to manage more than mere laws and international regulations greatly increases its power. And the more the government is allowed to manage things in the nation, the more power it gets. The more power it gets, the harder it is to fight corruption within it and so the more corrupt it gets. And a powerful, corrupt government is a tyranny, no more, no less. It does not matter whether it is a democracy or not; it is a logical conclusion.

The more powerful a government, the harder it is to take action against it. The harder it is to take action against it, the easier it is for corrupt government officials to get away with, well, corruption. And since, as exposed, giving greater management responsibilities proportionally increases the government's powers, we can therefore conclude that giving greater management responsibilities to the government corrupts it.

Yet, are there things a government can do which would not increase its power? Or can we prevent corruption in any way?

The key question that you ask is how we can prevent corruption, because that allows for governments to expand their powers without causing significant damage. Also, because off the top of my head I really can't think of an effective way to increase what the government can do without increasing its power.

There is more than one way to do this, but not all are practical.

Absurd levels of vigilance are one. People who chose to become public servants would have to be monitored essentially 24/7 to ensure that they can't pull any bullshit. These days it isn't hard to monitor people like that, but it would be hard to find people willing to work. If we kept the monitoring of public servants to a single agency and did not publicly release stuff about their private lives, it would be feasible that people would go into government, but then that opens up the possibility of the monitors being bribed.

Instead we could simply increase their pay such that public servants would be willing to put up with being monitored. I'm not how much money we'd have to pay people to give up their privacy almost entirely, but it may be lower now than in the past. We could also enforce anti-corruption laws with execution, or just extremely harshly and reduce the amount of monitoring to more reasonable levels. Naturally, my preference is simply to keep government smaller than deal with all of this, but I gave it a shot.

In conclusion, this is why I denounced national multiculturalism in a previous essay. The more multicultural a nation, the less coherent the people. The less coherent the people, the

harder it is to have nationalism. The harder it is to have nationalism, the less social projects you can engage in.

And with this, we can conclude the following things:

1. The more responsibilities are given to a government, the higher the risk it will become tyrannical.
2. When planning social projects, a nation should aim for finite ones rather than perpetual ones.
3. Nationalism reduces corruption and therefore allows greater social projects.

These three principles are fairly safe bets when you want to achieve a functional nation. It is of course possible to argue about the extent to which each should be applied, yet they will always remain true. And remember that they are not possible in a multicultural nation.

First, let's examine what additional tasks a government could accomplish which would not threaten to give it undue powers. Let us call those additional tasks "social projects". Quite honestly, it is exactly what they are: Projects which societies want to achieve for the good of its members. However, as we've seen, a large scale social project which requires constant management is a bad thing. However, we can separate social projects into two categories: perpetual and finite.

Perpetual projects are those like the one I used as an example; we want to provide goods and services to the population, yet they require constant upkeep, therefore require records, regulations and so on.

Finite projects are different. They're usually about infrastructure (though not always) and are meant to either provide something essential to the functioning of society or to advance our knowledge. Good examples are roads, aqueducts, the space program, etc. Though governments love to keep managing the things they build, nothing forces them to; as an example, once an aqueduct is built in a village which did not possess the money or knowledge to build one, its management could easily be relayed to the local authorities. These projects also somewhat increase the government's powers since they require greater taxation and some management for their duration, yet the potential for abuse is much lower. Existent, yet much lower.

But what about corruption? What can we do about it?

To fight corruption, one must understand its source: The will to power.

The will to power is not a bad thing. In fact, it's quite the opposite: The will to power is what drives us to elevate humanity. However, an ill-advised will to power can be destructive. This is what corruption is.

Corruption happens when an individual with power uses it to the detriment of others for personal gain. This may seem natural, one wishes for power naturally unless taken in by slave morality. However, when one looks at the greater picture, it becomes obvious that corruption is actually self-defeating: By acting to the detriment of your nation for personal gains, you are harming the nation you are a part of, and therefore harming yourself. What you are doing is not increasing your own absolute power, but simply increasing your power relative to the other individuals in your nation. This is why the most corrupt governments in the world, though they

possess unbelievable amounts of power over their citizens, are usually the weakest in the international power structure. The corrupt unwittingly work against themselves. So, how can we prevent this?

The answer is actually appears quite obvious once you know it: Nationalism. Nationalism is what teaches people the importance of the nation, it's what teaches them how their own power depends on the power of the nation, how harming the nation harms them. Therefore, we can conclude that the more nationalist a nation, particularly a nation's government, the less corrupt a nation will be. And as the potential for corruption becomes smaller, the scope of social projects can increase.

On Confederations

And now, I arrive at my conclusion. All of what I've written so far has led to this. The whole of what I've written will be necessary not only to understand what I'm about to say, but to achieve it. This also means that it is my final thread. I will keep posting, as I always have, and I will definitely create more threads, but it is the last time you will see the beaver being used to mark my threads. And so, to the matter at hand:

Confederations are the power structures of the future, and the only imaginable supranational entity which is functional and morally sound. But what is a confederation? How does it function? Why is it necessary? What are the advantages? How do we maintain one? Ill try to cover as much as possible, and as said, knowledge of what I've said in the last year and a half will be necessary to fully comprehend.

As I've said, multiculturalism is a blight upon the world. Nations must be monocultural to be functional. However, the world itself should be multicultural: Seeking to establish a single monolithic culture for the whole of humanity would be ill-advised. Yet in a world which is getting more interconnected, where full scale war between advanced nations would lead to annihilation and where specialization becomes the norm, collaboration between nations becomes important. Furthermore, one can point out many countries in the world which do not correspond to the monocultural definition of the nation which I have given. The answer to these problems is the confederation.

A confederation is a supra-national entity which acts as a coordinator between different nations which all have common interests and similar, yet different cultures. It is an additional government level, above that of the national. However, as said before, a nation's laws can only be coherent if it is monocultural. Therefore, the confederation does not create laws or enforce them. Rather, its role is to consolidate different sectors of the governments of its member nations under a single, unified banner, as long as those sectors do not interfere with the autonomy of said member nations. A confederate government's role would then be to overwatch the military, transportation channels between the different constituent nations, international relationships (as in, relationships with nations which do not belong to the confederation, or with other confederations) and economic coherence within the confederation through the establishment of a single confederate currency

As you no doubt understand, this would be a massive undertaking and the mechanics of the confederation need to be established. I'll attempt to do so.

First of all, how do we determine whether different nations should be part of the same confederation? Well, first of all, their cultures should be similar enough that there would be no ideological clashes

between the constituent nations. It needs to be unimaginable for two nations within the same confederation to ever want to go to war with each other. Thus, two western european nations such as France and the United Kingdom would do well within the same confederation, but not, say, China and Saudi Arabia.

Furthermore, the constituent nations must have something to gain from being part of the same confederation. I once spoke of self-sufficiency: With confederations, a nation no longer has to be self-sufficient. Instead, it is the confederation which is self-sufficient, and the different constituent nations which provide for each other. Free trade between the confederation's nations is necessary to achieve this.

The level of human development, as well as working conditions and average disposable incomes should also be similar. A third world nation entering a confederation of industrialized nations would be tremendously harmful. One does not need to

explain the harm which has been caused by allowing free trade with developing countries where wages and the cost of life are low. Never mind that by purchasing goods produced by pseudo-slavery, the development of third world and developing nations is halted as the otherwise unsustainable system becomes sustainable.

So, similar cultures, common interest and similar life conditions are the necessary factors for different nations to form a confederation.

But what form should the confederate government take, and how do we make sure that it does not usurp the power which rightfully belongs to its constituent nations?

First of all, the confederate government should not be allowed to tax citizens directly. Instead, it is its constituent nations which should provide it with funds in order to function. Some may worry that a nation might decide to avoid paying its due to the confederation, but the solution to this problem is simple: If a nation refuses to contribute, it should not be part of the confederation. And as it is in its interest to be part of the confederation, it would be in its interest to contribute. Of course, to make sure the confederate government does not ask undue amounts from its constituents, the nations themselves need to have some leverage, and that leverage comes from the fact that they can still decide to withhold payment. Meaning, if the confederate government becomes abusive, the nations have the power to starve it

But what about the army? If the confederate government controls the army, then it has the ability to enforce its will on the constituent nations through force. There is a simple solution to this as well: Soldiers in the confederation should not be loyal to the confederation, but to their home nation. As long as the confederation works to help their nation, then they have an incentive to be loyal to the confederation. But if the confederation were to order them to tyrannize over the constituent nations, then such orders would not be obeyed. One can however imagine that the upper echelons of military command must never be given over to a single nation within a confederation, but those are details which would be worked out later. What is important to remember is that a confederation's

soldiers are only loyal to the confederation as long as it is functional. A confederate government seeking to use its army to usurp the power of its constituent nations would see its own army turn against it

Furthermore, democracy would be a dangerous form of government for the confederation. Democracy would automatically give power to the most populous nation, no matter what. Thus, a different form of government is necessary for the confederation. A form of military technocracy might be best. Going back on what I've said considering democracy and what should replace it, we can establish that a series of objective criteria would have to be established to determine who would be eligible not only to occupy positions of power within the confederation, but to vote for who will occupy those positions. The individual nations can keep their own form of governments, regardless of what form the confederate government will take.

And what about the rights of the citizens of a confederation? Should all citizens of a confederation have the same rights? Ideally, they should. However, I personally believe that the rights should be determined by nations. The rights of a citizen would depend on his nation, not on the confederation.

The confederation should also facilitate collaboration between its constituent nations. Freedom of movement between the nations would be necessary, as well as a single currency to facilitate trade, and of course free trade. However, what of immigration? I speak not here of the movement of citizens of different nations within the confederation, but of extra-confederate immigration. People from outside the confederation seeking citizenship. I've given my opinion of immigration before, and I'll restate it, but this time taking into account the existence of confederations: No confederation has any duty towards foreigners. Immigration should only be allowed if the confederation has anything to gain from it. And there is no problem in a confederation which can be solved by replacing its population

with that of extra-confederate elements. Thus, I believe that for extra-confederate individuals to be allowed to immigrate to the confederation, they should have the support of both the confederate government and of the government of whichever nation they are immigrating to. The confederate government should not have the power to force nations to accept immigrants, nor should nations be able to accept immigrants without the approval of the confederation.

Language however should not be standardized except in the military. The aim of the confederation is to allow different nations to be part of the same entity without threatening their autonomy or suppressing their individual cultures. Even in the case of the military, the standardization of language is merely the lesser evil. A military can not afford to sacrifice efficiency for any reason whatsoever, so all its members should be able to communicate with each other. I'd also like to point out three proto-confederations which already exist, while also explaining how they're not truly confederations. They are the United States of America, the European Union and Canada.

The United States of America already function very much like a confederation. There is an unprecedented amount of separation of powers within that country which creates a federal government which has far less power over its constituents (the states) than any other federal government on the planet at this time. However, it is not truly a confederation. Could the states

be considered different enough to be separate nations'? In certain cases, they certainly can. But in others, the distinction between two states is merely geographic. Furthermore, the federal government of the United States still has an inordinate amount of power over its constituents which would be abhorrent in a confederation.

The European Union is seemingly an attempt at creating such a confederation, but it fails for many reasons. It tries to legislate and standardize laws between its constituent nations, many nations do not contribute to the Union, the life conditions in its constituent nations can vary quite a bit and it often tries to usurp national power. The current refugee crisis is a good example of mismanagement, especially in the case of immigration.

Canada itself was meant to be a confederation from the start, but quickly became a country like any other through different acts which centralized the powers into the hands of the federal government. Canada is definitely constituted of many different nations, yet it tries to act as if it is but one nation. Canada is peculiar compared to the other two examples however as it has the best potential to become a functional confederation. Quebec itself has sought more autonomy for decades now, and the metamorphosis of Canada from a country into a confederation would help solve that problem. I spoke of how the separation of Quebec was an inevitability and how damaging it would be for not only Quebec and the rest of Canada, but even for the whole world. The confederation is a solution to that problem: The constituent nations of Canada would regain their own autonomy, while maintaining a supra-national power structure which would allow them to remain independent from potentially predatory nations which would take over were they not working together. It would essentially bring them the advantages of Canada's current form, which is a united front against the rest of the world so as to maintain control over their territory, while also removing the disadvantages, which are that the nations interfere with each other.

Yet, achieving the confederation would be difficult. The people in power right now would not allow it: It would mean the establishment of a government level above theirs, or, if their own government level were to take the role of confederate government, the loss of many powers. They will not allow it because they are shortsighted buffoons. They would rather have total control of the countries they rule over even if it were to bring their own destruction rather than accept a position of lesser control which would bring about an entity to surpass the Roman Empire.

Thus, revolution will be necessary. What form this revolution will take will depend on how unreasonable the current leaders are, and how urgent the formation of the confederation is. My advice is to keep an eye on Canada: As said, it has a lot to gain from becoming a confederation, and I would go so far as to say that it is ripe for it. The idea only needs to gain ground and it will become a reality there. And once Canada has become a confederation and the success of such an entity has become self-evident to the rest of the world, the dominoes will fall. Hell, maybe Canada and the United States will join into a single confederation. It would indeed be a very effective confederation.

Confederations are the future. The only other alternative is a gradual degradation of humanity and war, as the different nations of the world become unable to cope with the issues they face. And all we have to do to achieve this bright future is to seize it.

On Propaganda

Propaganda is not merely a useful tool, but a necessity in a functional nation.

Propaganda has become a dark word associated with repression, disinformation and totalitarianism. In fact, our governments will use this as a tool: Enemy propaganda is presented as it is, propaganda. Neutral information is also called propaganda. However, the government's propaganda will be given more pleasant names, such as "journalism" or "public service announcements"" In the end, they are all the same thing: Propaganda. Yet, the idea that propaganda is necessarily a bad thing is wrong.

As explained before, the leading of a nation is beyond the grasp of the common man, and not always through intellectual limitations but sometimes merely through motivation" An individual only has so much time in his day and depending on his situation, political activity may not be possible" The common man should not be expected to keep himself well informed on all political events; that is the duty of the politician.

However, for a nation to function, the aims of its citizens must be in line with those of the leadership, and this can only be achieved if the citizens have some knowledge of political issues" This is where propaganda comes in.

Good propaganda does not need to lie. In fact, it must be telling the truth: If the propaganda lies, the citizenship will find out sooner or later and their trust in their government will be severely undermined, which in turn will make all future propaganda ineffective. No, the aim of propaganda should not be to disinform the citizenship but to inform it. It is meant to break down complex political issues into an easy to understand and memorize format fit for the proletariat. Not the intelligentsia, but the proletariat. The more intelligent members of a society will be able to understand the basics of a political issue without the aid of propaganda and so it should not be targeted to them.

Hence, propaganda should aim at being simple. Simple in that it should be easy to remember. Simple in that it should not be morally ambiguous. Simple in that it should be easy to convey it quickly to as many people as possible. Once that is achieved, it must be repeated as often as possible to make sure it enters the public's consciousness. Furthermore, a government should have as few propaganda campaigns at once as possible" The more messages being sent to the populace, the less likely they are to remember any of it.

In the end, if propaganda is done well, not only will it allow better management of the nation as the citizenship will be better informed of the leadership's intentions, but it will also increase

general contentment as people will now understand the measures taken by their government. If it is not done well, it will sow distrust and greatly hinder the nation's potential.

What is important to remember however is that the idea that propaganda is wrong is, itself, wrong" If our aim is to better our society and to build better nations, then we must learn to use propaganda properly. It is the only way to gain the people's approval and thus their collaboration. And only once that is achieved can change finally happen.

On Morality

While being subjective, the existence of morality is undeniable and general rules can still be applied as to how it functions.

For the sake of argument, let us assume that there is no supreme divine authority" The most common amoralist argument is often atheistic, claiming that without the judgement of a supreme being, morality does not exist. Better yet, some would like to claim that at most, morality is a human invention and therefore is nothing but a figment of the imagination, a limit on the human spirit meant to degrade us"

Yet if there is no deity, who else but man rules this universe? As far as we know, we are the sole thinking beings in the universe. We thus become its masters, all while being at its mercy" We are the thinking part of reality and therefore what we believe is not merely relevant, but of capital importance, objectivity be damned" Hence, we can conclude that morality does not require the existence of a supreme being to be valid; it would exist and be relevant regardless"

At this point however, we could still ask ourselves a few questions: Is there a use for morality? Is morality beneficial or harmful to an individual and its society? Are there certain universal tenets?

Two of these questions are intrinsically related, namely whether morality is useful and whether it's beneficial or not.

Let us not talk of "conventional" morality. Such a concept is merely pompous drivel from men who believe their morality to be the right one and thus "conventional". In truth, morality is far more subjective than we often realize, especially on more complex issues. Still, one can easily tell whether morality is good or not, as oxymoronic as such a question may seem. Morality can easily be defined as an individual's willingness to harm himself, to limit himself, for the sake of society, whether consciously or not. The individual must limit his access to certain resources even if they would be beneficial to him, he must deny himself certain things he desires.

We can thus determine that functionally, morality is harmful to the individual yet beneficial to society. However, in the long run, a proper morality is beneficial to the functional individual too; it protects him from the predation of others" Morality is thus a function of a man's consciousness of not only his being a member of a society, but of his capacity for abstract thought.

Yet what makes a proper morality? This is where things get interesting"

As morality apparently seeks the maintenance of society, a man of simple thought might believe it is possible to have a form of objective morality: After all, there must be a set of norms which determine whether a society will function or not.

Though the thought is elegant, it unfortunately does not resist contact with reality. Such an objective morality would require the ability to predict the outcome of any action taken at any time, something we do not possess" This comes back to what I explained earlier, that morality depends on the capacity for abstract thought: Without it, one is not capable of examining the possible outcomes of certain actions, especially on a large time scale, and is thus unable to determine whether an action is moral or not.

Though morality is subjective, we can still determine a constant: Survival" The ultimate goal of morality is to increase the chances of survival of the human species, of different human races, of different human societies and of individuals. Strangely, once considered from this angle, all morality is simplified. We consider murder wrong, yet we know killing another human being is sometimes not only justified, yet necessary. We consider theft wrong, yet we know a man is sometimes justified in stealing.

So you could say that the ultimate moralist is the man with the greatest capacity to evaluate the long term impacts of actions on the greatest number of people.

We could then claim that the source of all evil is merely shortsightedness. A man will commit an act we consider evil because he does not consider its impact on a larger scale. Yet people who are capable of thinking far ahead in time on a whim are actually not that common" In fact, humans are limited in their ability to consider the consequences of their actions on other human beings. If you are interested in this, I recommend reading on Dunbar's number.

This is where religion becomes important. Religion is morality simplified for the masses. As societies grow and interactions become more complex, the common individual becomes less and less able to predict the outcome of his action and thus their morality. Religion aims to provide a common set of morals to the masses which they obey unquestioningly. When a more complex issue arises, judgement of its morality is left to elites who have a greater capacity for abstract thought. Yet in the end, religion is sufficient for the every day life of the masses.

Many variables must be considered to determine the morality of an action and in fact, the simpler minded will believe that even considering them will be immoral. Religion will often teach the equality of all men, yet a moralist must recognize that some individuals are more important than others. Yet in the end, morality is not an attack on abstract thought, as some would like others to believe; it is its ultimate form. It is its end result.

Morality is the final refinement of human thought.

On Self-Sufficiency

Self-sufficiency is the key to a nation's prosperity.

Any nation which cannot produce its own food and other resources required for basic needs is essentially nothing but a vassal state, entirely dependent on the whims of the nation providing it with goods. To understand this, I will explain what many consider a basic concept of economy, yet which bears repeating for this discussion. The economy is divided between three sectors:

Primary, which is production. This sector includes farms, mines, the lumber industry, oil wells, etc. Basically, any activity which extracts resources and makes them available.

Secondary, which is transformation. This sector concerns itself with taking the resources and creating things with them" This is manufacturing, construction, food processing, etc. It is entirely dependent on the primary sector to function.

Tertiary, which is service. This sector concerns pretty much everything else, from selling to transport to healthcare to entertainment. Though not entirely, it is still extremely dependent on both the primary and secondary sectors. The tertiary sector is different from the two previous ones in that it does not actually produce any wealth. At best, it transfers wealth from one entity to the other.

Now that we've established this, we can explore how self-sufficiency is crucial to any nation.

To better understand, let us explore four different societies.

The first one only has the tertiary sector. These nations actually exist, they rely entirely on tourism for subsistence. As they do not produce anything themselves, they must buy the things they need from other nations; however, they cannot do so without anything to provide in exchange, and so they rely on tourists from other nations coming to visit them and selling services to them. This allows them to obtain money, which they then exchange for the goods they need. The citizens of these nations are entirely at the mercy of the rest of the world however: Other nations may decide to raise their prices to take advantage of them, or tourism may stop, or a catastrophe in might mean that other nations aren't even willing to sell to them. A nation whose economy revolves around the tertiary sector is thus at the mercy of the international economy.

The second one has both the secondary and tertiary sector. Many nations nowadays have taken this model, having stopped producing their own resources and instead importing them to

transform them. Such an economy is less vulnerable as it is capable of producing its own goods, yet it still depends on other nations to provide it with the resources it needs.

The third one has both the primary and tertiary sector. It produces its own resources, sells them to client nations who transform them, then buys them back. Though it has some leeway against other nations (if the other nations try and swindle them through rising the prices of processed goods, as an example, it can just stop providing them with the resources they need in return), it is still dependent on other nations.

Only the fourth one is self-sufficient: The nation with a primary, a secondary and a tertiary sector. Such an economy does not fear embargoes, sanctions, taxes or catastrophes in other parts of the world as it does not depend on other nations to produce its resources and process them. Thus, any such nation cannot be bullied by others in any way except military.

We can then rightfully claim that the prosperity of a nation depends on its self-sufficiency. As seen, any nation not capable of producing its own resources and transforming them is dependent on the international economy in one way or another and thus at its mercy. However, in the last decades, we've seen the opposite; with urbanization, wealthy nations have abandoned either the primary or secondary sector, constantly placing more and more emphasis on the tertiary. The secondary sector has been almost entirely moved to less prosperous nations. Though the effect is avoidable for a while, it was inevitable: As the supposedly wealthy nations produced less and less wealth, they fell deeper and deeper into debt. Solutions have been proposed, yet what must be done remains obvious. Any nation which wishes to reverse this trend of increasingly greater dependence on the global economy must achieve these:

1. Restart the primary resource sector, food production in particular. Feeding your people is the most important objective one must meet, and as long as your nation is capable of feeding itself, you're not going to feel most methods of economic warfare. Even if you cannot produce all the resources you need, everyone needs food and you can always trade food for fuel and materials.
2. Focus the secondary sector on processing local resources. This means your manufacturing sector is not dependent on the whims of the international economy. Only once you can process your resources yourself should you consider opening industries which process foreign resources.
3. Acquire "vassal states". If a nation can become self-sufficient, it should then seek nations which cannot be and submit them. This is simple: Offer them what they need in exchange for their loyalty. One should focus on nations which can produce resources which are unavailable at home, thereby securing them. If the vassal state refuses to cooperate in the future, you can simply cut the flow of the resources they need and starve them.

So remember: Any man who speaks of replacing agriculture with industry and industry with tourism is not a friend to your nation.

On Equal Opportunity

What today's moral guardians call "equal opportunity" is a disgusting corruption of the concept and this needs to be fixed.

The meaning of "equal opportunity" is in the name of the concept itself: All individuals should be judged equally based on their abilities rather than on their race, gender, religion, nationality, sexual orientation or any other irrelevant factor. The aim of this is twofold:

Justice by allowing everyone an equal chance.

Efficiency by making sure we don't ignore talented individuals based on arbitrary factors.

However, good intentioned morons have twisted this concept into an abomination which can best be described as "equal representation".

You see, the concept of "equal opportunity" was originally intended as a method of fighting discrimination of all kinds. Of course, a wise man would point out that this is putting the cart before the bull: Ending discrimination should lead to equal opportunity, not the other way around. This has little relevance to the point I'm about to make, yet I felt the need to comment on it.

As the concept of equal opportunity was put in place, advocates for social justice observed a trend which alarmed them greatly: Despite their best efforts, many jobs were still mostly occupied by men and whites were overrepresented in many professions, especially high ranking ones. The explanation for this was rather obvious: Certain jobs require great physical strength and average women, whether we like it or not, do not possess the raw physical strength of average men. This is not a social construct, it is not discrimination, it is not a patriarchal invention, it is a biological fact.

As for racial representation, whether we subscribe to racial theory or not, one cannot deny that people of different cultures will have different affinities for certain jobs. People raised in a low income ghetto are naturally less inclined to higher studies than people raised in a cushy, high income home. In fact, culture even has an impact on gender representation: A culture which raises its daughters as housekeepers and its sons as providers will naturally see a difference in gender representation across professions.

Yet, the liberals were blind to this. To them, the difference in representation was not due to these factors but rather to a failure to apply equal representation resulting from residual discrimination. Their response to this was a perversion.

This is how we wound up with quotas, with affirmative action, with progressive stacks. The aim of these methods was to combat the supposed residual discrimination existing within

societies. Better yet, we can observe cognitive dissonance as the same people who invented these also admit the truth of my previous statements, namely that biology and culture will naturally affect the representation of different groups in certain domains. From this we observed the rise of the concept of "innate privilege", which was a proper way of saying whites and males should be discriminated against because they have higher odds of coming from a background which promotes intellectual pursuits.

And so we're back where we started, with individuals being discriminated against based on arbitrary factors. This time, however, the moral guardians are satisfied because they see a fairly equal representation in certain well paying careers, failing to realize that this goes entirely against the original point of equal opportunity: Equal chances for all and efficiency in selecting able individuals.

But how do we fight this? With nothing more than the truth. We point out how whites and males from "underprivileged" backgrounds are getting discriminated against as much as those from supposedly "privileged" backgrounds. We explain why lowering the standards for access to a profession in order to meet quotas is a dangerous practice. We point out the real reasons behind the differences in representation. We denounce the patronizing belief that women and minorities need an advantage to succeed. We demonize the idea that some people should be selected against by mere virtue of their birth.

At the same time, we try and propose solutions to the problem of representation. Greater promotion of intellectual pursuits in low income communities, financial support for talented individuals from low income backgrounds regardless of race or gender, learning to educate our daughters to practice rational rather than emotional thinking. All of these would go a long way towards fixing representation without affecting equal opportunity.

We will meet opposition when trying to achieve this, but fret not; we are the majority. They are the minority. The people who think like us are overwhelmingly numerous compared to those who brandish the scarecrow of discrimination when we question their methods. It is time to speak, to stop pretending that we are a few individuals who still see the truth and realize that we are part of a silent majority. Once this is done, they will bend and our society will be free from their idiocy.

On Democracy

The only reason democracy is still used is because those who control our governments have managed to convince people that it is impossible to have anything better.

Why do we have democracy? Winston Churchill once said that democracy is the worst government system except every other that's been tried. The truth of his words will resonate once I'm done explaining how we wound up with democracy.

First of all, as democracy is a type of republic, we have to understand why we have a republican government. There are really only three kinds of governments, all based on how the leaders are picked, with every other type simply being variants of these. Political scholars would no doubt claim that this is wrong, yet once you've read what I'm about to explain, you'll realize the truth of it.

The first type is simply force. In such a government, the leaders are simply those who have enough military power to take control of the nation. Some would claim this is a good form of government as they believe that power should go to whoever is capable of acquiring it, yet being a good military strategist and having a large army does not necessarily make you a good leader. It likely makes you a good military leader, but ruling a nation is more than leading a military. Furthermore, such governments are unstable, their nations prone to civil wars as people fight over control of the nation.

The second type is hereditary. A hereditary government is usually descended from another, yet that's not really important. What is important is that in this government, leaders are chosen by other leaders. More precisely, a leader will choose his successor or there will be a set of laws determining who will succeed him, usually one of his children. The advantages of such a system are obvious; as we know who will succeed the current leaders as soon as they are gone, it is possible to raise them for that purpose, therefore forming leaders from infancy. The pitfalls are obvious however: You're never guaranteed that those chosen will have any competence, or that they'll have the will to act for the good of the nation. In fact, as their power is secure no matter what, they often care little for the nation, only for themselves.

The third type is the republic. In a republic, the leaders are chosen from a pool of eligible candidates by voters and must rule the nation according to a set of laws. The republic naturally appears to be superior to the previous two, and it is. Being able to choose the leader in such a way not only allows the nation to have the most competent leader possible, but also allows it to replace the leader without the use of violence if need be.

The main issue with the republic is deciding who can vote. There are many forms of republic, their definitions depending on who can vote and thus who ultimately has power over the government. However, how can we be sure that those who vote won't simply vote for their own benefits to the detriment of the nation? Thus

democracy appears: By allowing nearly everyone (minors and extremely mentally ill people being the exceptions) to vote, you bypass the issue entirely. Y the problem of deciding who can or can't vote. Simply put, in a democracy, since everyone can vote, then the government chosen will have been voted on by the whole population and this will be the one benefiting the greatest amount of people in the nation, and thus (ideally) the nation itself.

Though this is a fairly quick and crude explanation, it remains true. However, democracy is far from flawless.

Democracy is definitely not without its pitfalls. I'll examine the main three ones, namely: Incompetent voters, incompetent leaders and the tyranny of the masses.

First of all, understand that allowing everyone to vote was never considered an ideal solution by anyone but the most obtuse and idealistic moron. It was merely a band-aid solution: We can't determine who's competent without risking corruption, thus we allow everyone to vote. This in tum gives voting power to the incompetent. Anyone with any degree of political knowledge knows the average voter is barely aware of how his own government even functions, let alone the issues faced by his nation at the moment. Furthermore, to say that these people know who is best fit to lead them is laughable; these people vote not for the most fit, but for who they like the most. And as the incompetent outnumber the competent by a large margin, it is safe to say that the voters in a democracy are not capable of making a constructive choice.

This in tum brings us to incompetent leaders. As leaders are chosen not by how competent they are, but how popular, the odds of getting a competent leader are dramatically diminished. In fact, in a democracy, the leader's job is not to rule, but to obtain and maintain his rule. Thus, a leader in a democracy will take decisions based not on how beneficial they are to the nation, but on how popular they are so as to secure his rule.

Finally, there is the tyranny of the majority. In a democracy, the majority always wins. However, the majority is not always right. In fact, history shows that the majority is alarmingly often wrong. As competent citizens represent only a minority of the voters, they are incapable of effecting any significant change and thus are forced to live under the rule of the incompetent.

There are quite a few other issues with democracy, such as the massive bureaucracy accompanying it or the risk of being tumed into an oligarchy as good examples, but I believe made my point, which is that democracy is far from an ideal system. However, Churchill's words ring true now:

We haven't tried anything better yet. So the question is, can we think of anything better?

It is my sincere belief that it could b possible to replace democracy with something better. The fact that, after centuries, we still haven't figured out anything to replace it is not proof that democracy is the best there is, but rather that people have given up and simply accepted it as their system. After all, democracy favors the greatest number of people, so the greatest number of people like it, so it is good, right?

Anyway, what could replace democracy? It obviously should be a form of republic; the issues here are determining who can vote and who is eligible for a leadership position. The latter is rather simple; we already have a fairly good definition in most democracies and even in a worst case scenario, it can simply be defined as "anyone with the right to vote". The difficult question, as always, is "Who should be able to vote?"

Can there be an objective measure of an individual's competence to take decisions regarding the direction of a nation? The classical answer is no, but I challenge that perception. The criteria used to determine this are many, of course, but can be boiled down to intelligence, knowledge, experience and integrity. This seems contradictory to my earlier statement, as there is no objective measure of any of these except knowledge. Yet this is the question: How can we objectively measure intelligence, knowledge, experience and integrity?

The answer will surprise you: There isn't. Some will claim intelligence can be measured through IQ, yet anyone with any knowledge of the topic knows why that's wrong. Though knowledge can be determined by tests, you can never know if whoever designed the tests is asking for the right type of knowledge. Experience can be measured in years, but the important part isn't how much experience you have but rather what kind of experience you have. Finally, integrity cannot be measured at all. At best you can look at an individual's past history, yet you never know what he might be hiding and it does not guarantee future integrity.

Does this mean it is impossible to test these factors? Absolutely not. They can't be measured, yet it is possible, through pressure, to test them. As an example, you cannot measure military prowess, yet it is undeniable that the winner of a war is superior in that regard. Thus, we can assume that certain conditions, certain experiences, can force an individual to display his leadership qualities for all to see in an objective manner. If we could determine what kind of experiences are favorable to this, then we could use them to determine who is competent enough to vote.

Until we can do this, democracy is inevitably what we must rely on. However, that is no excuse not to try and figure out something better to replace it. And if we decide to do it, expect a lot of resistance; those who rule through democracy will do everything to prevent success in that regard and they will have the support of the majority.

Replacing democracy will depend on convincing the majority that it is not right.

I agree, democracy is far from the idealized form of government. Ideally an Anarchy, or lack of government would be the best, however human nature keeps that from being possible. I agree with the sentiment that "If humanity could live without laws, then there are no more humans". For an idealized form of government to exist (an Anarchy) it would require some sort of Nietzschean Ubermensch.

Since ideal government is not a possibility, what should we do?

Your criticisms of Democracy mostly stand, however I would like to add something in, counter to your idea of the voter having the power. In the United States, for example, while in theory the voter has the power, or "the majority", in practice votes can be bought through various marketing manipulation techniques. Repeating a phrase over and over does not make it true, but gives what the phrase is trying to say some form of reality. The "mob" or the general masses do not care for the ins and outs of policy decisions. They will always go with the fashionable, good-looking, and similar to them. They are easy to manipulate into voting a

certain way, or for certain groomed candidates. What has always struck me about democracy is the corruption that seems to be rampant among all forms. There are countless examples throughout the world and throughout history of this corruption.

Knowing that voters cannot be trusted, and that votes can be bought or manipulated, I think we should generally throw the entire system of voting for a leader out entirely. Instead, a Meritocracy should be striven for, or a government based on human virtue and the best of our kind. Our leaders should be tested intensely, physically, mentally, and harshly, to determine their worth. The Chinese used to have tests that would sometimes kill the people taking them, as they would last for days and be very stressful.

Some system of voting should stay in place, as for lawmakers or for the people who create the testing for the leaders, whatever agency or system would do that. However when it comes down to the choice of a leader, only the best of the best should even be allowed in the conversation.

On Free Speech

Free speech is considered a basic requirement for freedom, for a modern, civilized society. I don't need to explain why free speech is important, yet I will before I move on.

Free speech is considered a right because it implies freedom of thought. Furthermore, it empowers ordinary citizens by allowing them to denounce corrupt leaders and it protects them from abuse. Free speech leads to a better informed, better educated and ultimately stronger society.

But what limits should be put on free speech? The seemingly obvious answer is none: How can you say you have free speech if there are things you can't say? Therefore, hate speech and blasphemy laws are antithetical to free speech as they can be abused to shut down opposition to corrupt powers.

Yet, anyone with an ounce of sense knows some things can objectively be very harmful to say. This is why we have slander and libel laws, as an example: You're not allowed to spread lies about a person or organization. But then, if you're not allowed to lie, what stops the powers that be from simply claiming that you are lying to shut down your right to free speech?

And that's not all. In war times, crucial strategic information must be censored for the interest of the nation. Any information which is known to the public is information known to the enemy, thus it becomes necessary to restrict free speech. Yet, again, corrupt powers could abuse this to claim those who oppose them are helping the enemy to shut them down. We have quite a conundrum here. So, what constitutes acceptable free speech and what doesn't?

Ergo, it is my belief that "free speech" should be abandoned as a concept, as it is self-defeating. Instead, it should be replaced by three more specific rights:

1. The right to criticize.
2. The right to question.
3. The right to hate.

These three rights encompass everything which free speech aims to defend without the inconvenient of ambiguity which mere "free speech" offers. They provide the right to disagree with others and explain why you do, the right to question what you are told and the right to

dislike someone or something. Meanwhile, libel and slander are still disallowed while censoring critical strategic information remains moral.

The future ahead is difficult, and it is important that we question how our rights work, or more specifically why we have them. In this way, we can better protect what is essential and prevent abuse.